Anti-pædobaptiſm,

OR THE

SECOND PART

Of the full Review of the Diſpute

Concerning

INFANT-BAPTISM:

In which the invalidity of Arguments inferring a Duty from a poſitive Rite of the Old Teſtament concerning a poſitive Rite of the New, by reaſon of Analogy between them, is ſhewed; and the Argument againſt Infant-baptiſm, from Chriſts inſtitution, *Matth.* 28.19. the ſayings and practice in the New Teſtament is made good againſt the Writings of Mr. *Stephen Marſhall*, Mr. *Richard Baxter*, Mr. *Thomas Blake*, Mr. *Thomas Cobbet*, Mr. *John Cotton* Dr. *Nathaniel Homes*, Mr. *Robert Bailee*, Dr. *Daniel Featley*, Mr. *John Brinſley*, Mr. *Cuthbert Sydenham*, Dr. *Henry Hammond*, Mr. *Thomas Fuller*, and others.

By *John Tombs*, B. D.

But ſpeaking the truth in love, we may grow up into him in all things, which is the Head, even Chriſt. Epheſ. 4.15.

LONDON,
Printed by *Henry Hills*, and are to be ſold at his Houſe at the Sign of Sir *John Oldcaſtle* in *Py-corner*.
MDCLIV.

BRITISH MUSEUM

To the Right Honorable the Lord PRESIDENT and COUNCIL to his Highneſs the Lord *PROTECTOR.*

I Preſume to preſent to your Honors a Continuation of the full Review of a Diſpute of which the firſt part was preſented to his Highneſs more than a year ago. To which Writing I take my ſelf many ways obliged, not onely becauſe of my own engagements, but alſo, and that chiefly, by reaſon of the important concernment that the truth be preſerved. I am ſenſible that the increaſe of Books is thought a grievance by many, and that none

are more unwelcome, than ſuch as are about Controverſies, ſpecially when they tend to unſettle men in what they have received, and in no point more than in this. Few have abilitie to diſcern in Diſputes which part preponderates: Few are willing to beſtow pains in ſuch unpleaſant ſtudies: Few can digeſt a truth which expoſeth to reproach and loſs. Theſe and other conſiderations had kept me from this adventure, if my allegiance to Chriſt had not bound me to vindicate his truth, and charity to men tied me to endeavour their undeceiving. Wiſdom muſt be juſtified by her children: nor can he give a good account to Chriſt at his appearing, who ſhall, out of undue reſpects, leave to ſpoil the truth with which he is intruſted. Polemick Writing are

to

to few delightfull, yet neceſſary; it being unlikely that practice of piey ſhould flouriſh when Doctrines of Faith and Worſhip are corrupted. They that decline ſtudying and meddling with Controverſies, if they be not ſluggiſh, yet are likely unwary, not heeding that thereby the wall is unrepaired, which ſhould keep out Seducers from perverting the Churches. Peace is indeed very deſirable, but Truth is put firſt, *Zech.*8.19. Were menbetter temper'd than commonly they are, diſſenters might ventilate things in queſtion with leſs offence; I mention it with rejoycing, as a ſign of Gods preſence with us, in hope that the ſame Spirit of unanimity will diffuſe it ſelf among our Chriſtian brethren throughout the Nation. That Diſſenters and Contenders in writing, and otherwiſe, in this and other points, for their ſeveral judgments, have acted hitherto in the buſineſs of approving publick Preachers with much harmony of minde, and agreement of votes; Surely the work of Chriſt would be much advanced by a firm conſociation in order to the work of Chriſt ſo far as we agree, though there ſhould remain, as no doubt there will, diverſities of

opinions in things diſputable. Nor do I deſpair that Diſputes will be mannaged with more ſweetneſs of ſpirit, candour, and tenderneſs towards diſſenters than formerly they have been.

In this hope my intention is (with Gods aſſiſtence) to proſecute the Diſpute begun, a part whereof I now tender to your Honours, being deſirous that my ſelf, and the cauſe I mannage ſhould ſtand right in your eys, who are the eys of the Common-wealth. For whom I beg light from Heaven toguide you in your way, and help from him, who hath been hitherto your ſtrength, and who will be with you, while you be with him, and remain,

London,
June 1. 1654.

Your Honours humble and devoted Servant in the Lord,

John Tombes.

The Contents.

*Sect.*1. Of the reason and purport of this writing.

*Sect.*2. That no good argument can be drawn from positive rites of the Old Testament to prove a Divine appointment in positive rites of the New, nor is it true which Mr. *Baxter* saith that infants admission into the Church is fully determined in the Old Testament.

*Sect.*3. Mr. *Blakes* plea for arguments from analogy in meer positive rites of the Old Testament, and Mr. *Baxters* speech about infant admission as determined in it, are refelled.

*Sect.*4. Mr. *Baxters* speech about the little sayd for Antipædobaptism is vain, and his speech about the antiquity of infant-baptism, is very inconsiderate; and his speech about the difficulty and importance of the point in question is examined.

*Sect.*5. The first argument against infant-baptism from the institution *Mat.*19.28. *Mark* 16.16. and the practise in the New Testament is urged.

*Sect.*6. Mr. *Blakes* exception, against the *major*, that such institution or example as I require for infant-baptism is unnecessary, is refelled.

*Sect.*7. Mr. *Marshalls* exceptions that *Matth.*28.19. is not the institution of baptism, that onely Disciples are not appointed to be baptized, that this was a rule onely for a Church to be constituted, are refelled.

*Sect.*8. The exceptions of Mr. *Cobbet*, Mr. *Blake &c.* against the arguing from the order of teaching afore baptizing, of Mr. *Marshal*, Mr. *Hussey*, *&c.* that baptizing is discipling, are refelled.

*Sect.*9. The exception of Mr. *Marshal*, Mr. *Blake*, Mr. *Cobbet*, that nations are appointed to be baptized *Matth.*28.19. and so infants is refelled.

*Sect.*10. That infants of believers are not Disciples appointed to be baptized, *Matth.*28.19.

*Sect.*13.

*Sect.*11. Mr. *Cottons* allegations in his Dialogue *ch.*1. to prove infants Disciples, are shewed to be insufficient.

*Sect.*12. Mr. *Baxters* allegation of *Acts* 15.10. to prove infants Disciples, is fully answered, and his arguments retorted.

*Sect.*13. The arguments are vindicated which are brought to prove infants not meant by Disciples *Acts* 15.10.

*Sect.*14. Infants discipleship is not proved by Mr. *Baxter* from *Lev.*25.41,42. which speaks of the *Israelites* being Gods servants.

*Sect.*15. That infants are not proved to be Christs Disciples from being subjects to Christ, Christians, belonging to Christ, *Luke* 9.47,48 *Matth.*18.5. *Mark* 9.41.

Sect 16. Dr. *Featlie* and Mr. *Stephens* arguments from *John* 3.5. for infant-baptism, are answered, and baptism shewed not to be a cause of regeneration, and Mr. *Cranfords* words are considered.

*Sect.*17. The 31. *Cap.* of Mr. *Baxters* plain Scripture-proof, *&c.* is answered, and *Mark* 10.13,14,15,16. is shewed to make nothing for infants visible Church-membership and baptism, and his description of visible Church-membership is considered and his argument from *Deut.*29.10. shewed to be insufficient.

*Sect.*18. The 41. *Chap.* of Mr. *Blakes Vindic. Fœder.* about Christs speech of little children *Matth.*19.14. is answered, and my sayings in my Postscript vindicated.

*Sect.*19. Animadversions on Mr. *Cobbets. Just Vindic. part.*1. *ch.*4. and the arguings of Dr. *Homes*, Mr. *Bailee*, Mr. *Fuller*, Mr. *Sidenham* from the words and actions of Christ to little ones are answered.

*Sect.*20. The practise of infant-baptism is not proved, *Acts* 16. 15. by baptizing an household, against Mr. *Marshall*, Dr. *Homes* Mr. *Bailee*, Mr. *Cook*, Mr. *Sidenham*, Mr *Fuller*.

*Sect.*21. That 1 *Cor.*10.2. proves not the practise of infant-baptism against Mr. *Bailee*, Mr. *Cobbet*, *&c.*

*Sect.*22. Mr. *Blakes* argument from *Gal.*4.29. is answered.

*Sect.*23. Mr. *Brinsley* and Dr. *Homes* their conjecture from *Heb.*6.2 to prove infant-baptism, is refelled.

*Sect.*24 Dr. *Hammond* his way of proving infant-baptism from the *Jews* baptizing Proselytes children, is shewed to be vain.

*Sect.*25. Dr. *Hammonds* elusion of *Matth* 28.19. alleged against infant-baptism, is refelled.

*Sect.*26. Dr. *Hammond* neither from 1 *Cor.*7.14. nor from sayings of ancients proves the Apostles to have baptized infants.

Anti-Pædobaptiſm,

OR

A Full Review of the Diſpute concerning INFANT-BAPTISM.

SECT. I.

Of the Reaſon and Purport of this writing,

HAving by my *Poſtſcript*, *Antidote*, *Addition to the Apology*, *Præcurſor*, and *Ample diſquiſition of the meaning of the ingraffing*, Rom. 11. 17 *The promiſe*, Acts 2. 39. *The holineſſe of Children*, 1. Cor. 7. 14 formerly printed, endeavoured to vindicate my ſelf, and the doctrine of Anti Pædobaptiſm, which I aſſert, from the objections which have been publiſhed to hinder the entertainment of it; I now proceed with the divine aſſiſtance to review the diſpute about Infant Baptiſm, which was made publick by the Printing of my *Exercitation* and *Examen* of Mr. *Marſhal's* Ser-

mon in the year 1645. which is become the more laborious and tedious to me by reason of the many Antagonists, and their several writings since published, notwithstanding the equal and serious motion I made in the Epilogue of my *Examen*, that I might see some one writing, either of the *Assemblies*, or of their *Committees*, or the *London* Ministers (who in their *attestation* ceasur'd my Positions as *erroneous* and *pernicious*) in which the whole strength of the proofs for Infant-baptism might be put together, and Readers with my self eased of the trouble and charge of buying and perusing so many several writings, which some disclaim, and others magnifie. But this motion which would have quickly brought the matter to an issue, and made a shorter dispatch of the dispute than is now likely to be, being so far from meeting with a ready acceptance, that thereby an occasion was taken to misrepresent me as a braving challenger, and one that minds self-ostentation more than the truth of God (which is an artifice unworthy the users) and an opposite course taken to bear me down with a floud of injurious calumnies, and impetuous rather than considerate Antagonists, I am put to this choice, either to weary my self by answering so manie several writings, or else give advantage to them who are ready to take all advantages how indirectly soever (as appears by master *Baxters* dealing with me about the dispute at *Bewdly*, master *Simon Ford* of *Reading* his dealing with me about the passages in the *Act* at *Oxford* 1652.) to possesse people with prejudices against me, and of the unanswerablenesse of what is brought for Infant baptism, if they can but pretend that it is declined, though it be neglected onely for the futility and feeblenesse of it. But the former being more eligible for the truths sake, I conceive my self engaged to proceed in the *Review of the Dispute*. The writings which with mine own I am to review, are either such as are directly written against me, or such as at least for the truths sake I conceive meet to examine, whether they meddle with my writings or not; of the former sort are Master *Stephen Marshals defence of his Sermon*, Master *John Gerees Vindiciæ pædobaptismi*, and *Vindiciæ Vindiciarum*, Doctor *Nathanuel Homes* his *Animadversions* on my *Exercitation*, Master *Thomas Blake* his *Answer* to my *Letter*, and a great part of his *Vindiciæ fœderis*, and most of all Mr. *Richard Baxter* his *plain Scripture proof of Infants Church-membership*

berſhip and Baptiſm. and together with theſe, what Mr. *Thomas Cobbet of New England*, in his *juſt vindication* hath thought fit to oppoſe againſt my *Examen*, ſent in a manuſcript to New England, and delivered to him to examine, as Mr. *Cotton* informed me by his letter, though I be not named in Mr. *Cobbets* book. Others there are, which though they do not expreſly oppoſe me, yet Mr. *M.* Mr. *B.* or ſome other, do direct me to them, as Mr. *Cottons Dialogue*, *Voſſius* his *Theſes*, Mr. *Baillees Anabaptiſm*, Mr. *Drew*, Mr. *Church*, Mr. *Stephens*, Dr. *Featly*, Mr. *Lyford*, Doctor *Hammond*, &c. Mr. *Rutherfurd* is one, to whoſe writing Mr. *Baxter* pag. 211. directs me, but I have not yet met with anie other thing which he hath written about this argument, than what I find in his *Temperate plea*, chap. 11, 12. yet when any other thing of his, or any other Authors, occurrs, which ſuggeſts any thing conſidetable, beſides what others before have publiſhed, and is already anſwered, I do intend to take it into the *Review*, and to deal impartially, as one that ſeeks truth, and is ſenſible that he is accountable to the Lord about writing as well as ſpeaking; nevertheleſſe, in handling thereof, I ſhall not tie my ſelf, any further than I ſee neceſſary, to ſet down each Authors words at large, but ſo much of them as I conceive requiſite, and according to their meaning, and the force of their arguments, as rightly as I can. The method I once intended to uſe in this *Review* was according to the order of my *Examen*, but I ſhall now uſe ſuch an arbitrary method as I ſhall judge moſt clear and comprehenſive, beginning with Mr. *Richard Baxter* his three firſt chapters of the firſt part of his book fore-named.

SECT. II.

That no good argument can be drawn from the positive Rites of the old Testament, to prove a divine appointment in positive Rites of the new; nor is it true as Mr B. saith, that Infants admission into the Church is fully determined in the old Testament.

MAster *B.* begins the dispute, pag. 1. with a preface tending to move affections, otherwise than pleaders before the *Aropagites* were to do, and was desired of Mr. *B.* that Logick might be used, and Rhetorick forborn; but however the preface is framed, and takes with many, yet so many mistakes in it are shewed in my *Præcursor*, as might deterre readers from blinding their eyes by the dust raised in it. He then tells us *he must needs lay down several positions that must necessarily be well understood before they could understand the point in hand*, and these are no fewer than ten, which if they had been all omitted, I see not but that the point might have been as well understood as now it is. I do not remember where master *B.* makes any use of them for clearing the point, and therefore I judge them, with his three propositions, chap. 2. to serve onely to forestall mens minds, if they be not used to dull the Readers attention ere he come to the point, as the Turks use their *Asapi* to blunt the Christians swords by killing them afore their Janizaries fall on. But what ever the intent was, there are sundry passages that require animadversions; His first position is, *That the holy Ghost speaks of somethings in scripture more fully, and of others more sparingly*, which I grant to be true; but I like not his instance when he saith, *that the scripture speaks little concerning the heathen that never heard the Gospell, whether any of them be saved? or upon what terms he dealeth with them for life or death? Far is it* [saith he,] *from my reach, to discover the Holy Ghosts mind in this*: whereas me thinks the Scripture speaketh much of this, *Ephes.* 2. 1, 2, 3, 12. *Rom.* 1. & 2. & 3. & 11. Chapters. And to be doubtfull, *whether they that never heard the Gospel*

Gospel were saved, and upon what terms God dealt with them for life or death, is in my apprehension to be unresolved whether there be not ano her way of salvation than by Christ; whether a man living and dying a professed Idolater without repentance, may not be saved by his moral demeanour; and whether Pelagianism be not true, that by nature without grace men may be saved. *Vedelius* in his book *de deo synagoga* charged *Barlet* the *Arminian* with a dangerous position in writing in verses before a book of *Manasseh Ben Israel the Jew, that the God of Iews and Christians was one*, and intimating that *Iews remaining in denial of Christ might have God for their God*, contrary to *Iohn* 8. 24. and 14. 6. *Act.* 4 12. 1 *Iohn* 2. 23. and 5. 12. 2. *Iohn* 9. How much more dangerous a conceit must this be, much lessening the grace of God in Christ, tending to Pelagianism, and to make Idolatrie a venial sin, to imagine that men that never had the Gospel nor the Prophets, but were such, even the best of them, as are described *Rom.* 1. 21. &c. that they should be saved, when the Scripture so plainly tels us, *Revel.* 21. 8. 27. & 22. 15. that all Idolaters shall be without? But I leave master *B.* to Doctor *Prideaux* his lecture *de salute Ethnicorum* to resolve him in this point.

And whereas he saith *the Scripture speaketh sparingly of Infants*, it seems then some at least of his texts he brings for Infants discipleship and visible Church-membership are impertinent, sith they are so many; and whereas he instanceth in *the case of Infant-Baptism among such things as are not plainly determined in Scripture*, he doth thereby gainsay the title of his book, which he cals *plain Scripture proof of Infants baptism*; nor is he relieved by what he replies in his *praefatinamis morator*, where nothing is brought out of his words, before or after, wch shews I have not rightly alleged his words in my *Praecursor*, *Sect.* 2. And his words pag. 9. [*the grounds of it are very easie and plain, though to many it be difficult to discern how it is from those grounds inferred*] do confirm my observation, that he contradicted his title, sith the inference which is the proof, is in them confessed to be difficult. But what he saith in the words following, pag. 3. 4. is more exactly to be scanned, as touching the main *Basis* of Pædo-Baptism. *The new Testament* (saith Mr. *B.*) *speaks more sparingly of that which is more fully discovered in the old, what need the same thing be so done twice,*

except men had questioned the authority of the old? the whole Scripture is the perfect word and Law of God; & if he should reveal all his mind in one part, what use should we make of the other? How silent is the N. T. concerning Christian magistracy? which made the Anabaptists of old deny it: Where find you a Christian in the new Testament that exercised the place of a King, a Parliament-man, or Justice of Peace, or the like? so of an oath before a Magistrate, of war, of the Sabbath, &c. how sparing is the new Testament? and why? but because there was enough said of them before in the old; This also is the very case in the question in hand. The main question is not, by what sign members are to be admitted into the Church? or whether by a sign or without? But at what age they are to be admitted members? now this is as fully determined in the old Testament, as most things in the Bible, and therefore what need any more?

Answ. Mr. *B.* here asserts *in the question about Infant baptism, that it is as fully determined in the old Testament as most things in the Bible, at what age persons should be admitted members into the Church, and therefore what need any more?* which if true, Mr. *B.* had done well to have spared the allegation of *Mat.* 28. 19. *Acts* 15. 10. *Luk.* 9. 42. 48. *Mat.* 18. 5. *Mark* 9. 41. *Rom.* 11. 17, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26. *Mat.* 23. 37, 38, 39. *Rom.* 4. 11. 1. *Cor.* 7. 14, *Mark* 9. 36, 37. and 10. 13, 14, 15, 16. and others the allegation of *Act.* 2. 38, 39. and 16. 15. 1. *Cor.* 10 1, 2. for Infant-baptism, not troubling the Reader with more, when, if he speak true, the proof might have been made by fewer texts; *Frustra fit per plura, quod fieri potest per pauciora.* And indeed when Pædo-baptists speak not like wranglers, but ingenuously confesse the naked truth, they acknowledge there is no expresse precept or example for Infantbaptism in the new Testament, but they must flye to the old, Master *Marshal in his sermon of baptizing Infants*, pag. 34. Doctor *Young* in the passage cited in my *Praecursor*, Sect. 22. *Eaton* and *Taylor*, *defence*, pag. 57. *Do not you conclude Infants must be baptized, not because the new Testament expressly saith so, but because you find it in the old; the Jews children were circumcised, therefore Christians children must be baptized.* *The assembly at Westminster answer to the dissenting Brethren touching Ordination*, pag. 186. *If parity will not serve turn to prove an ordinance of Christ, or at least to*

warrant a practice, how will our brethren prove baptizing of infants? Which confessions me thinks should deterre Pædobaptists from alleging precept and practice of it out of the new Testament; or at least readers and hearers should learn more wit than to be cheated thereby, when their own confessions do shew that they are brought onely to fill up books, and to deceive the poor simple readers. But let us view Mr. *B.* words better.

He saith, *the main question is not by what sign members are to be admitted into the Church, or whether by a sign or without, but at what age they are to be admitted members?* now this is as *fully determined in the old Testament as most things in the Bible.* *Mr. M. in his defence*, pag. 195. saith thus; *First, for the point of willworship I shall desire you to prove this Conclusion, That all things belonging to Christian worship, even in the circumstances of it, even the ages and sexes of the persons to whom the ordinances are to be applyed, must expresly be set down in the new Testament; if you prove not this, you say nothing to the purpose, for this is our very case*, pag. 205. *This about Infant baptism touches but a circumstance of age.*

Answ. Tis true, the main question is, whether infants are to be baptized? But they that deny it, do so, not meerly because of their age, but because they appear not ordinarily to be disciples of Christ, or believers, or capable of these in act. Their admission by baptism is questioned because of their nondiscipleship, not precisely by reason of their age. Mr. *B.* in his *Appendix to his plain scripture proof*, &c. pag. 302. *And that in so material a thing as Infant baptism, and so about the proper subject of so great an ordinance; and if you judge Infant baptism a meer circumstance, you are much mistaken.* If the question about Infant baptism touch but a circumstance of age, then the question about Infant-communion toucheth but a circumstance of age, and if men may without precept or

Collings vindic. minist. Evan. pag. 67. *It is a rotten distinction to distinguish of substantial and circumstantial acts in businesses relating to Gods worship, in which we must have an eye to every tittle of institution.* Cawdrey Sab. Rediv. *part.* 2. *ch.* 7. pag. 277. *The subject or material thing is the substance of a command.*

exampl

example in the new Testament of Infantbaptism be acquitted from willworship, because it toucheth but a circumstance of age, by the same reason they may be acquitted from willworship, who give Infants the Communion, because it toucheth but a circumstance of age. Our Lord Christ and his Apostles having determined who are to be baptized, it is manifest willworship or humane Invention to baptize others than he and they have appointed; and it is so much the worse, because it is not onely about the proper subject of so great an ordinance, but also the main end and use of baptism, by altering of which the ordinance is quite changed into another thing, and the Church of God exceedingly corrupted. But letting that passe, *admission of Infants into the Church* (Mr. *B.* saith) *is fully determined in the old Testament*; if he mean not the Christian visible Church, he speaks ambiguously, and if his words be meant of the Christion visible Churah (of which onely is the question) then it is as fully determined in the old Testament, that Infants should be admitted into the visible Church Christian as most things in the Bible, as that God made heaven and earth, idols are vanities, fornication a sin, &c. But surely none will believe Mr. *B.* in this, but he that is so simple as to believe every word. Me thinks he should not have said such a word at *Bewdly*, where he saith in his *History*, *were many antient stayd Christians, that would not as children be tost up and down, and carried too and fro with every wind of doctrine*, except he presumed they would take what he said, as true, without trial. Formerly this was the received doctrine, that Baptism was the sacrament of admission into the Christian Church, that Baptism and the Lords supper were the sacraments of the new Testament, instituted by Christ himself, that Circumcision, and the Passeover, and the whole Jewish Church policy are abrogated, which if true, it is very bold to say, that *Infants are to be admitted into the visible Church Christian, is as fully determined in the old Testament, as most things in the Bible*, when there is not a word in all the old Testament about the age, or way of admission into the visible Church Christian. But where doth Mr. *B.* find this admission so fully determined in the old Testament? In the dispute at *Bewdly* he denied the precept of Circumcision to be the ordinance of visible church-membership, And in my *Præcursor*, *Sect. 6* I say, as yet I can find no such law or ordinance for Infants

visible

visible Church-membership save what is injoyned concerning Circumcision. To wch he replies in his *Præfestinantis morator*, *What not yet? And yet dare you boast so confidently of your prepared confutation? yet can you find no law that made women Church-members? nor the uncircumcised males in the wilderness? O the power of prejudice!* Whereto I say, though I boast not of my prepared confutation, but speak of it modestly, yet I find no cause to be lesse confident of my prepared confutation, because of these frivolous interogations of Mr. *B.* It is not the power of prejudice which is the reason why I find not a law or ordinance for Infants visible Church-membership, but because I do not see or read of law or ordinance for Infants visible Church-membership besides that of Circumcision, either upon my own search, or Mr. *B*'s, or others shewing; I asked once a Preacher at *Bewdley* where it was? he told me it was *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12, 13. I told him I find a relation of a fact, of a thing that was done, but not a word of any law, ordinance precept or command, determining thus it shall be, this shall be done, &c. or any other form of speech that imports a law, ordinance, precept, statute or command to make female infants visible Church-members; much lesse do I find an appointment, law, ordinance, that *some infants were once to be admitted members of the visible Church* (which Mr. *B.* should have proved to be unrepealed, according to his assertion, cap. 5. 26.) except the law of Circumcising infants. And therefore my confutation of Mr. *B*'s argument, cap. 5. might be sufficient, if I only denied such an ordinance or appointment, till it be shewed. I do confess my weakness in my answering at *Bewdley*, in that I permitted Mr. *B.* to run on in the proof of an ordinance unrepealed, afore he had shewed me where that ordinance is, but I perceived therein what I feared still, that I should not in a verball dispute observe what was necessary to be heeded. But I may say with truth Mr. *B.* either understands not what is meant by a law, ordinance, appointment liable to repeal, or still binding, or loves to pervert words from the genuine sense, as he did the word [*accuse*;] or else he is unwilling to speak plainly, who being provoked to shew in what text of Scripture that pretended law, ordinance, appointment is, doth not yet shew it. And for his assertion here, it exceeds all faith, that *infant admission into the Church* (meaning the visible Church Christian) *should be as fully determined in the old Testament, as most things in the Bible.*

But wherever, Mr. *B.* imagines it is fully determined in the old Testament, the *Assembly* at *Westminster* in their *Confession of faith*, chap. 25. Art. 4. allege but one text out of the old Testament, *viz. Gen.* 17. 7, 9. for admission of Infants by Baptism into the visible Church, and if Mr. *M.* their Champion in this Point expresse their minds, they deduce Infant-baptism from this principle, *All Gods Commands and Institutions about the Sacraments of the Jews bind us as much as they did them in all things which belong to the substance of the Covenant, and were not accidental to them.* Which how false it is, how contrary to the Tenet of Divines former and later, is shewed in my *Examen*, part. 3. Sect. 12. to which I may add the *Assemblies confession of faith*, chap. 19. Art. 3. *All which ceremonial laws are now abrogated under the New Testament.* And if all of them be abrogated, how can it be true that the law about circumcising Infants still binds? But Mr. *M.* in his *Defence* pag. 195. conceives his argument from the analogy of the Ceremonial law of Circumcision, which he calls his *Analogical argument*, pag. 201. good; on the contrary I deny any argument from analogy of the Ceremonial law good in meer positive ceremonies to prove thus it was in the old Testament, therefore it must be so in the new, And thus I argue,

1. Arguments from Analogy in meer positive Rites of the old Testament to make rules for observing meer positive Ceremonies of the new without institution gathered by precept or apostolical example or other declaration in the new Testament, do suppose that without Institution there may be *par ratio*, *a like reason* of the use of the one Ceremony as the other. But this is not true; For in positive Rites there is no reason for the use of this & not another thing in this manner to this end, by, or to persons, but the will of the appointer. For there is not any thing natural or moral in them, they have no general equity, they are supposed to be meerly not mixtly positive. Therefore where there is not the like Institution, there is not a like reason; and therefore this opinion of Analogy in positive Rites from a parity of reason without Institution in the new Testament is a meer fancy, and no good ground

Cawdrey Sab. Rediv. Part. 2. Chap. 6. pag. 226. A meer positive law which is special to some person or nation is of no force under the Gospel, unless it be ratified by the Gospel.

Baxter plain Scripture proofs pag. 342. Nature telleth us nothing of meer positives

ground for an argument. To apply it to the case in hand, Circumcision and Baptism are meerly positive ordinances; Mr. *B.* cals them, p. 9. *Positives about worship.* Generally Sacraments by Divines are reckoned among meer positives; *Chamier. Panstr. Cath. Tom.* 4. l. 2. c. 12. *Sect.* 20. *nulla vera ratio Sacramentorum potest consistere absque institutione.* l. 7. c. 10. *Sect.* 1. *nullum Sacramentum est à naturâ suâ, itaque prorsus ab institutione.* The places are innumerable in Protestant writers and others to prove this; were it not that I find my Antagonists often forget what is elsewhere yielded by them, I should not say so much, the thing being so plain, that there is nothing natural or moral in them, because till they were appointed (which was thousands of years after the creation) they were not used, nor taken for signs of that which they signified. The reason then of Baptism and Circumcision is meerly Institution; if then there be not the like Institution, there is not the like reason. This argument is confirmed by Mr. *M'.* grant, *Defence*, pag. 92. 182. the *formal reason of the Iews being circumcised was the Command of God*, therefore there is not the like reason of Infant-baptism as of Infant-circumcision without the like command of God. But there is no expresse command for Infant-baptism as Mr. *M.* confesseth, therefore there is not *par ratio, like reason* of the one as the other.

Mr. *Collings* caveat for Proph. pag. 77. The equity of the ceremonial law is a dark notion to me, Christ is the equity of it. The Apostle cals it a shadow; the equity the of it is the substance of a shadow, and what that is I cannot divine besides Christ whose shadow it was. I always understood by the ceremonial laws those laws that concerned the worship of God in that time, which were wholly ceremonial and abolished being fulfilled in Christ.

2. I thus argue, If all the Laws and Commands about the Sacraments, positive Rites and Ceremonies of the Jews, be now abrogated, then no argument upon supposed analogy or parity of reason from the institution of those abrogated Rites can prove a binding rule to us about a meer positive Rite of the new Testament. For how can that make a binding rule to us about another meer positive Rite without any other Institution, which it self is abrogated? that which binds not at all, binds not about another thing, *v. g.* Baptism. But all the Laws and Commands about the Sacraments, positive Rites and Ceremonies of the Jews, are now abrogated, as

is proved in my *Examen*, part. 3. sect. 12. and confessed by the *Assembly Conf. of faith*, chap. 19. art. 3. *ergo* none of them bind. This argument is confirmed by the words of Mr *Cawdrey Sabbat. Redi v.* part. 2. chap. 7. sect. 7. pag. 263. *No ceremonial commandement can infer a moral commandement. The reason of our assertion is this, because partial commandments given to some Nation or persons (as the Ceremonial precepts were) cannot infer a general to oblige others, even all the world.* Again, *Sect.* 10. *pag.* 276. *First it is so in all other like special and ceremonial Commandements concerning dayes, whensoever the particular day was abrogated, the whole Commandement concerning that day was utterly abolished, the Law of Circumcision and of the Passeover is expired as well as the sacramental and ceremonial actions commanded by that law.* This Mr. *M.* conceived he had prevented by supposing *that in some commands about the Sacraments of the Iews, are some things that belong to the substance of the Covenant, and limiting his assertion to those.* And when in my *Examen* pag. 115. I argued, that in no good sense it can be true *that some of the commands of God about the Sacraments of the Jews contained things belonging to the substance of the Covenant*, he tels us pag. 198, 199. of his *Defence*, *that our Sacraments have the same substance with theirs, the same general nature, end, and use; which he makes in these things, theirs were seals of the Covenant, so ours*, &c. But none of all these are to the purpose, his allegations tending onely to prove that our Sacraments and the Jews have the same general nature, which he calls *substance*, but not a word to shew that any command about them belonged to the substance of the Covenant, but as if he were angry, or did disdain a man should question his dictates, onely recites his meaning, and a passage or two of Protestant Authors, and never answers a word to my objection, *Exam.* pag. 115. that in no good sense could it be true that some commands of God about the Sacraments of the Jews did contain things belonging to the substance of the Covenant. Yea when I animadverted on that saying in his *Sermon, the manner of administration of this Covenant was first by types, shadows and sacrifices*, &c. It had been convenient to have named Circumcision, that it might not be conceived to belong to the substance of the Covenant: *I reply*, saith he, *in his Defence*, pag. 99. *this is a very small quar-*

rell

rell, I added, &c. which supplies both Circumcision and other things. Which words in the plain construction of them do note, that Circumcision is comprehended in his &c. as belonging to the manner of administration, not to the substance of the Covenant. And yet pag. 187. he hath these words, *I have already proved* (that is no where, no not so much as in attempt) *that Circumcision though a part of their administration did yet belong to the substance* (meaning of the Covenant of grace) *belong to it, I say, not as a part of it, but as a means of applying it.* So uncertain and enterferring one another are his speeches about this thing. And yet this salve he adds is not true in any sense in which the word [*substance*] may be taken. For if he mean by [*applying the Covenant*] the signifying Christ to come, or the spiritual part promised, so Circumcision was a Type or shadow, and therefore according to his doctrine belonging to the administration that then was, not to the substance of the Covenant; if he mean by [*applying the Conant*] sealing or assuring the righteousnesse of faith to mens consciences, neither doth this make it of the substance of the Covenant, the Covenant being made before, and though Circumcision had never thus applyed it, the substance of the Covenant had been the same, yea the Covenant was the same in substance, according to his own doctrine, 2000. years before Circumcision did apply it to any; now I do not conceive any thing is to be said of the substance of a thing, when the thing may be entire without it; so that in this point I deprehend in Mr. *M*. speeches nothing but dictates, and those very uncertain and confused.

Secondly, saith he, pag. 198. *When I say that Gods Commands about their Sacraments bind us, my meaning never was to assert, that the ritual part of their Sacraments do remain in the least particle, or that we are tyed to practise any of those things, but onely that there is a general and analogical nature, wherein the Sacraments of the Old and New Testament do agree*, which he thus a little before expresseth, *my meaning being plainly this, that all Gods Commands and Institutions about the Sacraments of the Jews as touching their general nature of being Sacraments and Seals of the Covenant, and as touching their use and end, do bind us in our Sacraments, because they are the same*; whereto I reply, that Mr. *M*. supposeth *the Commands of God are about the*

general

general nature of being Sacraments and Seals of the Covenant; which is a most vain conceit, there being no such Command or Institution, there's no such Command that Sacraments should have the general nature of Sacraments, or be Seals of the Covenant, or that they should signifie Christ and seal spiritual grace: these things they have *from their nature*, as he saith, which is the same without any Institution. The natures, essences and quiddities of things are eternal, invariable, and so come not under Command, which reacheth onely to things contingent, that may be done, or not be done. Did ever any wise man command to men that man should be a reasonable living body, or whitenesse a visible quality, or fatherhood a relation? And to say that *God commands Sacraments to seal the Covenant*, what is this but to say that God commands himself? For he alone by the Sacraments seals to us the Covenant or Promise of Christ, or grace by him. All Commands of God are concerning what the persons commanded should do, and they must needs be of particulars, not of generals, for *actio est singularium*, *action is of singular persons and things*. Though God may command man to think or acknowledge Sacraments to be Seals of the Covenant, yet it were a most vain thing for God to command that Sacraments should be Seals of the Covenant, or to have this general end or use, to seal or signifie Christ, and spiritual grace, to us, which belongs onely to himself to do by his declaration of his meaning in them. Such Commands as Mr. *M.* imagines, are a meer *Chimæra*, or dream of his brain. Secondly, the like is to be sayd concerning his conceit, that such *Commands bind us in our Sacraments*; For to bind us is to determine what is to be done, or not to be done by us; But such imagined Commands do not determine what is to be done or not to be done by us, and therefore cannot bind at all. Thirdly, when Mr. *M.* confesseth we *are not tyed to the least particle of the ritual part or any practise of those things*, he doth thereby acknowledge that all the Commands of God about the Sacraments of the Jews, which were all about rituals, are quite abrogated. For all Sacraments are Rites or Ceremonies, and to imagine a Command about a Sacrament, and not about a ritual part or Ceremony, is to imagine a Command about a Sacrament, which is not a Sacrament, *Chamier. Panstr. Cathol.* Tom. 4. lib. 1. chap. 8. Sect. 9.

arguing

arguing against *Suarez* the Jesuit, *that dreamed of a Sacrament appointed in the law of nature for remedy of original sin, yet had no determined Ceremony*, speaks thus; *Sacramentum aliquod institutum à Deo, Ceremonia nulla determinata à Deo; quis capiat? Sacramentum instituì et Ceremoniam non determinari? Æquè dixerit loquutum esse deum, et tamen vocem nullam protulisse, nam æquè Sacramenti genus est Ceremonia et Vox loquutionis.* Fourthly, were it supposed that there were some Commands about the general nature of Sacraments, binding us, though every particle and practice of the ritual part be abrogated, yet this would not reach Mr. *M'.* intent, which is to prove the Command of sealing Infants with the initial seal in force, binds. But to seal Infants with the initial seal in force is not of the general nature of Sacraments (for then it should belong to the after seal as well as the initiating) but after his own dictates of the special nature of the initial seal, and so Mr. *M'.* principle serves not for his purpose.

Thirdly, I argued thus, *Examen.* part. 2. sect. 8. If we may frame an addition to Gods worship from analogy or resemblance conceived by us between two ordinances, whereof one is quite taken away, without any Institution gathered by precept or Apostolical example, then a certain rule may be set down from Gods word how far a man may go in his conceived parity of reason equity or analogy, and where he must stay; For to use the words of the Author, whose book is intituled *Gralla, if Christians must measure their worship according to the Institution and Ceremonies of the Jews, it is needfull that either they imitate them in all things, or else that some OEdipus resolve this riddle hitherto not resolved, to wit, what is moral and imitable in those Ceremonies, and what not.* But out of Gods word no rule can be framed to resolve us how far we must or may not go in this conceived parity of reason, equity, or analogy, *Ergo*. The major is evinced from the perfection of Gods word, and the providence of God to have the consciences of his people rightly guided. The minor is proved by provoking those analogists that determine from the Commands about the Mosaical Rites and usages what must be done or may not be done about the meer positive worship and Church-order of the New Testament, to set down this rule out of Gods word. This argument is confirmed by experience in the controversie between *Presbyterians* and *Independents*, jarring about the extent of Infant-baptism, the *Elders*

in

in new England, Mr. *Hooker*, (besides Mr. *Firmin*) Mr. *Barslet*, &c. restraining it to the Infants of members joined in a Church gathered after the congregational way as it is called. Mr. *Cawdrey*, Mr. *Blake*, Mr. *Rutherfurd* and others extend it farther, master *B. Plain scripture proof*, &c. chap. 29. part 1. pag. 101. to all whosoever they be, if they be at a believers dispose. And both sides pretend analogy, which being uncertain, Mr. *Ball* after much debate about this difference, as distrusting analogy, determines thus in his *reply to the answer of the new England Elders to the 9. posit. posit.* 3. and 4. pag. 38. *But in whatsoever Circumcision and Baptism do agree or differ* (which is as much as to say, whatsoever their analogy or resemblance be) *we must look to the Institution* (therefore the Institution of each Sacrament must be our rule in the use of them, not analogy, and analogy is not sufficient to guide us without Institution, and to shew that analogy serves not turn of it self to determine who are to be baptised, he adds) *and neither stretch it wider, nor draw it narrower than the Lord hath made it, for he is the Institutor of the Sacraments according to his own good pleasure, and it is our part to learn of him, both to whom, how, and for what end the Sacraments are to be administred, how they agree, and wherein they differ, in all which we must affirm nothing but what God hath taught us, and as he hath taught us.* Which how they cut the sinews of the argument from Circumcision to Baptism, without wrong to master *Ball*, is shewed in my *Apology*, Sect. 13. pag. 57.

Mr. *M.* in his *Defence*, pag. 83. Mr. *Blake* pag. 74, 75. of his *answer to my letter*, seem to deny, that Pædobaptists do frame an addition to Gods worship from such analogy, the contraty whereof is manifest from the passages cited before. But Mr. *Blake* over and above, pag. 75. sets down three cautions, which being observed, then this kind of arguing from analogy and proportion is without any such pretended danger. The insufficieny of which cautions being shewed in my *Postscript* to the *Apology*, Sect 17 pag. 143. I conceive it unnecessary to repeat my words, which the Reader may here find, and the vindication of them from what Mr. *Blake* opposeth in his *vindiciæ fœderis*, chap 42. follows in the next Section.

4. I argued, that if this way of making rules binding mens consciences in meer positive worship from analogy of the ceremonies or rites of the Old Testament, without institution in the New, be valid, then our Christian liberty from the Ceremonial Law is made void. For by this way of determining things as of Gods appointment, by our conceived analogy, all or a great part of the Ceremonial Law may be put on our necks under pretence of analogy, and so the fruit of Christs purchase of Christian liberty lost, and we in vain exhorted to stand fast in the liberty, wherewith Christ hath made us free. For as *Chillingworth* once told *Knot* the Jesuit, if the Pope be made sole Judge of Controversies, & infallible Expositor of Scripture, it will be in effect all one, as if he were allowed to make a new Scripture and Articles of faith; and tyranny may be introduced as well by arbitrary expounding, as well as by arbitrary making of laws: so in this case the bondage of *Moses* his law may be put on our necks, not onely by those that say, it binds in the letter, but also by those that say, Gods commands about the Sacraments of the Jews bind us in the analogy and proportion.

5. This argument hath strength from the sad experience the Church hath formerly and of late had in yielding to these reasonings from analogy, in the many Canons of Popes and Prelates, heavily loading Gods Church with rites and decrees about them, imposed from analogy of the Ceremonial Laws of *Moses*. The Constitutions of Popes, and Canons of Prelates, and the books of the maintainers of them expounding and defending their rituals, and liturgies, are full of them, to wit, rites about Priests, their Orders, Garments, Dues, Festivals, Sacraments, Votaries, Religious houses, and such like, drawn from Mosaical Laws. It is a common complaint of Protestants and Antiprelatists, that in imitation of the Jews, under pretence of analogy, a new named Judaism hath been brought into the Christian Church, and the reforming of them like *Hercules* his labour in clensing *Augias* his stable Some I have named in my *Examen*, part. 3. s. 9. more I might. In the *Augustan Confession* among the *Articles of abuses, in the chapter of the Ecclesiastick power*, its the *general complaint, that Popish writers made a worship in the New Testament, like the Levitical.* I may use Mr. *Bs* words in his *Appendix to plain Scripture-proof*, &c. pag. 302. *And indeed if*

all that is not contrary to Scripture customs, and that mans vain wit can find reasonable from Scripture, must be admitted, and that upon equal authority with Scripture, if they do but take it for a tradition Apostolical. Then 1. *it will set mans wit a work to make God a worship, or judge of the currantness of it, according to his reason; and one man will think it reasonable and another not.* 2. *And what a multitude of Ceremonies will this admit into the Church, to the burthening of mens consciences, and the polluting of Gods worship? Is not this the door that the body of Popish trash came in at? and the Argument that hardneth them in it, and hindereth their reformation to this day? And if you open this Gap, what a multitude of fopperies will rush in?* Certainly by this means the Gospel hath been shadow'd and repressed; no stint either hath been or could be put to the inundation of such impositions, as long as liberty hath been given under pretence of analogy with Jewish rites to add to the worship and discipline of the new Testament: but it hath happened according to *Austins* Complaint, *Epist.* 119. to *Ianuarius*, that the state of the Jewish Church under Divine precepts hath been more tolerable, than the Christian burdened with humane presumptions. *Ames Bell. enerv. tom.* 3. *lib.* 1. *cap.* 8. *th.* 15. *Romanenses in suis ceremoniis partim imitati sunt Gentes, partim Iudæos. th.* 17. *Ceremoniæ hujusmodi tollunt discrimen illud quod Deus voluit esse inter Iudæos & Christianos, quia padagogiam Iudaica similem habent.*

6. If such Arguments from Analogy of Jewish rites abrogated may be valid to impose on mens consciences things about the worship of God, then Popes and Prelates are not only unblamable and justifiable in so doing, but also Protestants and Non-conformists will be unjustifiable in no yielding to them, but opposing them.

Mr. *Church Divine warrant of Infant-bapt.* pag. 49. in answer to these three latter reasons, speaks thus. *Arguing from the Jewish types for the Substance of those shadowes, tends neither to an introducement of Judaism, nor yet to a justification of the Quisquilian toyes of the Papists: for it is neither arguing for the Ceremonies of the Jewish Church, nor for the fooleries of the Popish Synagogue, but for privileges which the faithful may expect by Christ, of which those ceremonies were prenunciative,*

and

and are ceased, not because they were evil, but because we have the substance and truth of them, which is much better, non quia damnata, sed quia in melius mutata, *August.*

Answ. The objection was, Arguing from Circumcision for Baptism of infants, is the way to introduce Judaism, and to subject the Church again to the whole burthen of Jewish Ceremonies: Mr. *Churches* answer is, *Arguing from the Jewish types for the substance of those shadowes,* &c. Which answer is either meerly impertinent, or else he conceives arguing from Circumcision for Baptism of infants to be arguing from the Jewish type for the substance of the shadow. Which if he stand to, then he must make Circumcision the type, and Baptism of infants the substance of Circumcision, which sure is not according to Scripture, which makes Christ the body, of which the ceremonies, and among them Circumcision, was a shadow, *Col.* 2. 17. Nor doth Mr. *Church* prove any thing that he saith, but vainly dictate, when he makes arguing for infant Baptism from Circumcision to be arguing for privileges which the faithful may expect by Christ, and makes Circumcision a ceremony prenunciative of infant Baptism; against which, and the whole way of arguing from the use of Jewish rites to Christian from analogy without other institution, I further reason.

7. Protestant Divines do frequently deny the Jewish Sacraments to be types or figures of ours, *Ames. Bellarm. ener. tom.* 3. *lib.* 1. *cap.* 3. *th.* 11. *Sacramenta externa sunt figuræ: figuras figurarum non instituit Deus,* that they figured or represented Christ and his grace, not other Sacraments. *Cap.* 4. *th.* 13. *Absque ulla ratione asseritur circumcisionem fuisse figuram baptismi: sacramentum non est signum visibilis sacramenti, sed invisibilis gratiæ.* Therefore no right arguing by analogy from a Jewish rite to a Christian, which must suppose one to be a sign of the other, which is denyed by them. Mr. *Church* his speech is vain, *That the Apostle argues from the Sacrifices in the Jewish Church,* Rom. 12. 2. Heb. 13. 15. *the offering of our selves, and the sacrificing of praises, which he calls the calves of the lips,* &c. For 1. the Apostle doth not argue at all, but only allusively calls the presenting of our bodies, and giving thanks, a sacrifice, and the calves of our lips, by reason of some resemblance: which if it be arguing

In the use of every Metaphor there is arguing. 2. Were it arguing, yet it is not to the purpose, sith it is not any arguing from the use of one rite to another by analogy; but from a rite to a moral duty, to wit, devotion and thanksgiving. And when he adds, *And from sealing the promise by the initial Sacrament to infants of Gods people aforetime, may the sealing of the promise by the initial Sacrament to infants of Christians in this Dispensation be rightly argued; sealing the promise, being the substance of Circumcision and benefit intended by it: and such arguing hath no colour of setting up Iudaism, for arguing for the thing signified tends not to the introducement of antiquated Ceremonies*, he doth but write at random. For if the reason of his assertion be pertinent, then he must hold, that sealing the promise by the initial Sacrament to infants of Christians in this Dispensation is the substance of circumcision and benefit intended by it. But it is either unintelligible to me in what sense the sealing of the promise by baptism to infants of Christians can be the substance of circumcision, and the benefit intended by it, or else it is very absurd.

For then it will plainly follow, 1. That till infant baptism of Christians, Circumcision was without its substance, and the benefit intended by it. 2. He makes infant baptism the thing signified by circumcision, and the substance of circumcision, and so one ceremony signifies, and is the substance of another. But however we judge of his unintelligible or absurd arguing, it appears not by his answer but that the way of arguing by analogy from circumcision to baptism, that is from the regulating our practice in a rite of the New Testament by a rite of the Old, as obliging our consciences, may and doth introduce Judaism, and other evils, as was objected.

Mr. *Blake answer to my Letter*, pag. 97. seems to put by this arguing of mine, by *advising me to read over* Bellermine, *and tell him then whether his arguments to lay the Sacraments of the Iews as low as types, and to extol the Sacraments of Christians as their antitypes, be not the self same that I and my party make use of to make so large a difference between circumcision and baptism. Protestants deny them indeed to be types, because they affirm they are in substance the same, our doctrine keeps us at a distance from* Bellarmine, *when you are in this reconciled to him,*

making

making the same differences As he doth between Circumcision and Baptism.

Answ. Had M. *Blake* directed me to the place in *Bellarmine*, he would have me seriously read over, I should have done it. But now not well knowing what place in *Bellarmine* he would have me read, and the reading him all over, and that seriously, being a very tedious task, I do not gratifie M. *Blake* in his request: But to what he saith, I reply, I put sundry differences between Circumcision and Baptism in my *Examen*, *part* 3. *sect.* 9. which Mr. *M.* his *Defence* doth not shew to be false. If they, or any other I make, be the same with *Bellarmines*, and yet true, Mr. *Blake* doth causelessly except against me for agreeing with *Bellarmine*; sure it is no matter of blame to agree with the Devil himself in the truth, it is no evill to believe *there is one God*, because *the Devils do so*, *James* 2.19. But how this should reconcile me to *Bellarmine* in that which I except against him, that he makes the Jews Sacraments Types of ours, is to me unintelligible. 2. Dr. *Ames* his words shew, that therefore he denied that Circumcision was the figure or type of Baptism, because *a Sacrament is not a sign of a visible Sacrament, but of invisible grace, and that God hath not appointed figures of figures, or types of types, but types of some body or substance.* The reason M. *Blake* gives why they are not types, *because they are in substance the same*, I know not what Protestants do give, whoever they be that do say so, in my apprehension, either they speak non-sense, or false. Sacraments being nothing but actions used to some ends, according to appointment, what substance they should have, but the actions and the use, I understand not. Now that the actions are not the same, it is manifest, cutting off a little skin, killing, roasting eating a lamb, being not the same with washing the body with water, and breaking and eating bread, and drinking wine; and for their end and use it is certain, however they may agree in some things, yet those being generals, and accompanied with more differences in their end and use both general and particular, it may be with greater reason denied, that they are the same in substance, than averred that they are: And arguments drawn from the one to the other concerning their use, are from things unlike, as much as like, yea denied by the users to be types, figures or signs the one of the other, and therefore cannot infer a parity in the thing questioned, without institution.

8 I

8. The ceremonies of the Jews are now not only mortal, but dead, buried, and deadly, according to the received Doctrine; yea, some condemn not only the use of them formally, but also materally; *Rutherford Divine right of Church-Government, Introd. sect.* 1. *pag.* 8. saith, *It is a false ground of the Prelates, that Circumcision, a Passeover Lamb, and all the Jewish ceremonies, though with another end and intention than to shadow forth Christ to come in the flesh, are indifferent.* *Riv.* on *Exod*, 20. *Walaus* are cited by Mr. *Cawdrey, Sab. Red. part.* 4. *c.* 1. *pag.* 527. to the same purpose; therefore not to be revived, no not in *Effigie* by following any rule about them, as by Analogie, or proportion between them and ours, without like institution binding us.

9. Arguments from Analogie in positive rites, without institution in the New Testament, except God declare either by general rule, or particular example he allowes such Arguments, are but humane inventions, as not being from the Spirit of God, (for that speaks only in the word about Doctrines, but from mans reason: But such are the Arguments drawn from a positive rite of the Old Testament now abrogated, to regulate our practice in the Sacraments of the New, as obliging our consciences. Therefore they are against the second Commandment in the Decalogue, our Saviours words *Mat.* 15. 9. *In vain do they worship me, teaching for Doctrines mens Precepts*; it is tyranny and usurpation in them that impose them, and violation of their liberty, forbidden by the Apostle, *Col.* 2. 20. in them that submit to them. *Davenant exhort. to brotherly communion*, ch. 1. tells us, *that* Luther *wisely admoniseth us, that in matters surmounting the capacity of humane reason, we beware of Etymologies, Analogies, Consequences and Examples.*

10. Arguments from conceived Analogy, are but Arguments from that which is like, not the same: But such are but weak things. *Proportions are weak probations*, said M. *Rutherford, Due right of Presbyt.* ch. 2. sect. 2. pag. 37. *Chamier Panstr. Cath. tom.* 1. *lib.* 9. *c.* 10. *s.* 47. *Deinde sunt hujus generis conclusiones magis verisimiles quam necessariæ nisi nitantur Diserto Dei verbo. Oxford Convocat. reasons against the Covenant*, pag. 27. *The Arguments* à minore *and* à majore *are subject to many fallacies, and unless there be a parity of reason in every requisite respect between the things compared, will not hold good:* They do illustrate rather

than

than prove; and therefore they that assert that Pœdobaptism is fully determined in the old Testament, where they have nothing but analogy from Circumcision, and the Jewish Church state, what ever their confidence be, do but shew their weakness. I shall now examine what Master *Blake* saith in answer to my Arguments, and then what Mr. *B.* brings for his speech above recited.

SECT. III.

Mr. Blakes *plea for arguments from analogy in meer positive rites of the old Testament, and Mr.* Bs. *speech about infant-admission as determined in it, are refelled.*

MAster *Blake Vindic. Fœderis* ch. 42. sect. 2. speaking of me saith. *And to this end he sets himself, First to dispute down all Arguments* à pari, *all whatsoever that are grounded on parity of reason, or analogy and proportion. This he speaks to in his Examen* pag. 28. *And I may here fitly refer the Reader to that which I have written chap.* 10. *sect.* 4. *of my answer to M.*T. *only in a few words viudicate it from his exceptions against it in his Apology, page* 140.

And page 308. he saith, *The Reader will hereafter find me reasoning with my full strength against the force of all Arguments* à pari.

Answ. It is not true, *That I set my self to dispute down all arguments* à pari, *all whatsoever that are grounded on parity of reason, or analogy and proportion.* For 1 in the place cited *Examen* pag. 28, 29. I do expresly level my arguing against arguments from analogy onely in positive instituted worship consisting in outward rites, such as Circumcision, Baptism, and the Lords Supper are, which have nothing moral or natural in them, but are in whole and part cetemonial. 2. I do dispute against all such arguments, not as brought to illustrate or confirm a thing otherwise proved from institution, but when they are brought to infer Divine institutions and commands obligatory of mens consciences.

I had said *Exam.* part. 2. ſ. 8. pag. 29. To me it is a dangerous principle upon which they go that ſo argue, to wit, that in meer poſitive things (ſuch as Circumciſion and Baptiſm are) we may frame an addition to Gods worſhip from analogy or reſemblance conceived by us between two ordinances, whereof one is quite taken away, without inſtitution gathered by precept or Apoſtolical example. Mr. *Blake anſwer to my letter* pag. 74 *asks who thoſe be?* I told him that he did *Birth-privilege* pag. 15. (I ſhould have ſaid 14) and I mean thoſe words, *upon this ground (the Covenant) Infants under the Law were Circumciſed, and upon the ſame ground Infants are now to be Baptized: by the grounds of both Circumciſion and Baptiſm we inforce the Baptiſm of Infants: what is objected againſt one concludes againſt both: Circumciſion and Baptiſm are therefore by the Apoſtle promiſcuouſly taken; there being the ſame principal and main end of both.* But he ſaith now *Vindic. fœderis* pag. 373. *In my whole diſcourſe I did ſtudiouſly avoid arguments drawn barely from analogy, ſo that we may ſee how willing Mr. T. is to quarrel, and how loath to ſpeak truth:*

Anſw. There was nothing but truth and fair arguing in my *Apology* pag. 142. For though Mr. *B.* denies his argument to be barely from the analogy between Circumciſion and Baptiſm, by which he hid inforce the Baptiſm of Infants, yet his arguing from the grounds of both, without inſtitution gathered by precept, or Apoſtolical example, is barely from analogy. Analogy or proportion I neither did imagine nor conceive Mr. *B.* made in the likeneſs, reſemblance, or evenneſs in the ritual part of Circumciſion and Baptiſm, that is the cutting off the skin, or the waſhing the body, as if he did argue, Infants had a skin cut off, therefore Infants are to be waſhed with water: But the analogy I conceive made by him between them, is in the ſuppoſed parity of reaſon, taken from (as he calls them) the grounds of both, excluding inſtitution, as my words ſhew, Examen p g. 29. and poſtſcript pag. 142. now this Mr. *B.* doth in the words cited, arguing from the Covenant, the ſame principal and main end of both, and thence dictating what is objected againſt one concludes againſt both, and aſſerting (though falſely) that Circumciſion and Baptiſm are therefore by the Apoſtle promiſcuouſly taken, and

mentions

mentions not the distinct institution of Infant-baptism from Infantcircumcision, but as if he counted them the same, yea as if he meant them all one, imposeth on the Apostle as if he took Baptism and Circumcision promiscuously; wherein he argues from bare analogy (if not identity) between them without institution. And therefore I do still charge him with arguing according to that principle, which he saith, *is as dangerous to him as to me.* But he hath yet another shift.

In case, saith he, *I had by analogy with Circumcision made proof of Infants title to Baptism, it would not have freed him from calumny, seeing it is no addition to worship, Baptism is worship as Circumcision was, this is but a demonstration of the latitude and extent of it.*

Answ. There is no calumny in it. For he adds to Gods worship who doth make something worship of God, which he hath not appointed, as Non-Conformists did argue in their Negative argument against the Bishops Ceremonies from *Deut.* 4. 2. and though the Conformists did allow some addition to Gods worship in indifferent ceremonies, yet they agreed that to make any such addition as necessary binding the conscience, or part of Gods worship, specially when it is in things determined by institution, was unlawful. Now God hath appointed expresly disciples or believers in Christ to be baptized, *Mat.* 28. 19. *Mark* 16. 16. and no other, and this is his instituted worship; he then who baptizeth Infants who are not disciples or believers, and doth this as Gods worship, doth add to the worship having no institution gathered by precept or Apostolical example: nor doth he demonstrate, but devise a latitude and extent of the worship of his own head, or worships God after the precepts of men. As for the words, *it is no addition to worship, Baptism is worship as Circumcision was*, they seems to intimate, if there be any reason in them, than Infantbaptism is no addition to worship, because Baptism is worship as Circmcision was, which imports, that there could be no addition to worship in adding to Baptism, because it is worship as Circumcision was, whereas the reason is better to the contrary, that it being not commanded Infant-baptism is addition to worship, because Baptism is worship as circumcision was.

Mr. *Blake* goes on. *It runs in Mr.* T. *his head that we go about to find not a Baptism-institution, but an Infant-baptism. institution, and that barely by analogy from Circumcision. This I confess were a wild undertaking.*

Answ. Tis true, I did think Mr. *M.* in his *Sermon* pag. 44. when he said, *Baptism was instituted long before* (that command *Mat.* 28. 19.) *to be the seal of the Covenant*, had sought its institution from *Gen.* 17. and in his *Defence* I find not that which might take me off from that conceit. And it still runs in my head that Mr. *Blake* must either find not onely a Baptism-institution, but also an Infant-baptism-institution, or else we must yield Infant-baptism a corruption of that ordinance, whether it be called will-worship, or profaning it, or what other sin that corruption be termed. As he that will acquit prayer to Saints, or for the dead, from corruption, must find not onely an institution of prayer, but also of prayer to Saints and for the dead; he that will acquit Infant-communion, Bell-baptism, &c. from corruption, must find not onely an institution of the Communion and Baptism, but also of Infant-communion and Bell-baptism. I agree, that it were a wild undertaking to go about to find an institution of Infant-baptism, especially *Gen.* 17. because it is not to be found there, or in any other part of holy Scripture, and yet I think Pædobaptists do go about to find an institution of Infant-baptism, and that barely by analogy from Circumcision, as I shew before, and therefore by Mr. *Blakes* own censure their attempt is *a wild undertaking.*

He addes. *Neither I nor Mr.* T. *to help me, can find an Infant-circumcision-institution. If he instances* Gen. 17. 12. *He that is eight dayes old shall be circumcised among you, every man-child in your generations; I say that is no institution of Circumcision, but a subsequent directory for the particular day (according to the Pædagogy of those times) when the person was to be circumcised. The institution we find not with restriction to infancy, but in that latitude as to comprize males of any age, v.* 10. *This is my Covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee, every man-child among you shall be circumcised. Mr.* T. *knows very well, that by man-child onely the sex and not the growth is distingnished,* omnis mas, *as* Junius

and

and Tremellius, *every male, as* Aniſworth *reads it; If that after directory had not followed, they might have circumciſed (as we baptize) infants upon any day at our beſt conveniences. This is plain in the text, and may be further cleared; if the inſtitution it ſelf be with that limit of time to the eighth day, then it had been their ſin (according to Mr.* Tombs, *the ſin of will-worſhip) in caſe that time through negligence had ſlipt, to have circumciſed them another day, as it was for a man unclean, or in a journey on the* 14*th day of the firſt moneth (the time appointed for the paſſeover) to obſerve it any other day, till God appointed the* 14*th day of the ſecond moneth for ſuch occaſions,* Num. 9. 6, 7, 8. *But that they had their liberty by vertue of the inſtitution to circumciſe any other day, when that was over, is clear in the text, and may be farther made plain, that* Abraham *ſo underſtood it by his circumciſing of* Iſhmael *at* 13 *years, which had been without warrant, had there been an inſtitution only for children of eight dayes; when God was diſpleaſed at* Moſes *his neglect of the Circumciſion of his Son,* Exod. 4. 24. *yet he was pleaſed that he was after circumciſed v.* 26. *So that as there was an inſtitution in Old-Teſtament-times, for all males in Covenant without difference of age; ſo there is in New-Teſtament times an inſtitution of Baptiſm for all in Covenant without difference of age or ſex.*

Anſw. Mr. *Blake* ſaith, *neither he nor I to help him can find an Infant-circumciſion-inſtitution,* and yet he himſelf finds, *Gen.* 17. 10. *an inſtitution in that latitude, as to comprize males of any age:* if there be an inſtitution to circumciſe males of any age, then there is an inſtitution to circumciſe male infants, who are of ſome age. And therefore it ſeems to me a wild ſpeech of Mr. *B.* to deny the finding of an inſtitution of Infant-circumciſion, when he himſelf ſets down the inſtitution of it within a few lines of thoſe words. But he conceives *it no inſtitution of circumciſion* Gen. 12. 10. To which I ſay, Be it ſubſequent directory, or what ever elſe he will call it, Mr. *Blake* might eaſily perceive by my words, *Examen* pag. 28, 29. and elſewhere, I take the word inſtitution for any appointment by precept, command or example approved, either expreſs, or gathered by good conſequence; if any of theſe wayes an inſtitution of Infant-baptiſm can be ſhewed

out of the New Testament without the analogy of Circumcision, I should not make any doubt of it, and therefore it is but unnecessary wrangling which he useth about the word [institution]. Let him shew any subsequent directory for Infant-baptism, as is for Infant-circumcision without the analogy of Circumcision, and I am satisfied. Yet to shew the vanity of his speeches and arguings I shall a little scanne them. *He denies an institution of Infant-circumcision*, Gen. 17. 10. *he saith, it is but a subsequent directory for the particular day.*

Answ. *Ausonius Popma de differ. verborum l. 3. Institutiones sunt praecepta, quibus docentur homines atque instituuntur.* In this general acception a directory is an institution. But were it taken strictly for a command establishing that rite, surely v. 12. not onely the particular day was appointed, but the person also, to wit, the Infant of eight dayes old among *Abrahams* people, and all the verses 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. together are termed *sanctio circumcisionis*, by *Parens* in his *Commentary. But we find not the institution with restriction to Infancy*, saith Mr. *Blake*. Ans. True, nor did I ever say the institution was restrained to Infancy, or that there was an institution only for children of eight dayes, nor do I deny that the precept *Gen.* 17. 10. was more general than that it should be restrained to the eighth day: yet v. 12. the circumcising of infants was limited to the eighth day. Mr. *Cawdrey Sabb. rediv. part.* 1. *pag.* 135. *For some particular occasions of worship, God was pleased of old to determine some time exclusively, as the eighth day from the birth of a child for Circumcision, and the eighth day for the sacrificing of the firstling males of cattel, neither sooner nor later.* Nor do there want those among Protestant Divines, who make it unlawful to do it before or after but will-worship, except in cases of necessity, as in the wilderness, &c. in which case the rule holds, *God will have mercy and not sacrifice*, and the thing might be done afterwards, as in the circumcision of those who were born in time of their travel in the wilderness. But to have altered the time of a mans own motion, without such neeessity. had been will-worship, as it was charged on *Jeroboam* 1 Kings 12. 33. *that he sacrificed in the moneth he had devised of his own heart.* What Mr. *Blake* saith, *there is in the New-Testament-times an institution of baptism for all in Covenant, without difference of age or sex*, is false, except by being in Covenant he understand, not be-

ing in Covenant by Gods promiſe onely, or others faith, or undertaking for them, but by their own act of Covenanting, that is engaging themſelves in their own perſons by their own act to be Chriſts Diſciples or believers in him, there being no inſtitution in the New Teſtament times of baptizing any other than Diſciples or Believers in Chriſt. Mr. *Blake* adds. *I inſtanced in the Apoſtles argument from analogy for Miniſters maintenance*, 1 Cor. 9.9. 1 Tim. 5. 18. *Mr.* Tombs *anſwers, The Apoſtle doth not by bare analogy conclude Miniſters maintenance, but from the Lords ordinance; He does conlude it then (by his confeſſion) from analogy, though not barely from analogy. Neither have any one of Mr.* Ts *Antagoniſts concluded Infant baptiſm barely from analogy of Circumciſion. There are other arguments which wait for his anſwer, ſo that this inſtance ſtands.*

Anſw. My Confeſſion was not, that the Apoſtle argued from any ſuch analogy as Pædobaptiſts conclude Infants-baptiſm from, to wit, the rule of Circumciſion, thus, *Circumciſion was appointed to Infants in Covenant, therefore Baptiſm is appointed to Infants in Covenant, they having the ſame main and principle end to ſeal the Covenant of grace* (which is Mr. *Blakes* own arguing) which is from a ceremonial rite of the Old Teſtament to a ceremonial rite of the New, without precept or example of Chriſt or his Apoſtles. For 1. The Apoſtles argument 1 *Cor.* 9. 9. ſeems not to me to be from analogy, but a teſtimony explained. So Mr. *Dicſon* in his *Com. Arg.* 3. *a teſtimonio legis de pabulo bovi trituranti dando: quod oſtendit dictum eſſe in gratiam omnium laborantium in aliorum uſum, potiſſimum in miniſterio. Diodati, The end of Gods Law is not to ſhew how cattel ſhould be fed, but to command equity to be uſed in juſt rewarding of thoſe who labour for us.* Mr. *Blake* himſelf *vindic. fœderis* pag. 406. *Thirdly he argues from the command of the Law:* 2. If it be from any analogy, it is in things that have a parity of equity, and ſo it is in moral things, which are perpetual, not

To Mr. *Fiſher*, urging 1 *Cor.* 9. 10. for an equity of the Ceremonial Law to prove Chriſtmas, Mr. *Collings Caveat* p. 77. ſaith. The Apoſtle indeed 1 Cor. 9. 10. urgeth the equity of that piece of the Law, Thou ſhalt not muzzle the mouth of the Oxe, &c. but I never took that for a piece of the Ceremonial, but for a piece of the Judicial Law.

not in meer positive rites. 3. It is an analogy which the Apostle delivered to us, not analogy made by men not guided by an infallible spirit, as is the inference of Pædobaptism from Circumcision, and therefore is not of force to oblige mens consciences. I have shewed before that the Pædobaptists main argument is barely from such analogy, and for *other arguments waiting for mine answer*, either they are answered before sufficiently, or God assisting, will have answer in this *Review*. Mr. *Blakes* arguments *vindic. fœde.* ch. 43. sect. 1. require no longer answer. The first is the same with Mr. *Bs.* second. And the Major is to be denied, if by [*unless order be given to the contrary*] be meant of order given to the contrary in formal positive terms, such as this, Thou shalt not baptize Infants. If it be meant of order given to the contrary, either in expres formal prohibitive terms, or equipollent, the Minor is to be denied.

In the second the Major is to be denyed, and in like manner the third, distinguishing the term [*holy*] In the fourth both the Major and the Minor, and so likewise the fifth, explaining the term [*church privileges*] In the sixth the Major is to be denyed if understood of the invisible Kingdom of God only, if of the visible, the Minor is to be denyed: In the other two additionals, the Major if universal is to be denyed, and the Minor is true of infants of unbelievers as well as believers.

And for the last Argument the matter is as easily answered as the form. For the Major, *Those that are to be saved are to be added to the Church by baptism*, Acts 2.47. is to be limited by the text v. 41. thus [*when they willingly receive the word*] If no larger answer be given Mr. *B.* to these arguments, yet this will be enough to shew they are without much difficulty answerable. Mr. *Bs.* proofs likewise, God assisting, shall have fuller answer than they deserve, though were it not for his own and others conceits of his writings for infant-baptism, I should think it lost time to bestow it in an exact examination of his inconsiderable dictates.

As for the present instance of M. *B.* of the Apostles arguing from analogy, he may see it now fallen, and so likewise the next, of which he speaks thus.

I instanced in the Apostles arguing 1 Cor. 10. 16, 17. *he makes it good that partaking together of the Sacrament of the*

Lords

Lords Supper, we are made one Eccleſiaſtical body, by way of Analogy with the like in the ſacrifices of the Jews, yea in the ſacrifices of the Gentiles; to which Mr. T. ſaies, this argument is to preve, that they which profeſs Chriſt may not partake of the things of Idols. From this general truth, that they which join in the ſervice of any God, they hold Communion with that God, and are one with thoſe that worſhip that God; this the Apoſtle proves by inſtances in the Chriſtian and Jewiſh ſervices. So that this argument is from a general truth proved by induction of inſtances. Mr. T. miſtakes, the Apoſtle takes no ſuch general truth for granted, but affirms that we are one body at the Lords table, which he firſt proves by analogy in the inſtances mentioned, and then concludes thence againſt communion with Idols; That which the Apoſtle diſputes he laies down, but we have not theſe words in the text.

Anſw. There is no miſtake in my Analyſis of the Apoſtles words. He had v. 14. warned them of Idolatry, to wit in going with the Infidels to their Idol feaſts, and to make them more heedful of what he ſaid he prefaceth, v. 19. And then argues: not thus, *they that partake of the Lords Supper are made one Eccleſiaſtical body by way of analogy with the like in the ſacrifices of the Jews, yea in the ſacrifices of the Gentiles;* For then the concluſion to be proved ſhould be, we are one body Eccleſiaſtical at the Lords table, and the ſacrifices of the Gentiles ſhould be the *medium* to prove it, which had been unfit for ſuch a proof, nor in any paſſage of the Apoſtle is uſed to that end. For how inept an Argument had this been, the Gentiles in their ſacrifices had communion with the Idol, therefore they that partake of the Lords Supper are made one body Eccleſiaſtical? Nor would the proof be much otherwiſe if it were thus (as Mr. *Blake* makes it) *we are one body Eccleſiaſtical who partake of the Lords Supper, therefore in Gentile ſacrifices we communicate with Idols.* And me thinks there is a circle in this proof, by the Gentiles ſacrifices to prove we are one body Eccleſiaſtical in the Lords Supper, and thence to prove we communicate with Idols in Gentile ſacrifices. But the ſcope of the Apoſtle appears by the words, v. 14. and v. 19, 20, 21. evidently to be the diſſwading them from the Idol-feaſts on their ſacrifices, becauſe they had therein fellowſhip with the Idol, did partake of

its

its cup and table, and so with Devils v. 20, 21. which had been an argument inconcludent, were it not thus made, To have fellowship with the Idol is evil to be avoided by Christians, as being Communion with Devils. But to partake of the thing offered to Idols is to have fellowship with the Idol. *Ergo*, The Minor, which alone is proved, rests on this general maxim, They have fellowship with a true or supposed Deity, who partake of his service, and this the Apostle proves to be true by the instances of the Christians and the Israelites, v. 16, 17, 18. I know sundry Protestant Expositors make the argument to be thus, Ye may not partake of the Idol banquets, because ye are partakers of the Lords supper. But I conceive this not right: For v. 16, 17. the Apostles *medium* is not from the matter of fact what they did, or duty what they were to do, but from the tendence of their action in common construction and interpretation of the end and use of such actions, which did shew they had Communion in the body of Christ. Which is clearly proved from v. 18. where the Apostle allegeth the Israelites partaking of their altar to the same purpose to which he had used the former, v. 16, 17. now the Christians neither did nor were to partake then of the Jewish altar, and it is not a reason from their fact or duty, but onely from that wherein Christians breaking bread, Jews and Gentiles eating of their sacrifices did agree, that these actions testified their fellowship with that Lord for whom these services were performed. And therefore by *Piscator*, *Dickson*, and others, the argument is thus framed, *Israelites by eating of the sacrifices testified they were professors and partakers of the Jewish religion, therefore they that eat of Idol sacrifices, they testify that they Communicate with Idolaters in their idolatry*: Yea Mr. *Blake* himself in his *answer to my Letter* pag. 74. doth plainly acknowledge the Apostles argument to be from a general maxim common to all religious service, when he saith, *yea he further makes it good* (that which he concluded before) *in the words following, even from the Heathen, it is of the nature of religious worship, whether true or false, to make those of one body* (*as I may say*) *religious that partake of them.* Whence it is apparent that it is not an argument to prove any duty in a Christian rite of the New Testament from the ceremonial law, sith it is by his own confession even from the Gentiles sactifices, which sure by analo-

gy or resemblance being altogether forbidden, cannot make us a rule in Christian meer positive worship, and therefore there is no such argument in the Apostles speech from analogy, as I oppugn.

Mr. *Blake* yet adds. *I instanced in Christs defence of his disciples from the charge of the Pharisees*, Mat. 12. 3, 4. *by analogy and proportion of the like in* David. *Mr.* T. *answers, that is only an instance to prove that sacrifice must give place to mercy, a ceremonial to a moral duty, not an argument from meer analogy or resemblance of things different. He proves that truth then by analogy, if not by meer analogy, and he tells us of no other thing that is joined to help it out, and make it an argument compleat. To these, abundance more might be added.*

Answ. It is enough to shew this instance impertinent, in that it is not from such analogy as is used to prove Infant-baptism by Infant-circumcision; Thus it was in a rite in the old Testament upon this ground, *Ergo*, it must be so in a rite of the New Testament, because the same pretended ground remains other than Gods command or institution: which I called meer analogy in meer positives without a distinct command about each rite. As for my exposition it was right, that Christ allegeth *Davids* fact as an instance, that ceremonials give place to morals, and sacrifice to mercy, as appears by v. 7. And hence in giving rules about exposition of the Decalogue usually from this passage a rule is drawn, that ceremonials give place to morals, sacrifice to mercy. Sure I am, neither here, nor any where else in Scripture is there found such an argument as this, Thus it was in a ceremony of *Moses* Law, therfore thus is must be in a rite or ceremony of the New Testament.

Mr. *Blake* proceeds thus. *Upon Mr.* T. *his desire of rules how farre we may go in this parity of reason, and himself allowing this way of reasoning in morals, which in many cases might be singularly usefull and very helpful in this particular; he is yet silent, we may then keep our way of reasoning without rules, as well as he his; I yet gave in mine, which he epitomizes, and gives in to the Reader by the halves. To whom in the first place I might apply that of the Poet,* Carpere vel noli nostra, vel ede tua.

Answ. There was no reason I should set down rules about reasoning from analogy in morals, how usefull soever they might be. For 1. though I said in my *Examen* pag. 28. for that which is natural or moral in worship an institution or command in the old

Testament is allowed as obligatory to Christians, yet I did not say that in morals a man may reason as Pædobaptists reason in ceremonials, This was a duty or sin in the Old Testament, therefore another thing is a duty or sin in the New Testament (which was not in the old also) by imagined parity of reason, as my words *Postscript* sect. 17. import. 2 Neither is it necessary to set down any other rules than what either Logicians set down in the Topicks about arguments *à comparatis*, or Divines give in the expounding the Decalogue. 3. If any more were requisite, yet it would have been to draw me into a dispute on the by, to fall on that point in that place. 4. If it had been fit for me to do it, yet at that time I had no leisure, the *Postscript* being written when my *Apology* was almost printed, as I say in the *Postscript* sect. 1. which is also a reason why I did not set down all his words about his rules in my *Postscript* sect. 17. which he calls *epitomizing of them, and giving in to the Reader by halves*, when the rules were as fully delivered by me as himself, and only the applications and amplifications omitted, nor doth he shew wherein I have omitted any thing of the strength of them. But whereas Mr. *Blake* saith, *he may keep up his way of reasoning without rules, as well as I mine*, he doth untruly suggest that I keep up any way of reasoning without rules; my way of reasoning is such as the Apostle used 1 *Cor.* 11. 23. and best Divines count certain, to take that onely as of Gods appointment in meer positive ceremonies of the New Testament, which is gathered by Christ or the Apostles, precept or example, in the New Testament. *Pareus Comment.* in *Mat.* 26. 26. *quicquid igitur Dominus Jesus hic instituit atque præcepit necessariò est observandum, nec omittendum, quicquid non instituit nec præcepit non est quasi necessarium huic sacramento obtrudendum sed rejiciendum. Hinc videant illi qui fractionem panis à Domino institutam omittunt vel damnant.* Which doubtless is as true concerning Baptism, *Mat.* 28. 19. *Jus Divinum Eccl. regiminis* by *London Ministers, part.* 2. *ch.* 10 *pag.* 99. *The power of Church government is not natural but positive. Therefore all such power claimed or exercised without such positive grant is meerly* sine titulo, & ipso facto *null and void.* And for his way of reasoning without rules, to wit, to argue thus, It was so in a meer positive ceremony of the old Testament now abolished upon

this

this conceived reason, *Ergo*, it must be in like sort in another ceremony of the new Testament, which is conceived to have in part the same use, if he kept it up, it will condemn the reformation of many Popish and Prelatical ceremonies, and justifie the retaining of them.

The thing I required in my *Examen* pag. 29. was this, I desire any learned man to set me down a rule from Gods Word, how far I may go in my conceived parity of reason, equity or analogy (to wit, in meer positive things to frame an addition to Gods worship from analogy or resemblance conceived by us between two ordinances, whereof one is taken away, without any institution gathered by precept or Apostolical example) and where I must stay; when it will be superstition and wil-worship, when not, when my conscience may be satisfied, when not.

Mr. *Blake, Vindic. fœd.* pag. 375. saies of me. *Take them as he layes them down Apolog. pag.* 142. 1. *When parity of reason or analogy doth not institute any piece of worship, or the least part of the service of God, but onely help to a right understanding of the nature, use and extent of that which is instituted.* 2. *When in our reasoning from analogy for the right understanding of any institution or ordinance, we do not rest solely on the analogy with other commands, but have our further reason for confirmation.* 3. *When the analogy holds full proportion in that for which it is brought, so that nothing can fairly be brought against the one, but may be also concluded against the other. Against these rules he takes three exceptions,* 1. *That never a one of these rules is brought out of Gods Word, for there is neither declaration of such rule, nor example to prove it. The first rule I thus illustrated,* Ainsw. pag. 76. *You find nothing in Scripture for excommunication of women, yet we find in the old Testament* Miriam *shut out of the Camp,* Num. 12. 14. *and in all penalties for transgression, in Scriptures we find no regard had of distinction of sex, and by consequence it is not to be denied, that women offending are within this censure. Mr.* T. *magisterially answers, The proving of excommunicating of women from* Miriams *shutting out of the Camp,* Num. 12. 14 *is not a Scripture Collection, but a meer device of men. If there be no such thing as excommunication in the New Testament (as Mr.* T. *saies* pag. 92. *and*

unsaies pag. 93.) *then I confess what he saies, but if there be such an institution (which here is not a time to examine, as I am sure there is of Baptism) then it may be evinced from that place that it reacheth to both sexes. Mr. T. would have us to proceed by alterable rules of prudence. This prudence as may be inferred, is to reach to both sexes.*

Answ. My answer notwithstanding this reply stands good. For 1. He brings not any declaration or example where the Holy Ghost argues thus, Excommunication extends to women, because *Miriam* was shut out of the Camp, *Num.* 12. 14. It is true, the Anti-Erastians, as *Rutherfurd Divine right of Church-govern. ment*, c. 7. q. 3. attempt to prove that separating from the congregation for leprosie typified Christian excommunication, and thence Mr. *Blake* would prove Excommunication of women. But neither is any other than an humane device, it cannot be proved, that onely scandalous sin answers to leprosie; original sin or sins of thoughts may as well be conceived to be signified by it, and separating from the congregation may as well typifie exclusion from heaven, as removal from the visible Church, yea more agreeable to the end, sith putting out of the Camp was not for amendment as excommunication was. That excommunication which the Scripture in the New Testament mentions as belonging to Christians, I grant is to be of women as well as men, but we need not run to the Old Testament to prove it, 1 *Cor.* 5. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. 2 *Thess.* 3. 6. 14. 2 *Tim.* 3. 5. prove it. If that *Rev.* 2. 20. belong to excommunication, a woman is in expres terms made liable to it. I agree with Mr. *Blake*, *In all penalties for transgression in Scripture we find no regard had of distinction of sexe, and by consequence it is not to be denied, that women offending are within this censure*: so that by his own grant we need not run to analogy from ejecting the Leper, to prove excommunicating of women. It is not true, that *I say and unsay*: my words are plain, distinguishing juridical Excommunication of superious from social, granting this latter, though demurring about the former. I have shewed my meaning plainly in the *Addition of my Apology* sect. 17. 19. in my letter to Mr. *Robert Baillee of Scotland*; what Mr. *Blake* holds in this point I cannot well tell. Some conference I had with him in *London* made me doubtful whether he were not some-

what

what of *Erastus* his judgement in this point; here he doth not say there is an institution of Excommunication as he is sure there is of Baptism. But I deny *if there be an institution of excommunition that it may be evinced from* Num. 12. 14. *that it reacheth both sexes*, much less that any precept may be thence gathered as obliging Christians in the use of excommunication: If there were a rule thence obliging, it would follow that excommunication is to be but seven dayes, and then the excommunicate to be received in again. What I said of ordering things by alterable rules of prudence is expressely meant of things concerning which we have not precise direction from Gods Word, which I suppose Mr. *Blake* will not deny to be true, though he is pleased to mention it, as if it were mine and not his tenent.

He saith further. *I brought an instance not for a proof of it self, but illustration of another proof from Divines arguing against nonresidence from* Ezek. 44. 8. *This (he saies) is good after other arguments, but of it self is not convincing. Such arguments then are of validity when aright placed and marshalled orderly, I hope this of mine then is of force, it is not in the van but brings up the rear.*

Answ. What I acknowledged, that the argument was good after other arguments, I mean to illustrate, not to prove, nor would I deny an argument from Circumcision of infants good to illustrate Baptism of infants, if it were before proved from precept or Apostolical example, manifested in expres assertion, or deduced by good consequences. But the most of Pædobaptists make the argument from Circumcision their *Achilles*, and by their texts, and confession of a *Committee* of them, it was the main, if not the onely argument in the *Assembly*. Mr. *Bs* arguments he puts in the van are no better, as is briefly shewed, *Postscript*, sect. 2. &c. Yet for the text *Ezek.* 44. 8. upon better consideration it seems not fit to illustrate a proof against nonresidence, sith the sin there charged was not leaving the Temple themselves, but admitting at the will of the Prince other than of the Tribe of *Levi* to be in Gods sanctuary, *Num.* 18. 4. yea even the uncircumcised, and thereby Gods holy things were profaned, and idolatry brought in. And therefore the observation of the *New Annot.* of the second edition is, *that unlawful Ministers, false in doctrine, foul in life, are not to be admitted but ejected.* But for Mr. *Blakes* rule, there is no one text brought out

of

of Gods Word to prove it, that we may argue from analogy, so as to infer a duty from an use in meer positive worship of the Old Testament now abolished in the use of a rite of the New, without any other precept in the New Testament, *when we do not institute thence any piece of worship, or the least part of the service of God, but onely make it a help to a right understanding of the nature, use and extent of that which is instituted.* Yea this rule seems to me to speak inconsistencies, For he supposeth that *analogy may not institute any piece of worship, or the least part of the service of God,* yet allows direction from analogy in the nature, extent and use of that which is instituted; whereas the nature, use and extent being the chief part, or the very service it self, and are determined in the institution *Mat.* 28.19. if we may take direction from our conceived analogy in them, we may not onely institute a piece of worship, or the least part of the service of God (which Mr. *Blake* denies) but also the main part, yea the very service it self, which hath no greater parts than the nature, use and extent. So that Mr. *Blakes* first rule, denying the use of analogy in the least part of Gods service, yet allowing it in the nature, use and extent of that which is instituted, is but a rule destroying in one part, what is built up in the other.

He adds further. *The second and third rules he saies are not set down from any declaration or example in the Scripture. I desire him at his leisure to look again, and he may see the second rule confirmed from the Apostles way of thus arguing,* 1 Cor. 9. *and the Lord Christs* Mat. 12. *The third is confirmed by that reasoning of Christ with the Pharisees before mentioned, compared with our reasoning with Antipædobaptists.*

Answ. I have looked again, and I say still these are impertinently alleged by Mr. *B.* as being not one of them from such analogy as Mr. *B.* maintaines and I deny, as I have before shewed, and for Antipædobaptists reasonings, they are the faireſt that can be, keeping close to the confessed institution of Christ, and practice of the Apostles, and there is this objection which is fairly brought against Infant-baptism, that there is no command or example for it in Scripture, which cannot be brought against Infant circumcision, and for the hypotheses of Pædobaptists from the Covenant, seal, succession to circumcision, &c. there is not one of them true,

as God willing shall be shewed in the process of this *Review*.

Mr. *Blake* goes on, *His second exception is, These are very uncertain. For no reason is given, why they may not make a new worship, who may by their analogy extend it beyond the institution in the New Testament. This very well answers Mr. T. his ingenuity, to which I may reply by way of retortion, why may not Mr. T. as well deny an institution and destroy it, as well as curtail that which is instituted? we shall be able to make it good, that he curtails Christs institution in the New Testament, cutting off many Churchmembers in Covenant; he shall never be able to prove that we extend it by analogy or otherwise beyond the institution.*

Answ. That exception of mine did very well agree with ingenuity, and it might have stood better with Mr. *Bs.* ingenuity, to have taken the exception as sufficient to invalidate his rule, than to have made this taunting reply. The answer had no fault, but that it was a little more modest than might have stood with truth. For 1. I might have said truly, not onely that no reason is given, but also that no reason can be given, why they may not make a new worship, who may by their analogy extend it beyond the institution in the New Testament. For their analogy being a meer humane invention, if they have authority to enlarge the ordinance, they have authority to make a new worship; the Papists if they have authority to appoint Baptizing of bells, they have authority to appoint the Sign of the Cross, for the same end for which baptism was; the same authority which serves for the one, serves for the other. Yea, if the analogy direct in the nature, use and extent of an instituted worship, what doth it else but make a new worship? And that it may be seen how dangerous it is to follow Mr. *Blakes* rule, I would have it considered how we shall avoid justifying the Popish mass, if we stick to it. He allows analogy in the understanding of the nature or use of an instituted worship, the Lords Supper is an instituted worship, and it is conceived it succeeds the Passeover, as Baptism Circumcision; if then by the analogy of Circumcision we may gather the use of Baptism, we may in like manner from the analogy of the Passeover, gather the use of the Louds Supper. It is certain from the Apostles words, 1 *Cor.* 5.7. *For Christ our Passeover is sacrificed for us*, that the Passeover was a sacrifice,

crifice, and such a sacrifice as resembled Christ, and therefore propitiatory; and then by analogy the use of the Lords Supper is so too, which is the chief point whereby the popish mass is established. The very self same rule will prove the Ministers of the Gospel, who succeed the Priests of the Law, and by analogy from whom, according to Mr. *Blake*, the Apostle reasoneth, 1 *Cor.* 9. 13, 14. will be proved sacrificing Priests, if as Mr. *Blake* saith, analogy may direct us in the use of an instituted ordinance. 2. I say Mr. *Blake* doth by his analogy according to his first rule, allow the making a new worship: For the worship is not the same, but a new worship, when though the same element be used, yet the nature, use and extent of is otherwise than the institution, as though the Pharisees used water according to the tradition of the Elders, *Mark* 7. which is the element used in Baptism, yet their washing their hands was another worship than Christian Baptism, because the nature, use and extent of it, was other than the institution of Baptism: So likewise though water be retained in their so called Infant-baptism, yet it being neither used in the manner appointed by Christ, to wit, by dipping, but by sprinkling- or powring, nor on the subject appointed by Christ to be baptized, to wit, disciples or believers in him, but on Infants, who are not such, nor to the end Christ appointed, that is, to testifie by that act their owning Christ for their Lord, their dying to sin, and rising to newness of life, but onely to seal the Covenant of Grace, I say a new worship is made in their Infant-watering, as there was of old a new worship made in Infant-communion, and is at this day in the Popish mass, and Baptizing of bells. As for Mr. *Blakes* retortion, I do grant Mr. *T.* may as well deny an institution, and destroy as well as curtail that which is instituted. But that by denying Infants visible Churchmembership in the Christian Church of the New Testament, and their being in Covenant, and right thereby to Baptism, I curtail Christs institution, I do then expect he will be able to make good, when he proves the snow black and the crow white. And whether I prove that by analogy or some other way Baptism is extended beyond the institution in Infant-baptism, I leave it to the Reader to judge.

Mr. *Blake* goes on thus. *The second rule* (he saies) *overthrows all, for if we may not rest solely on the analogy, why at all?*

How

How then is that collection from Ezek. 44. 8. *good, after other arguments against non-residence? neither do I say, that it may not go alone, but it will hardly go alone, but other arguments will be found to second it, in which I also gave instances.*

Answ. 1. The collection from *Ezek.* 44. 8. is good to illustrate, not to rest on as a proof, yet with the correction of my speech as above. 2. I did not charge him that he said *it may not go alone*, nor is it to the purpose which he tells us that he said *analogy will hardly go alone*. But this I say, His second rule is *that reasoning from analogy holds when we do not rest solely on the analogy with other commands, but have our further reason for confirmation*, which doth plainly intimate that we may not rest solely on it. Now I argue, if it be a good proof, we may rest solely on it; For one good proof is enough for a man to rest upon, though more arguments make it clearer. If then we may not rest solely on analogy with other commands (as Mr. *Blakes* words intimate) then it is not a sufficient proof. To which in Mr. *Blakes* words there is no reply, nor hath he avoided my objection that his second rule overthrows what he contends for, the validity of his analogical arguments impugned by me.

Mr. *Blake* of me. *He adds, this is enough to shew that analogy hath no strength, that indeed it doth not onely illustrate, connot prove, what is an argument by analogy, but an argument à simili? I had thought there had been much difference between these two kinds of arguments* à pari & à simili; pari à similibus omninò differunt, *saith* Scheibler *in his Topicks. I may send him to his Dictionary to see whether one be not Englished equal or even, and the other like or semblable. I may send him to the Predicaments whether one be not in Quantity, the other in Quality, and demand of him whether there be* magis & minus par & æquale, *as there is* magis & minus simile? *And to consult with the Topicks whether that be not one head from which they draw arguments which in their judgement are valid: Hath Mr.* T. *never read* de paribus idem est judicium? quod valet in re pari valet etiam in compari. *I think he never read* de similibus idem est judicium: quod valet in simili valet etiam in re assimilata. *If Mr.* T. *be agreed we will refer it to the Common Law, whether this way of reasoning will hold or no; if it fail, we shall need*

no other Levellers to take down that art, it will fall of it self, they have scarce any other way of arguing. But if these onely illustrate (which I think no Logician will say) yet it is here sufficient, There was an institution of Circumcision and there is of Baptism; neither of these needs proof being not in controversie between us and our adversaries. The right subject of Baptism onely is enquired after; the institution hath Infants we say within the verge, and are not excluded from it; For this we have our arguments which from the initiating sacrament of the Iews we onely illustrate.

Answ. It seems Mr. *Blake* thought he had me here at a lift, and therefore after a message from him by words of mouth some years since, intimating he took my speech to be absurd, that an argument from analogy is but an argument *à simili*, he bestirs himself in this manner in this his book. But to stop him in his career. He tells me *he had thought there had been much difference between these two kinds of arguments* à pari & simili: which may be true, and yet my speech true also, what is an argument by analogy (I did not say *à pari*) but an argument *à simili*? He tells me, *paria à similibus omninò differunt*, saith *Scheibler* in his Topicks. *Answ.* It is true, *Scheibler Top.* c. 23. q. 2. saith so, But withal he tells us, that *Titelman* comprehends *paria sub similibus, & Hunnæus, similium & parium aut nullum aut perexile discrimen esse ait, idq; propterea, quia eadem exempla referantur ad similia & paria.* Yea even *Scheibler* himself c. 23. saith, *Ad similia etiam pertinent parabola & analogia; analogia est similitudo composita trium vel quatuor terminorum. Keckerm. syst. log. lib.* 3. *c.* 6. *sequitur locus qui est à similitudine composita, qua dicitur analogia seu proportio. Burgersdicius Instit. log. l.* 2. *c.* 18. *Intelligitur hoc loco non simplex sed composita similitudo sive analogia.* And in the same place hath this passage even of analogy. *Argumenta ex locis similium petita magis illustrant quàm probant, & ut ait Molinæus afferunt magis dissentiendi puderem quàm assentiendi necessitatem. Georg. Dunæus. Comment. in Rami Dialecti. lib.* 1. *c.* 21. *Comparatio similium vulgatè dicitur, id est similitudo, dicitur etiam proportio Græcè ἀναλογία ut similia proportio nalia Græcè ἀνάλογα & à mathematicis ἀναλογία, ἀναλογίαν, inquit Fabius lib.* 5. *c.*

11.

quidem à simili seperavimus, non eam subjectam huic generi putamus. Nam ut unum ad decem, sic decem ad centum, similè certè est, & ut hostis sic malis civis. At certè proportio nihil aliud est, quam duarum rationum similitudo. Sic enim Euclides ὁρίζ. ε. *ἀναλογίαν ἐν τρισὶν ὅροις εἶναι. Ratio autem seu λόγος est duorum inter se terminorum collatio. Exempli gratia, ut* 2. *ad* 4. *sic* 3. *ad* 6. *proportio sive similitudo est, quia eadem est ratio seu qualitas* 4. *ad* 2. *quæ* 6. *ad* 3. *scilicet dupla. Solent quidem hæ voces à quibusdam ad quantitatum collectiones adstringi, verùm generalis sunt significationis. Nam & similitudo omnis proportio est, & qualitas omnis ratio est.* And for the Dictionary. *Pares cum paribus facillime Congregantur* in *Cicero*, is rendred by *Cooper*, *like most readily gather in company with like.* Par est, Plaut. *it is like or equal.* Par Coeat jungatq; pari. Horat. Jam sumus Ergo Pares, Martial. These and innumerable instances besides shew that however in the Predicaments *par* is applied to discrete quantity, and *simile* to quality, yet they are taken without such exactness in other Authors, and that frequently parity is as much as likeness in quality and other conditions. And it is known that it is a rule in Logick, that qualities are sometimes expressed by words of quantity, as when we say a great Philosopher. And for the Topicks *locus à pari* is not *à pari numero*, or *simili qualitate* onely properly so called, but also from any such argument which makes it probable that the like may be said of the one as of the other: *locus à majori & minori* is all one with *locus à magis & minus probabili.* I find in *Keckerm. syst. log. l.* 3. *c.* 7. this Canon. *De paribus & similibus idem est judicium.* I grant good use of arguments *à paribus & à similibus* in the Common Law, which they call from the same case: nor do I except against it as insufficient for Judges and Lawyers to determine by. Yet as in the Law when there is a Statute Law which determines any case, Judges and Lawyers use not then such arguments: so Christ having made an express Statute concerning Baptizing, and who are to be baptized, it is against the Law of God for Mr. *Blake* to run to his analogy, and to impose on mens consciences such uncertain conjectures as his analogy from circumcision, which are no better than his own and other Pædobaptists figments. And me thinks his words shew there is no

strength in it, when he saith. *The institution of Baptism hath infants within the verge, and are not excluded from it; For this we have our arguments, which from the initiating sacrament of the Jews we onely illustrate.* If other Pædobaptists would stand to this, we should be less cumbred with the argument from the Covenant and seal, which was Mr. *Marshals* and the *Assemblies* main if not onely argument. However the Reader may here take notice that Mr. *Blake* confesses *that he with others do onely illustrate their arguments for Pædobaptism by the argument from the initiating sacrament of the Jews*: which may move the considerate Reader to regard little that argument, and to look for other arguments from the institution comprehending infants, which have and will appear frivolous, as his exception here against me hath been.

Mr. *Blake* yet adds. *The third likewise saith he, is uncertain and vain; For how shall we know when the analogy holds full proportion? when nothing can be fairly brought against the one but may be also concluded on the other? when is the proportion full? if onely when* omnia sunt paria. *When Mr. T. will destroy our old Logick to set up his own Divinity, it were to be wisht that he would furnish us with a new piece of Logick as he hath done of Divinity, that all learning humane and divine may stoop to his reformation. I have learnt these for maximes.* Parium exacta est convenientia. Quod de uno parium affirmatur id affirmatur etiam de altero & e contra. *But these with Mr. T. are vain and uncertain, and all arguments that dance not after his pipe, though our Saviors, St. Pauls, or any others.*

Answ. There is nothing here but flirts and flams. Neither do I destroy old Logick, nor set up any other than what I have from the Scripture, yea and the best approved writers: nor need I any new Logick to help me in the reformation of Infant baptism, but such as Protestant Divines have used in reformation of Popish and Prelatical ceremonies. I do not say the maximes of Logick Mr. *Blake* here sets down are vain and uncertain, and all arguments that dance not after my pipe. But this I say, Mr. *Blakes* rule about arguing from analogy conceived between Circumcision and Baptism, or any other Old and New Testament rites, so as without precept or Apostolical example in the New Testament to frame an ob-

obligation on our consciences is vain, and uncertain, not doth our Saviot, or St. *Paul*, or any other sacred writer argue so, as in my answer above may be seen.

Mr. *Blake*, *This can never happen* (saith Mr. T.) *in analogies between the rites of* Moses *and the rites of Christ. How did* Paul *then reason from a parity in the Jewish altar and the Lords table*, 1 Cor. 10. 16, 17. *Yea from* manna *and the rock to the Lords Table? as* Pareus *and other interpreters observe, that spiritual meat was eaten in the one and in the other, and a like danger of prophaning the one and the other.*

Answ. I said true, it can never happen in analogies between the rites of *Moses* and the rites of Christ that all things should be even, or that there should be an exact agreement between them, so, as that which is affirmed of the one should be affirmed of the other, or that there should be the same reason in the use of the one as in the other, and thence inferred, what ought to be done in the one ought to be done in the other, they who are to partake of the one are to partake of the other. This is enough to overthrow the supposed parity between Circumcision and Baptism as inferring Infant baptism, that they agree not in this, that the institution of Baptism extendeth it to all those to whom the institution of Circumcision extends it. It is not true that *Paul* did reason 1 *Cor.* 10. 16, 17. from such a parity in the Jewish altar and the Lords table, as if what was done at the one, must be done at the other by reason of an answerableness in the one rite to the other. But he argues from that which is common to both, and to all other Religions whether true or false, that they which did partake either of them did thereby profess the same Religion, to prove that they which should eat of the Idol meats had communion with the Idol, and so with the Devil. It is not true that the Apostle 1 *Cor.* 10. 1, 2, 3, 4. argues from *manna* and the rock to the Lords Table, as if he would prove that spiritual meat was eaten in the one, therefore in the other, or that it was dangerous to profane the one (for what danger was there in profaning the cloud, Sea, *manna*, or water out of the rock?) therefore there is the like danger of profaning the other, much less what was done in the one was to be done in the other by reason of analogy between them: But the Apostles argument is manifestly this, the Israelites being under

the

the cloud, and passing through the Sea, was to them as Baptism to us, their eating *manna* and drinking water from the rock noted Christ as well as the Lords supper to us, and yet this could not save them from Gods displeasure when they sinned, therefore our sacraments will not shelter us from Gods wrath if we sin, which v. 6. 11. 12. of 1 *Cor.* 10. manifestly shew to be the force of the Apostles reasoning.

Mr. *Blake* adds. *If when there is a parity in many things, it will be* (*saith he*) *uncertain how many parities will serve turn to make the proportion full. Here is an excellent dexterity to enervate so many Scripture arguments, that the weakness of this argument* (*in spight of all Logick*) *might appear; I have told him, and may tell him still, The* Corinthians *and the Pharisees wanted his head-piece, otherwise Christ and* Paul *had not gone so away with arguments of this nature. To satisfie him therefore fully, one parity will serve the turn. The exact proportion, say Logicians, is* in quantum paria respectu tertii in quo paria comparantur. *There are many imparities between the Lords supper and manna, yet they agree in this that both were spiritual meat; so between the Jewish altar and the Lords Table, but they agree in this, that there is Ecclesiastical communion in both of them, to make the partakers of one body Ecclesiastical: many differences between Circumcision and Baptism, but so farre they agree* (*by Mr.* T. *his confession*) *that both are initiating sacraments; he hath multiplied many differences, but stands not to any as in application to this particular in difference.*

Answ. There is in my answer nothing tending to enervate any Scripture argument, though what I say is enough to shew the vanity of Mr. *Blakes* arguments, there being no certain rule to shew how many or what sort of parities, general or special, essential or accidental will serve turn. Neither *Paul* nor Christ did argue thus, this was appointed in a rite of the Old Testament, therefore thus it is to be observed in a rite of the New. In Logick it is usuall to deny an argument valid *à comparatis*, though there be some parities, *caeteris non paribus*. It is true one parity will serve turn to make things compared even in the thing in which they agree. But there must be so many parities, or such a parity in things compared as make them equal in the reason of the thing inferred,

ferred, otherwise one disparity proper to the matter is enough to e-
vacuate the argument. Which is very manifest in the argument a-
bout Infant baptism. For the formal reason of Circumcising In-
fants being the command, there is no parity to infer thence Bap-
tizing of Infants without the parity of command. Which is the
difference I have often stood to in application to this particular in
difference; which is not whether Baptism and Circumcision be in-
itiating sacraments, but whether an argument can be drawn to
bind conscience in the use of the one from a command, in the use
of the other without a precept in the New Testament.

Mr. *Blake* concludes this section thus: *The third exception is, It is uncertain whether these rules be sufficient, whether there be no need of any more. It is certain then that Mr.* T. *cannot make it appear that they are insufficient, in case he could he would not have left them at any uncertainty: I shall judge them sufficient till I hear from Mr.* T. *the contrary.*

Answ. I have made it appear that these rules are not sufficient to make good the proof from analogy disproved by me: nor was it formerly uncertain to me they are not sufficient; yet I might say truly, it is uncertain, whether these rules be sufficient, whether there be no need of any more to satisfie others, who may think them too few as well as otherwise imperfect. I for my part do judge them notwithstanding Mr. *Blakes* plea to be insufficient, and all arguments inferring duty as of Gods appointment in the use of a rite of the New Testament from some likeness or agreement with a rite of the Old Testament now abolished, without direction in the New, as frivolous and serving onely to make wrangling, fill people with superstitions, and to weary Scholars, as I say in the *Addition* to my *Apology* in answer to Mr. *Baillee* sect. 15. Mr. *Cawdrey Sabb. rediv. part.* 4. *ch.* 1. against Dr. *Sanderson*, saying *Divine right or institution is that First which is properly and primarily such; as what is* (first) *enjoined by express ordinance of God, or* (*secondly*) *what may be deduced therefrom by evident illation. Secondly that which is secondarily and consequently such. To which four things* (*say they*) *are required,* 1. *equity,* 2. *analogy,* 3. *insinuations in the new Testament,* 4. *continued practice of the Church,* speaks thus. *But this proceeding seems not sufficient.* 3. *There are things now in common use which have all the four conditions, and yet he will*

not

not say they are Divine institutions; as the observation of Easter &c. which yet are confessedly but Ecclesiasticall. And will Mr. *Cawdrey* make a Divine institution of Infant baptism which in the next page he saith *we have no express command (nor expres example of it) in Scripture*, from grounds which at most can make but analogy without equity (for in meer positive rites there is no equity but the appointers will) insinuations in the New Testament or any truly wel-proved continued practice of the Church? However Mr. *Cawdreys* words are sufficient to shew (though they oppose himself) that he counted analogy not sufficient, no not though accompanied with equity, insinuations in the New Testament and continued practice of the Church to make a thing of Divine institution, but only Ecclesiastical. Which being granted, Mr. *Marshals analogical argument* (as he calls it) which with him the words of the *Assembly* intimate to be the chief prop of the Divine institution of Infant baptism, falls to the ground. But lets hear what Mr. *B.* saith also.

What need (saith Mr *B.*) *the same thing to be done twice, except men had questioned the authority of the old?*

Answ. The Holy Ghost hath delivered many things twice in the Old and New Testament, yet sure it was needful, else it is not likely it would have been done. Will Mr. *B.* charge the Spirit of God with needless committing so many histories, sayings of Christ &c. to writing, because they were written before? And to his question I say, If there were no other need, yet there was this that the agreement of the Old and New Testament might appear, whereby the authority of both is greatly confirmed.

The whole *Scripture* saith he, *is the perfect Word and Law of God: and if he should reveil all his mind in one part, what use should we make of the other.*

Answ. The Gospels of the four Evangelists are the perfect Word and Law of God, they need no unwritten tradition for a supplement, in them those things are written by which we may have life, *John* 20. 31. yet there is use of *Pauls* Epistles. Suppose all Gods mind revealed in one part, so as no more doctrine or truth were in the rest than in one, yet there is use to confirm, explain, inforce that which is elsewhere written in that one part. And indeed this reasoning of his would prove that book or part of Scripture to be of

no

no use, as suppose *Marks* Gospel, which is counted an abridgement of another, or so much of that Gospel as reveals no more of Gods mind than another doth: which me thinks Mr. *B.* on better consideration should disclaim.

He goes on. *How silent is the New Testament concerning a Christian Magistracy? which made the Anabaptists of old deny it. Where find you a Christian in the New Testament that exercised the place of a king, a Parliament man, or Justice of Peace, or the like? so of an oath before a Magistrate, of war, of the Sabbath, &c. how sparing is the new Testament? and why? but because there was enough said of them in the old? This also is the very case in the question in hand.*

Answ. The Anabaptists (as they are called) of former times, or some of them, as it is reported (for their own books I never saw) of them, denied it lawful for Christians to be Magistrates, to war, to swear, not onely because of the silence thereof in the New Testament, but also because they mistook the meaning of the texts, as forbidding them *Is.* 2. 4. *Micah* 4. 3. *Zach.* 9. 10. *John* 18. 36. *Mat.* 20. 26. *Mat.* 5. 34, 35. *Luke* 22. 25, 26. &c. And so either did or seemed to do some of the Antient Christians, even those who are called the Fathers, of which may be seen *Sixtus Senensis Biblioth. sanct. lib. 6. annot.* 25, 26. And yet learned men do not think the New Testament silent of a Christian Magistrate, of an oath, or war, but that there are texts for them in the New Testament, of which some are brought by *Grot. l.* 1. *de Iure Belli. ac Pacis c.* 2. 1 *Tim.* 2. 1, 2, 3. *Rom.* 13. 1. &c. And though there be no example of a Christian King, Parliament man, or Justice of Peace, yet we find a Christian Centurion *Act.* 10. a Christian Deputy *Act.* 13. 12. Christian parents, husbands, masters, whose government is allowed, and rules given about the managing of it. Wherefore I conceive Mr. *B.* doth too much betray Christian Magistracy, souldiery, civil judicature, &c. who suggests to his Reader, as if the New Testament were silent of Christian Magistracy, and sparing about war, or oaths before a Magistrate. I confess the determination of the Old Testament is obligatory, because these things are moral, not peculiar to the Jews: but it doth not follow therefore that an argument is valid from analogy conceived between rites of the old Testament and the new,

or the Jewish policy and the Christian to conclude an obligation to us in a rite of the New Testament, the rites of the Old Testament being meerly positive, not from the beginning proper to the Jews, and together with the policy of the Jewish Church now abrogated.

But there seems to be more difficulty about the Sabbath. Mr. *Marshall* had said in his *Sermon, that all that reject the baptizing of Infants do and must upon the same grounds reject the religious observation of the Lords day.* In my *Examen* part. 2. sect. 8. I denied it, there being something moral from the beginning in the Sabbath, not so in Circumcision, and there being something in the new Testament to prove an institution of the *Lords day*, nothing about infant baptism. To this Mr. *M.* replies, *However the determinate day doth depend wholly upon institution, therefore they who reject that which depends upon positive institution, unless its institution can be expresly found in the New Testament, are as much at a loss for the Lords day as for baptizing of infants.* 2. *And the advantage is here for infant baptism above the Lords day, because in the proof of infant baptism there is only need to shew the subject to whom baptism is to be applyed, in the Lords day the institution of the day it self.*

Answ. 1. That which he saies first confirms my exception; for therein he acknowledgeth there is something natural or moral by institution about a Sabbath, but shews nothing natural or moral in Circumcision.

2. I never rejected infant baptism because its institution cannot be expresly in so many words or syllables without consequence found in the New Testament, but because it is not there either in expres words, or by good consequence.

3. If the determinate day require positive institution, there is institution brought out of the New Testament, if not expres, yet by good consequence; which I count sufficient.

4. Yet I do not count Mr. *Ms.* consequence good by analogy in his *Defence* pag. 208. *The Jews keep the Sabbath on the seventh or last day of the week, ergo the Christians keep the Sabbath on the first day of the week.* Of my judgement herein with other Antipædobaptists more may be seen in my *Præcursor*, S. 25. And for the other thing Mr. *M.* adds, it is nothing to the

busineſs in hand, which is not about the greater or leſſer neceſſity of clearing the inſtitution of the Lords day or infant baptiſm, but about the principle by which infant baptiſm is rejected, whether it neceſſitate us to reject the Lords day: which I denyed, becauſe this principle, That uſe of a meer ceremony or poſitive rite which hath neither precept nor example in the New Teſtament is to be rejected, will not reach the Lords day, which is not meerly poſitive, but in part moral, and hath precept and example for it in the New Teſtament, neither of which can be ſaid of infant baptiſm.

That which Mr. *B.* adds next about *the deſperate higheſt ſort of Antinomians, who wipe out all the Old Teſtament with a ſtroke, and that they may as well do ſo by the New Teſtament too if they pleaſe, and telling us the queſtion whether infants ſhould be baptized is turned into a higher, whether the Scriptures be the word of God or not?* I might well let paſs as being nothing to the point in hand, the denying of infant baptiſm to be in the Old or New Teſtament, neither being upon the higher or lower ſort of Antinomians (if there be ſuch difference of them) principle, they that deny infant baptiſm, being not neceſſitated to it, nor ſo far as I find in their writings (except what I have met with in Mr. *Dens* Books) denying the obligation of moral precepts of the Old Teſtament. All that they are neceſſitated to maintain is, that Ceremonial precepts of the Old Teſtament and imagined ANALOGIE between Baptiſm and Circumciſion, the Jewiſh Church ſtate and the Chriſtian, are of no force to conclude a divine appointment concerning any Sacrament or meerly poſitive worſhip of the New Teſtament. And therefore his Pathetick Rhetorick, though elſewhere of uſe, yet in a diſpute as this his writing ſhould have been, hath the face either of malignancy towards his Antagoniſts, or of an indirect trick to prepoſſeſs people with horrour of that opinion, which he would refuſe afore he comes to his Arguments, which is the chief part of his skill. And for what he ſaith further that *inceſtuous marriages are not forbidden in the New Teſtament*, and tells the men of *Bewdley, That ſome of eminency that deny Infant baptiſm deny either inceſtuous marriages, or any thing elſe not forbidden in the New Teſtament to be ſin.* It is like the former, ſith he might know that Antipædobaptiſts are not neceſſitated to deny the obli-

gation of the moral Law, in which the Laws about incestuous marriages appear to be in that the *Canaanites* were punished for their incests *Levit.* 18. 25. And Mr. *B.* if he had any mind to deal candidly with me, might have told them, that I was none of those men, sith he might (if he did read my books with any heed, of which I much doubt) have told them, that to this objection I answered in my *Examen* pag 111. 1. That the instance of the Lawes about forbidden marriages brought by Mr. *M.* is not to the point of the obligation of meer positive ceremonial worship, sith the command about prohibited degrees in marriage is moral 2. That yet there is for one branch of Incest an expres censure in the New Testament, proving the unlawfulnes of it. To which Mr. *M.* page 196. of his *Defence* saith, *But how would you laugh at such a consequence in another, a man may not marry his Fathers wife, a thing which by the light of nature was abhorred among the Heathens, ergo all the degrees of forbidden marriages in* Moses *Laws stand firm?* whereto I reply, I made no consequence but this, one branch of Incest is expresly censured in the New Testament, therefore it is unlawful. And this I only brought to shew the impertinency of Mr. *M.* allegation to prove the matter in question, it being granted by me that a morall precept of *Moses* is in force, thought not a ceremonial, and yet Mr. *M.* brings instances only of morals standing in force, none of ceremonials, and instead of cleering the pertinency of his own instances, makes a consequence as mine, which, saith he, *I would laugh at in another*, which dealing is cavilling not answering. The like to which is that which follows in him. *The like say you against Polygamy, there is proof against it*, Mat. 19. 5. 9. *But is this an expres prohibition of it? Must you not be compelled to go by a consequence to bring it in, which is all I contend for?* Whereto I reply. Though Mr. *M.* page 3. of his *Defence* charged me unjustly *with a Socinian plot in my writings to question all conclusions deduced by consequence from Scripture*, yet page 205. he saith of me, *That I neither there nor here deny this Argument from a consequence to be sufficient for practice of some things in the worship of God, which are not expresly laid down in the New Testament*, and therefore he might easily have seen, if he would, that to prove we may go by a consequence is not all he

contends

contends for, it being known to him that I grant it. But this he is to prove, or else he still is besides the business, that a consequence is good from analogy of an abrogated rite of the Old Testament to prove a Divine appointment concerning a meer positive rite of the New Testament, till this be done, his, and Mr. *Bs.* and Mr. *Bls.* arguings are quite besides the business in hand and carry an apparent shew of Sophistry, not of just disputing.

SECT. IV.

Mr. Bs. *Speeches about the little said for Antipædobaptism is vain, and his speech about the Antiquity of Infant baptism is very inconsiderate, and his speech about the difficulty and importance of the point in question is examined*

THe rest of Mr. *Bs. ten positions* are granted by me, but what he saith of me, pag. 5. *that he never to his remembrance did plead with an able Papist, but he could say far more for his religion then Mr.* T. *said for his opinion on* James 1. *or his Sermon since*, that he might insinuate that he and others had reason to be settled in the practice of infant baptism, because I said so little then, and my Sermon presently after, is like, King *Iames* his resolution, to be more for the Bishops and Ceremonies, because Doctor *Reynolds* and his Collegues sayd so little against them in the Conference at *Hampton* Court, from whence M: *B.* might gather, that if such men as Dr: *Reynolds* (whose equal every way the world did then or since scarce yield) D: *Spark*, M: *Chaderton*, M: *Knewstubs*, did fail to speak what had been requisite, when it was expected, though they were four, which were to object, and that upon a sufficient time of premeditation, and yet this no good evidence for Bishops and Ceremonies, it is no good evidence for infant baptism, that I being single, being to answer *ex tempore*, hardly allowed by M: *B.* to repeat his Arguments, whereof some were hypothetical syllogisms, brought to prove an hypothetical proposition, and therefore such as could not be well repeated, and his arguments containing such terms, as it appears now by his Book, he

used in senses different from what other Authors use them, and yet would not explain them, with sundry other captious devices, and provoking speeches, as I have in part made manifest in my writings, and through Gods assistance shall do more, sayd so little at the dispute. Who is there that hath experience of humane infirmity, who knows not that distractions, forgetfulness, inadverrency, sudden weakness of body, extemporality necessitated, slowness of speech, care to restrain passion, do hinder a man from speaking that in a great meeting, which he could in his study by writing easily express? What I sayd *Jan.* 1. 1649. was almost wholly as a Respondent, as the Argument required. Now they that know the rule of Schools understand the Respondents business is but to repeat, deny, distinguish, apply to the arguments of the Opponent, and this was done by me then, why it was done no more fully my *Antidote*, *Præcursor*, and the *Review* shew. M: *B.* had in his *Epistle Dedicatory to his Saints everlasting rest*, published to the world, *that I was driven to gross absurdities*, being moved to name those absurdities in his *answer to my Valedictory oration*, he names 27. *p.* 207. To all which I answer in my *Præcursor Sect:* 17. and clear my self from the absurdities he imagined. In his *Præfestinantis morator*, when he comes to answer that Section, he onely replies thus, *Sect:* 17. *I know not one word of Answer that this Section needs for him that will peruse my words.* To which I conceive I may without any heat reply, that he either wrongs his Readers by not making good that I was driven to gross absurdities, after my clearing of my self from them, or me, in not acquitting me from his charge. But I must needs speak it, though with grief, that I have scarce met with less justice, or fair dealing from any man than from M: *B.* and both his and other Antagonists courses tend not to an impartial and equal way of examining the point in controversie, but they use artifices to prepossess men against me and my writings and speeches, and to deter them from considering them. In my *Sermon January* 20. 1649. was given an answer to M: *Bs.* arguments so far as I could retain them in memory, or finde them in some imperfect notes, when I had sought in vain to have them from M: *B.* himself in writing. Now they are in print, they have or shall have a large answer, if the Lord will. Papists may say much more than I sayd, yet that either for their Religion or ree will so much of moment can be sayd as against infant-

baptism

baptism is vainly surmised. It is well M: *B.* in his 7. *Position* confesseth *some Divines have argued weakly for infant-baptism, and brought some misapplied Scriptures*: If ye mean my Books *by the third or fourth written against them*, (as it is most likely) he might know my writings were in answer to M: *Marshall*, whose writing is conceived to contain the Assemblies grounds, he is stiled by M: *Stalham* the *Antesignanus*, and perhaps it may be judged arrogance in M: *B.* to imagine his own arguments better than his. For my part I think them weaker. However he had shewd some care of truth and love to me, if he had by communicating them to me endeavoured to stop me in my supposed error. But this I count my trouble, though I hope it will advantage the truth, that first Mr: *M.* *Sermon* hath been magnified, & that by examining it I hoped I had done my work, and yet after M: *Blakes* writing being magnified, I was put to answer that, and then Mr: *Bs.* preferred before them all, and yet I am referred by him to answer M: *Cobbet*, M: *Drew*, M: *Church*, and after all Doctor *Hammonds* is preferred, so that I must answer that, or else the truth be betrayed. It seems Pædobaptists know not well what to rely on, when they do shift so much from one to another. But I go on. M: *Bs. eighth Position is, that one sound argument is enough to prove any thing true*: yet more may be brought against infant-baptism. Almost all that Protestants dispute against Popish Rites, Non-conformists against Prelatical Ceremonies, may be said against Pædobaptism, M: *Bs.* words in answer to Mr. *Bedford, Plain Scripture proof* &c. *pag.* 302, 303. are appliable against infant-baptism. In my *Præcursor* I had set down M. *B.* words in the *second Edition of the Saints everlasting rest, part.* 1. *chap.* 8. *Sect.* 5. *pag.* 179. in the margin; in his *Præfestinantis morator* he sayth, *To what end you recite my allegation of* Justin Martyr *is past my reach to imagine; unless you would insinuate that I confess this to be the course with all the baptized, which I expresly say was the way of baptizing the aged. Answ* It had been easie for M. *B.* to conceive why I set down those words, to wit, to prove from his own confession, that to baptize upon profession of faith, and to admit none to the Lords Supper but those who are thus baptized, is *no new over-strict way*. And however he now endeavours to mince the matter, these words of his, [*And in the primitive times none were baptized without an expres covenanting*

naming, wherein they renounced the world, flesh, and devil, and engaged themselves to Christ, and promised to obey him, as you may see in Tertul: Origen, Cyprian, *and others at large.*] being printed with a ful point at the end, are as plain a denial that infants were baptized in the primitive times, as words usually express. As for the words following; *I will cite but one for all, who was before the rest, and that is* Justin Martyr; *speaking of the way of baptizing the aged, sayth, they are not words,* if they be restrictive, that limit any ones speech but *Justin Martyrs,* and if by them M: *B.* would intimate that *Justin Martyr* did not in that speech set down the way of baptizing all that were then baptized, the words following saying thus, *how we are dedicated to God we will now open unto you,* and then setting down the constant way of baptizing without any exception, M. *Bs.* addition will easily be perceived to be but a shift to avoid the evidence of this relation of *Justin Martyr, Apol. 2. ad Antoninum,* being so plain to prove infant-baptism not to have been then in use among Christians. Likewise in my *Praecursor, Sect. 16. pag. 66.* I bring an argument against infant-baptism from M: *Bs.* own words *mutatis mutandis.* His answer in his *Praefestinantis morator* is in these words. *His Confidence, pag. 66. is marvellous. I doubt not but that he knows that I take the words* [*since the solemn institution of Baptism* Matth: 28.] *inclusively; And so I answer, that this solemn institution is our warrant, requiring us both to disciple nations, and baptize Disciples; and we have other Scriptures which plainly prove infants to be Disciples.*

Answ: My confidence is upon good reason, M: *Bs.* marvelling is from ignorance; what he means *by taking the words* [*since the solemn institution of Baptism,* Matth. 28.] *inclusively* I know not, except he mean that time when that institution was given, as well as the time after, or that institution to be a warrant as well as after precepts or examples. Either way the *medium* of M. *B.* serves my purpose. For it plainly asserts, that *what we have no warrant, in all the New Testament, for, we are not to do ordinarily, what we have precept and example for, we are to do.* Which if he will stand to, then his warrant out of the Old Testament is not sufficient for infant-baptism, and so *it is not fully determined in the Old Testament, at what age persons are to be admitted into the Church,* as he

sayd

ſayd before, and what we do we have warrant for by his own grant, ſith he cannot deny we have precept and example for baptizing profeſſors of faith. And then his including here *Matth.*28.19. in his Texts (though not brought *Plain Scripture proof, &c. pag.*342. to prove his antecedent) is an intimation that in all the reſt of the Texts, *John* 4.1. *Acts* 2.38,41. *&* 8.12,13,16,36,38. *&* 9.18. *&* 10.47.48. *&* 16.15,33. *&* 18.8. *&* 19.3,4,5. *Rom.*6.3, *&c.* he findes not precept or example for baptizing of infants, and ſo if he finde not warrant *Matth.*28.19. for baptizing infants, all his other proofs are by his own reaſoning made invalid. For ſure the Texts alleged do as evidently prove this antecedent [*we have no warrant* by word or example in all the New Teſtament (ſince the ſolemn inſtitution of Baptiſm, *Matth.*28.) to admit any member into the Church by Baptiſm, but believers by profeſſion, but both precept and conſtant example of admitting them by it] as Mr. *Bs.* [*we have no warrant by word or example in all the New Teſtament* (*ſince the ſolemn inſtitution of Baptiſm*, Matth.28) *to admit any member into the Church without Baptiſm, but both precept and conſtant example of admitting them by it*] *The conſequent then* [we muſt not admit ordinarily any by Baptiſm without profeſſion of faith] muſt by the force of his own illation *be undoubted to thoſe that take the word for their rule.* As for his evaſion, *that he hath other Scriptures which plainly prove infants to be Diſciples*, how miſerably he fails therein will appear by that which follows in this *Review.* The Reader may perceive that whatſoever his talk be about a Gift and Ordinance of viſible Church-membership unrepealed, and of Chriſts Laying of hands on little ones, and ſuch like Arguments and Texts he brings, yet if he will ſtand to his own reaſoning in Arg.9. againſt deniers of Baptiſm by Water, *pag.*342. of his *Plain Scripture proof, &c.* we have no warrant to admit ordinarily by Baptiſm, but according to the precept and example in the New Teſtament in the Text, *Matth.*28.19. and the other Texts before recited. Concerning which I have reaſon to be as confident as of common notions, that they include not infants, and to marvel that Mr. *Bs.* prejudice ſhould ſo blinde him, as not to ſee the futility of his arguings to prove infants to be Diſciples included in the inſtitution *Matth.* 28.19. But I proceed.

nanting, wherein they renounced the world, flesh, and devil, and engaged themselves to Christ, and promised to obey him, as you may see in Tertul: Origen, Cyprian, *and others at large.*] being printed with a ful point at the end, are as plain a denial that infants were baptized in the primitive times, as words usually express. As for the words following; *I will cite but one for all, who was before the rest, and that is* Justin Martyr; *speaking of the way of baptizing the aged, sayth, they are not words,* if they be restrictive, that limit any ones speech but *Justin Martyrs,* and if by them M: *B.* would intimate that *Justin Martyr* did not in that speech set down the way of baptizing all that were then baptized, the words following saying thus, *how we are dedicated to God we will now open unto you,* and then setting down the constant way of baptizing without any exception, M. *Bs.* addition will easily be perceived to be but a shift to avoid the evidence of this relation of *Justin Martyr, Apol. 2. ad Antoninum,* being so plain to prove infant-baptism not to have been then in use among Christians. Likewise in my *Pracursor, Sect. 16. pag. 66.* I bring an argument against infant-baptism from M: *Bs.* own words *mutatis mutandis.* His answer in his *Præfestinantis morator* is in these words. *His Confidence, pag. 66. is marvellous. I doubt not but that he knows that I take the words* [*since the solemn institution of Baptism* Matth: 28.] *inclusively; And so I answer, that this solemn institution is our warrant, requiring us both to disciple nations, and baptize Disciples; and we have other Scriptures which plainly prove infants to be Disciples.*

Answ: My confidence is upon good reason, M: *Bs.* marvelling is from ignorance; what he means *by taking the words* [*since the solemn institution of Baptism,* Matth. 28.] *inclusively* I know not, except he mean that time when that institution was given, as well as the time after, or that institution to be a warrant as well as after precepts or examples. Either way the *medium* of M. *B.* serves my purpose. For it plainly asserts, that *what we have no warrant, in all the New Testament, for, we are not to do ordinarily, what we have precept and example for, we are to do.* Which if he will stand to, then his warrant out of the Old Testament is not sufficient for infant-baptism, and so *it is not fully determined in the Old Testament, at what age persons are to be admitted into the Church,* as he

sayd

ſayd before, and what we do we have warrant for by his own grant, ſith he cannot deny we have precept and example for baptizing profeſſors of faith. And then his including here *Matth.*28.19. in his Texts (though not brought *Plain Scripture proof, &c. pag.*342. to prove his antecedent) is an intimation that in all the reſt of the Texts, *John* 4. 1. *Acts* 2.38,41. & 8.12,13,16,36,38. & 9.18. & 10.47.48. & 16.15,33. & 18.8. & 19.3,4,5. *Rom.*6.3, *&c.* he findes not precept or example for baptizing of infants, and ſo if he finde not warrant *Matth.*28.19. for baptizing infants, all his other proofs are by his own reaſoning made invalid. For ſure the Texts alleged do as evidently prove this antecedent [*we have no warrant* by word or example in all the New Teſtament (ſince the ſolemn inſtitution of Baptiſm, *Matth.*28.) to admit any member into the Church by Baptiſm, but believers by profeſſion, but both precept and conſtant example of admitting them by it] as Mr. *Bs.* [*we have no warrant by word or example in all the New Teſtament* (*ſince the ſolemn inſtitution of Baptiſm*, Matth.28) *to admit any member into the Church without Baptiſm, but both precept and conſtant example of admitting them by it*] *The conſequent then* [we muſt not admit ordinarily any by Baptiſm without profeſſion of faith] muſt by the force of his own illation *be undoubted to thoſe that take the word for their rule.* As for his evaſion, *that he hath other Scriptures which plainly prove infants to be Diſciples*, how miſerably he fails therein will appear by that which follows in this *Review.* The Reader may perceive that whatſoever his talk be about a Gift and Ordinance of viſible Church-membership unrepealed, and of Chriſts Laying of hands on little ones, and ſuch like Arguments and Texts he brings, yet if he will ſtand to his own reaſoning in Arg.9. againſt deniers of Baptiſm by Water, *pag.*342. of his *Plain Scripture proof, &c.* we have no warrant to admit ordinarily by Baptiſm, but according to the precept and example in the New Teſtament in the Text, *Matth.*28.19. and the orher Texts before recited. Concerning which I have reaſon to be as confident as of common notions, that they include not infants, and to marvel that Mr. *Bs.* prejudice ſhould ſo blinde him, as not to ſee the futility of his arguings to prove infants to be Diſciples included in the inſtitution *Matth.* 28.19. But I proceed.

Becauſe, as he ſayth, *pag.5. An anſwer cannot be always preſently given, which may make the caſe plain to ſome men*, therefore Mr. *B.* ſhould have given his arguments in writing to thoſe that came to him, which had been an eaſier and fairer way than to tell them as he doth, *pag.6. If any of you have taken up the opinion of Antepædobaptiſm, and have not read and ſtudied Mr.* Cobber, *M.* Church, *and other the chief books, and been able* (*at leaſt to himſelf*) *to confute them, you have but diſcovered a ſeared conſcience* (a moſt heavy, though vain cenſure, ſhewing what raſhneſs and diſtemper was in Mr. *B.* in this writing) *which either taketh error for no ſin, or elſe dare venture on ſin without fear, and have betrayed your own ſouls by your lazineſs*, as if a man might not be ſatisfied by reading of the Scripture, and conference with the able of the oppoſite party, without reading ſo many Books. Sure Mr. *B.* who had read thoſe Books ſhewed little charity to thoſe of *Bewdley* that came to him for arguments for infant-baptiſm, when he would neither ſet down his own arguments in writing, nor direct them in what part of thoſe books they might have ſatisfaction; but fly upon them with ſo deep a charge, without any moderation of ſpirit. And when he ſaith, *pag.7. He dare ſay by my books, that it is my caſe not to have received the doctrine of infant-baptiſm on the beſt grounds and arguments.* I reply, 1. that there are many paſſages which make me think he never read my books with exact diligence and heed, but (if I may uſe his own words) *He betrays his own ſoul by his lazineſs* or prejudice. 2. It ſhews a fond conceit in him of his own arguments, which another perhaps will think weaker than thoſe of *Calvin, Urſin, Piſcator, the Aſſembly, Mr.* M. *&c.* which he might perceive by my *Exercit.* and otherwiſe, that I had conſidered. I ſaid in my *Apology, pag.6.* that I reſted wholly on 1 *Cor.*7.14. for many years, and that Text Mr. *B.* cals *a full plain Text*, and Dr. *Hammond* in effect builds all his proof for infant-baptiſm upon it, and therefore Mr. *B.* might have perceived his miſtake concerning me, if he had heeded my books. *If ſome Divines have argued weakly for infant-baptiſm, uſed ſome unfit phraſes, and brought ſome miſapplied Scriptures*, as he ſaith, I am ſure Mr. *B.* had reaſon to number himſelf among them, if he be not the man who hath in all theſe outſtripped them. I wiſh he had held his reſolution *of not heaping up many arguments*, it would have ſaved me much labor.

To

To his words, *Whatsoever Mr. T. may pretend among the simple, I shall easily prove, that infant-baptism was used in the Church as high to the Apostles days as there is any sufficient History extant to inform us: and that the deferring of Baptism came in with the rest of Popery, upon Popish or heretical grounds.*

I answer, 1. That my pretences about the innovation of infant-baptism are not among the simple, as he would insinuate, but among the most learned, for whose examination my allegations are obvious in print. 2. That his assertion concerning the antiquity of infant-baptism is most inconsiderate, there being nothing in *Ignatius*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Eusebius*, *Epiphanius*, and other the most approved Histories and Authors, for his assertion. And for those he brings, the highest is Pope *Hyginus*, whose words he alleged out of his Decree, which I conceived had been in his Epistle decretal, judged to be counterfeit, but Mr. *B.* in his *Præfestinantis morator* lets fly at me *Sect.* 3. for my mistake. I confess I have not *Blondellus*, *Surius*, *Nicolinus*, *Crab*, *Binius*, *Gratian*; but *Osiander Epit. Hist. Eccl. Cent.* 2. *l.* 2. *c.* 5. saith, *Reliqua Decreta, quæ huic Episcopo tribuuntur, ex Gratiano ad verbum* (*quia prolixa non sunt*) *referemus.* And then sets down five Decrees, on the second of which he notes thus, *Ex hoc decreto elucet vanitas harum constitutionum; & quod falsò prioribus Episcopis Romanis tribuantur. Quis enim credat? &c. Quare manifestum est hæc Decreta longo tempore post Hyginum facta, & in Ecclesiam Dei, jam superstitionibus Pontificiis contaminatam, introducta esse. Hujus farinæ sunt & proximè sequentia Decreta, de rebus frivolis edita,* of which the last is, *In catechismo, & in baptismo, & in confirmatione unus patrinus fieri potest, si necessitas cogat, non est tamen consuetudo Romana: sed per singulos* (*æstus*) *singuli suscipiunt.* Whereby the Reader may perceive the Decree to be but a forgery, and that if it were true, yet it doth not mention the baptizing of infants, sith Gossips were at the Baptism of elder persons, (though Dr. *Hammond* say in his Letter, *pag.* 214. Godfathers have place onely in baptizing of Children) as may be made appear by instances at the baptizing of some *Saxon* Kings, and otherwise, and the Decree it self, putting a Gossip in Catechism before a Gossip in Baptism, makes

Mr. *Fox* in the second Book of the *Acts & Monuments*, at the years 636. 664.

makes it probable not to be meant of a Gossip to an infant baptized. And lest it be thought *Osiander* is alone, I will adjoyn the words of Mr. *Fox*, *Acts and Monuments first book at the year* 175. *The like* (that *Telesphorus* made them not) *is to be thought also of the rest, not onely his Constitutions; but also of the other ancient Bishops and Martyrs, which followed after him, as of* Hyginus anno 142. *who succeeding him, and dying also a Martyr, as* Volateranus lib. 22. *declareth, is said or rather feigned to bring in the cream, one Godfather and Godmother in Baptism, to ordain the dedication of Churches: when as in his time so far it was off, that any solemn Churches were standing in* Rome, *that unneth the Christians could safely convent in their own houses. Likewise the distincting the orders of Metropolitans, Bishops, and other degrees, savour nothing less than of that time.* Doctor *Prideaux*, one of Mr. *Bs.* own Authors for this Decree of Pope *Hyginus* about Gossips, though he make mention of it where he speaks of that Pope, *Compend. of History, cap. 7. Sect. 3. interr. 7.* yet after, among many of his inquiries, this is the third, *Whether it be likely that these religious Popes in such extreme persecutions had liberty or list to think on making Cardinals or Gossips, and introduce a rabble of beggarly Ceremonies.* And though I were mistaken in calling that decree of *Hyginus* the Decree in the Epistle, yet I think the Authors which censured the decretal Epistles did comprehend the Decrees ascribed to those first Popes among those forged Writings under that name. However, what I have produced is enough to justifie my speeches in my *Praecursor*, that the Decree ascribed to Pope *Hyginus* about Gossips, is so manifest a forgery, that I could hardly have imagined any learned Protestant would ever have alleged so notoriously forged a writing: so that I need not answer Mr. *Bs.* allegation of this testimony, *as by currant consent of Historians assuring us that* Hyginus *Bishop of* Rome *did first ordain Godfathers and Godmothers at the baptizing of infants, and his questions thereon, but by telling him he hath reason to be ashamed of abusing men with this forgery after so much eviction of it by learned men, being more like a brazen faced allegation, than that he so censures me for without cause.* The next of his allegations is *Justin Martyr*, from whom besides the bastard writing of *Questions and Answers ad orthodoxos*, all the rest alleged, *pag.* 156.

by

by Mr. *B.* is manifestly impertinent, and his genuine writing yields a good evidence against the use of infant-baptism, as unknown to him, as may appear by what is said before. Mr. *B.* in his *Præfestinantis morator*, says *Sect.* 3. *Seeing you deny nothing in* Justin Martyrs *words, you must yield that it was known to Mothers that their infants were of Gods kingdom, and then certainly they were Church-members, and known Disciples or Christians.* To which I reply, that I have not *Justin Martyr* now by me, and do doubt whether in that passage of the *Epistle ad Zenam & Serenum*, he did mean infants, sith the term is [children] which may be meant of persons who are come to some age capable of understanding; and if the words be meant of infants, yet it may be very well conceived that the meaning is, that *of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*, that is the Kingdom of Glory, and that not in respect of their present, but future estate, as when it is said, *Matth.* 5. 10. *Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousnesse sake, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven*; that is, they shall *have a great reward in Heaven, vers.* 12. And then it neither proves their present being of Gods visible Kingdom, nor that they were Church-members, and known Disciples or Christians, and to be baptized. This testimony for the antiquity of infant-baptism I remember not alleged by any before Mr. *B.* and therefore besides the impertinency of the words, as he himself allegeth them, I see no need to search any further into it. His allegation, *pag.* 154. out of *Irenæus* is impertinent, wherein besides other frivolous inferences out of his words he tels us, *that* Irenæus *cannot mean by sanctifying, internal real sanctifying onely, for then according to their exposition of* Renascuntur, *it should be but Tautology*, q. d. [*He sanctifieth all that are sanctified or new born*] whereas had he heeded these words set down by himself, this imagined Tautology had been seen to be his meer mistake; for his words are, *Omnes venit per semetipsum salvare, He came to save men of all ages*, as Dr. *Hammond* renders it, not as Mr. *B. He sanctifieth all that are sanctified.* And yet if they had been thus, he sanctifieth by himself all that are born again or sanctified by him, it had not been a Tautology, sith it is manifest that *Irenæus* by [*per semetipsum*] meant by the patern or example of his own age, and then it is no Tautology, but hath this plain sense, that all that are sanctified by Christ, he came to sanctifie them by the patern

or example of his own age, and therefore lived in every age of a man, which is the purport of *Irenæus* his discourse in that place, which is by all sorts of writers censured as his mistake Having said so much of Mr. *Bs.* mistakes, and thereby sufficiently shewed that no writer in the two first Centuries mentions infant-baptism, and therefore Mr. *Bs.* speech is most false, *that he shall easily prove that infant-baptism was used in the Church as high as the Apostles days, as there is any sufficient history extant to inform us*, I leave the examining of the testimonies for baptizing of infants, or against them, till I have finished the review of the dispute from Scripture testimonies, and then I intend not onely to examine what Mr. *B.* hath scribled in his *Plain Scripure Proof, &c. part.* 2. *chap.* 15. and in his *Præfestinantis morator, Sect.* 3. but also what Mr. *Ms.* friend Dr. *Young* (as I am informed) and what Dr. *Hammond* (men better acquainted with the writings of the Ancients than Mr. *B.* or Mr. *Bl.*) have said about the antiquity of infant-baptism, and do no whit doubt but that I shall with the Lords assistance make good the assertions of the first part of my *Examen*, that First, infant-baptism is not so ancient as is pretended; Secondly, that as it is now taught it is a late innovation, meaning as it is taught by the *Assembly*, Mr. *M.* and the reformed Churches called Calvinists. As for Mr. *Bs.* assertion, that *he should easily prove that the deferring of Baptism came in with the rest of Popery upon popish or heretical grounds*, if he mean the deferring it till a person were catechized and of years sufficient to answer by himself to the three questions, about Repentance, Faith, and Obedience, which were still put to the baptized, it is not onely vain and inconsiderate, but notoriously false, it being the constant order of the Church to baptize after catechising, and the baptizing of infants onely an exception from the common rule and order, in case of danger of death, till after *Augustines* days, who flourished in the fifth Century. The grounds on which *Tertullian* and *Gregory Nazianzen* did perswade the delaying of Baptism, were neither popish nor heretical, as their words alleged in my *Exercit. Sect.* 22. shew. But on the contrary, the hastening of infant-baptism manifestly appears by the words of *Tertullian*, and *Gregory Nazianzen*, alleged there, and of *Cyprian*, and *Augustine*, together with the relations of *Gregory Nazianzens* and *Austins* Baptism alleged in

mo

my *Examen, Part.* 1. *Sect.* 7,8. to have come from the popiſh conceit, that without Baptiſm infants could not come to Gods Kingdom, or were damned. I deny not, deferring of Baptiſm to have been an abuſe upon ſundry miſconceits ſet down in Mr. *Ms. Defence, pag.* 22,23,24,25. but not one of them popiſh, except that of waſhing away ſins by it, which was the very ground of haſtening infant-baptiſm, as appears from the paſſages forenamed by me. That which made perſons of years defer their own Baptiſm, made them haſten the Baptiſm of their infants.

Whereas Mr. *B.* would have Mr. *Cradocks Goſpel Liberty read*, I have read it, and do finde that neither in his ſecond *part, chap.* 12. nor here, Mr. *Cradock* is well uſed by Mr. *B.* Mr. *Cradock pag.* 114. counts the cuſtome of the Church the weakeſt rule to diſcern by, and then onely he leaves Chriſtians to it, when there is no other light to go forward. Mr. *B.* himſelf *pag.* 302. concludes againſt Mr. *Bedford*, that in *ſo material a thing as infant-baptiſm, to hold Traditions Apoſtolical, not contrary to Scripture-cuſtome, or which may not be confirmed from Scripture, as our rule, is prejudicial to Scripture, and a complying with Papiſts.* Beſides, I need not ſay any more than Mr. *B.* there ſaith about the uncertainty of Traditions unwritten, and cuſtomes of the Ancients, which may ſerve for the preſent till a fuller anſwer be made to that calumniating queſtion in his *Præfeſtinantis morator, Sect.* 3. *Do not you care to ſmite through Chriſtianity, ſo you may bring down infant-baptiſm?* which he hath as much need to anſwer as my ſelf; for he ſhews *pag.* 303. by the uncertainty about *Eaſter*, the miſtake of *Irenæus* about *Chriſts* age, how uncertain the relations of the Ancients are about things not ſet down in Scripture. And for the cuſtomes of Chriſtians an Age or two after the Apoſtles, Writers do ſhew many corrupt cuſtomes came in about *Eaſter, Lent*, Infant-communion, ſending the Communion to the abſent, mingling Water with Wine, Monaſtick profeſſion, honoring of Martyrs; about Baptiſm, giving Milk and Honey to the baptized, anointing them, the uſe of the ſign of the Croſs, which grew to a very great number in *Auguſtines* time, ſo as that in his 119. Epiſtle to *Januarius*, he complained, as is before mentioned, and yet they increaſed after in the heighth of Popery, by reaſon of the innumerable

See *Sprint of Conformity.*

innumerable company of humane Ceremonies, insomuch as that the pure worship and truth of the Gospel was shadowed so much, as that for the abundance of such leavs, the fruit of the Gospel-worship and doctrine was very little or scarce discernible, and Christian Religion was almost wholly placed in those Ceremonies. And therefore however there *were weight in that argument of the Apostle, we have no such custome, nor the Churches of God* of those times, yet especially in matters of Ceremonies and positive worship the former after the Apostles days, much less the present customes of the holiest Saints and Churches should not be of any great weight in cases controverted, except when they serve to expound some passages of the Scripture that are cleared by them. Yet this will no whit infringe the validity of the testimony of the Ancients about the canonical books, or right readings of the Scripture, no more than the discrediting of the *Jewish* Rabbins relations about their Traditions doth infringe their testimony about the books of the Old Testament, though Mr. *B.* in his *Præfestinantis morator, Sect.* 3. would insinuate, as if denying the certainty of *Austins* rule about Apostolical Traditions must infer an uncertainty about the canonical Scripture, which shews his proness to calumniate me, and his inconsiderateness in not observing how this may be objected against his own speeches, *pag.* 303, as well as mine. As for Mr. *Bs.* tenth *Position*, though I grant it as it is set down, yet in his amplyfying of it there are sundry things that need animadversions. 1. That whereas he speaks of some, that *disclaim Reason because they require expres words of Scripture, and content not themselves with his supposed evident consequences*; he may know that I have often acknowledged consequences good proof from Scripture, and if others do deny consequences, I do imagine that if they were rightly understood, it would appear that they deny onely such far-fetcht consequences as are used about infant-baptism, resting upon such *hypotheses* as are taken for granted, when they have need of proof, or such consequences as are drawn from the rites of the *Jews* to the Sacraments of the New Testament, which if it be their meaning, Mr. *Bs.* censure of them *as senseless ignorant wretches* is too harsh and magisterial. 2. To what he saith, *Will you allow of such an argument for infant-baptism as Christ brings for the Resurrection?* I answer for my

self,

ſelf and the people of *Bewdley*, to whom that ſpeech was intended, we will: but withall I ſay, that in viewing of his book I diſcern nothing but Mr. *Bs.* vanity, in imagining his arguments to be like Chriſts, when upon trial they have little in them but ſuperficial reaſonings urged with much confidence and importunity upon miſtakes, and ſtuffed with impertinent Texts, frivolous queſtions, and childiſh wonderings, fitted like things ſet in fields and gardens to fright birds, to deter the ſhallow heads of this age from the truth, who either have no minde, or no ability to examine it ſcholaſtically. This is my judgment of it. *Chap.* 2. After all his ten Poſitions, Mr. *B.* hath three more Propoſitions, the firſt about the difficulty of it, in amplifying of which he confeſſeth *the point of infant-baptiſm to be ſuch, as the moſt godly learned impartial Divines cannot agree in, after all their writings, diſputing, ſtudying, and praying*; which being true, it is moſt unjuſt in *Mareſius* that in his *ſixth queſtion he makes the error of Anabaptiſts intolerable*, in Miniſters, that they will not permit ſuch as deny infant-baptiſm to preach, nor will either themſelves hear them, or pray with them, or ſuffer their hearers, but renounce communion with them, and make ſeparations from them, and ſo ſhew themſelves Schiſmaticks, yea, and in their Pulpits and Writings endeavour to make them odious, exciting Magiſtrates to impriſon, expell, and deſtroy them; on the otherſide the Parlament is juſtified in that ſpeech of theirs in the *Declaration* Ordered *March* 4. 1647. to be publiſhed *in anſwer to the* Scots *Commiſſioners Paper, that the opinion againſt the baptiſm of Infants is ſuch, as wherein in former ages as well as this learned men have differed both in opinion and practice, and that therein they held it fit that men ſhould be convinced by the Word of God, with gentleneſs and reaſon, and not beaten out of it by force and violence.* But Mr. *B.* hath another fling at my ſpeech, that it is an eaſie point, and that the reaſon why ſo many Divines did not diſcern it, was their wilfulneſs or negligence, and this he imputes *to want of humility, modeſty, conſcientiouſneſs, and that he ſhould tremble to paſs ſo high a cenſure*, forgetting what a heavy cenſure he had paſt before on others *of diſcovering a ſeared conſcience, either taking error for no ſin, or elſe daring to venture on ſin without fear, and betraying their own ſouls by their lazineſs*, p. 6. *Who ſhould be Antipædobaptiſts without reading, and ſtudying firſt*

 ſome

ſome books there named, calling others *ignorant ſenſleſs wretches*, with much more of this kinde over all his book, in which it is frequent with him to cenſure me, my anſwers and ſpeeches, as if they ſhewed ſome ſearfull ſpiritual judgment fallen on me, when his own miſtakes through heedleſneſs, or uncharitableneſs, are all the occaſion of ſuch a cenſure. But for my ſpeech here, I ſay ſtill, that I know not how to ſay otherwiſe, and yet deprehend not any ſuch pride, immodeſty, or want of conſcientiouſneſs in my ſpeech, nor any ſuch high cenſure as he ſhould tremble to paſs, but as humble and fair an anſwer as is to be given to the queſtion. Godly, learned, and humble men have differed in the points of Prelacy, Ceremonies, Ordinances, even in things that in themſelves were eaſie to be diſcerned. What cenſure is eaſier than this, when ſome of them have continued in an error eaſily diſcernible, to ſay it hath been through wilfulneſs or negligence? which things are incident to the beſt and ableſt, when they have a conceit of the point as of ſmall moment, ſpecially in compariſon of peace and unity, when prejudice by education, determinations of Councils, Schools, leading Writers, Magiſtrates cenſures, *&c.* prepoſſeſſing them, draw them from examining it, or if they do examine it, makes them willing to ſatisfie themſelves with imperfect and raw anſwers to their ſcruples, and moſt of all, when the loſs of Preferment, Friends, Eſtate, Liberty comes to be in queſtion, and pre-engagements make it grievous to retract. What I ſaid of this is manifeſt by the inſtance I gave about *Lutheran* Conſubſtantiation, which M. *B.* ſhould have ſhewed not to be appoſitely brought, and not carp and cavil at my words ſo often as he doth (though they were but in a ſpeech in private conference) that he may paint me out in as ugly ſhape as he can, ſpecially to thoſe of *Bewdley*, my dear Auditors heretofore, but now cauſleſly by his affrightments eſtranged from me; which if it be not a fruit of malevolence in him I know not what to call it. As for his talk of his *own doubts and pains to reſolve himſelf, and the eaſineſs and plainneſs of the grounds of it*, it ſatisfies not me, but ſtill I am ſuſpitious of his negligence in not conſidering better many of thoſe things he hath taken up. In which I am confirmed from his own confeſſions of prejudice, unwillingneſs to be put on this buſineſs, in that it diverted him from other enjoyments and ſtudies, and from his haſty printing, his indiſtinct handling ſpecially of

his

his second argument, never clearly opening his terms, nor shewing the *hypotheses* on which he builds his *second main argument*, his disorderly placing his proofs, his heaping up impertinent Texts, his mistakes of my answers, his overly reading my writings out of contempt of them, his frivolous questions, and expostulations, *&c.* And for his inference about my wilfulness or negligence, it is but a further piece of petulancy to insinuate that of me, in which my *Apology*, *Sect.* 4. might have undeceived him, though it were not then so easie to discern that error as now, after so much debating of it, did not pride, prejudice, fear, or some other partial affection hinder. And for Mr. *Bs.* conceit of his grounds, though I neither finde *them easie nor plain*, yet it is no marvel others discern not how infant-baptism can be inferred from them, which can at most prove *a reasonableness of the thing*, as Mr. *Bedford*, Dr. *Field*, Dr. *Hammond*, and others speak, but not an institution of God, which must be gathered from precept or example in the N.T. and can onely warrant our practice as the minde of God in meer positives about worship in the New Testament. In the explication of his second Proposition, *pag.* 10. he again objects my speech, that Mr. *Ms.* Principle on which he establisheth his Proof from Circumcision for infant-baptism is one of the first condemned Heresies, by which I meant that Proposition which he hath in his *Sermon*, *pag.* 35. that *all Gods commands and institutions about the Sacraments of the* Jews *binde us as much as they did them, in all things which belong to the substance of the Covenant, and were not accidental to them*, in which thus much is maintained, that some part of the command of Circumcision, and the other Sacraments of the *Jews*, binde us as much as they did the *Jews*, which is expressly condemned, *Acts* 15. 24. as *subverting the soules of the Gentiles*, and is called, *the heresie of the false Apostles*, by the *Century-writers*, *Cent.* 1. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 5. and others rende.nn it under the title of *Judaism*. But then saith Mr. *B.* Mr. *M.* is an *Heretick with me, and all the Divines in the world that go his way*. To which I answer, This inference hath too much shew of Sycophancy, being urged so often, and to the People of *Bewdley*, my *quondam* Auditors. For, 1. though I say that Doctrine is such an Heresie, yet I do not say Mr. *M.* still holds it as his words did import; yea, I did acknowledg in my *Apology*, *pag.* 99. and in

this writing *Sect.* 2. that Mr. *M.* doth deny that *we are tied to any practise of the ritual part*, which is indeed to retract his former speech in his *Sermon*. 2. But were it tru that he did still hold it, yet it would not follow, that he were an Heretick with me. For, 1. I should not take him to be an Heretick that holds that Doctrine which is Heresie, if it were not so directly, but onely by consequence not heeded, as this of his is. 2. Nor do I take him to be an Heretick that doth hold that which is Heresie directly, except he hold it in or with a party made to maintain it. And therefore I do once more protest against Mr. *B's.* calumniatory inference, and deny that I account Mr. *M.* an Heretick, and yet I account still his Principle mentioned, if it were held as the words in the *Sermon* did import, to contain one of the first condemned Heresies, to wit, *Judaism*. To this calumny Mr. *B.* adds another. Because I used the words of the Apostle, *Acts* 20.26,27. in a Sermon, he from the report of his Notary, and a multitude of my Auditors, likely his tale tellers, without sending to me about the truth of it, prints what he received from them, and thence infers, *that the baptizing of persons of years, notwithstanding their infant-baptism, is taken by me for a fundamental point, which the salvation or damnation of men doth necessarily depend on. Or what I meant to say* [*their blood be on their own heads*] *he knows not. And yet he conceives me to contradict my self when I blame the Papists for making baptism of necessity to salvation.*

To which I reply, that herein Mr. *B.* shews his inconsiderateness, or his minde to calumniate, or both. For, 1. he might have interpreted my words, as I think when I spake them they were meant, in reference to other duties which I had taught them, with that of Baptism. 2. If it were meant particularly of Baptism, yet the threatning I conceive was not to the bare omission, but to the omission joyned with opposition. 3. I am sure, if I did threaten, their blood should be on their head for omission of Baptism, it was not simply or barely for the omission, but for the omission after teaching, and upon supposition of conviction, by it of their duty: And this I think Mr. *B.* doth not stick to do to his hearers, in case after teaching and supposed conviction by it, they practise not a duty, though non-fundamental, as suppose reproving of their neighbours. For then they live presumptuously in sin, and such sinning consists not

 with

with sincerity and truth of Regeneration. And yet this doth not suppose the point in it self fundamental, that is, such as the meer ignorance of it, or the bare omission of it doth damn a person, or exclude out of the kingdom of God: in which sense I blame the Papists for maintaining a necessity of an infants being baptized to its entering into the kingdom of Heaven.

But Mr. *B. doth not think God lays so great a stress on this point, as I and others do.*

Answ. That which I hold is this, 1. that Baptism with Water is an Ordinance of Christ that bindes Christians now as well as in the Apostles days, *Mat.* 28.19. *Mark* 16.15,16. *Act.* 2.38. & 10. 47,48. *Ephes.* 4.5. And I detest the audacious impiety of *Socinians*, and those in our days, who count themselves above Ordinances, that is as Mr. *B.* well interprets it, *Plain Scripture Proof, &c. pag.* 24. *above obedience to God, and so Gods*, as being one of the most palpable delusions of unsound men in our days, who place their perfection in a manifest disobedience to Christs appointment, and some of them in an Antichristian presumption, as if they sate in the Temple of God, and shewed themselves as God, do most arrogantly of their own heads, without any allowance of God, make void the expres prime Ordinance of the Lord Jesus Christ, calling it a low dispensation, *&c.* I hope I shall have liberty hereafter to shew the frivolous allegations and pretences of these men. In the mean time they may see what Mr. *Laurence*, Mr. *Bartlet*, M. *S. pag.* 341. of this his Book, have written for these Ordinances. 2. I hold that every Minister of the Gospel is bound, as to preach the Gospel, so to baptize those that are made Disciples, *Matth.* 28. 19. 3. That every believing Christian is by necessity of precept tied to be baptized, that is, dipped in water, in testimony of his profession of Christ his Lord, upon his being made a Disciple of Christ, *Mat.* 28.19. *Mark* 16.15,16. *Acts* 2.38. & 22. 16. 4. That this is ordinarily where and when it may be had without unmercifulness, defect of water, or some other like reason, a necessary means of salvation, *Mark* 16.16. 1 *Pet.* 3.21. *Tit.* 3.4,5. *Eph.* 4.4,5. 5. That infant-baptism is not the performance of the duty of being

Mr. *Blake, Vind. Sacr. cap.* 6. That is the Covenant draught, terms of the Covenant we bride, *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned*, Mark 16.16

baptized

baptized according to Christs appointment. 6. That in a regular and orderly way, persons, notwithstanding their pretended infant-baptism, are not to be admitted to the Lords Supper till they be baptized upon profession of their faith in Christ, *Acts* 2.41,42 1 *Cor.*10.2,3,4. & 12.13. These things I may hereafter have opportunity to debate more fully. As for that which Mr. *B.* saith, *pag.*10,11. It doth no whit overthrow this necessity which I assert, but rather confirm it: For *Gods freeing us from the great burden of Jewish rites* makes it the rather necessary for us to obey Christs appointment in those few Sacraments he hath ordained, which Mr. *B.* truly saith, *As they are duties they are great, and so in themselves considered, and not onely in respect of the consequences of them.* And he saith truly, *pag.*11. *All Christs commands must be obeyed, both great and small, so far as we know them.* Yea, Mr. *B. Scripture proof, pag.*342. saith, *Baptism with Water is Heb.*6.2. *reckoned among the foundations or principles which are of standing use, and therefore it is so it self.* Nor is his interpretation right, *that the things ascribed to Baptism are ascribed to it without the external washing.* In all these places, *Rom.*6.3,4. 1 *Cor.* 12.13. *Gal.*3.27. *Ephes.*5.25,27. 1 *Peter* 3.21. the outward use of Water is expressed, though the things ascribed to it do presuppose something more, as he himself allegeth them, *pag.*342. which is the meaning of that speech, 1 *Pet*, 3.21. *Not the putting away of the filthiness of the flesh*, that is, not it onely, but *the answer of a good conscience towards God* joyned with it. And whereas Mr. *B.* tells us, *that we shall never be able to justifie it, if we lay out the hundredth part, or perhaps the thousand part of our time, study, talk or zeal upon this question*, I confess this may be true at some times, in some persons: but if other tenets be clear, and other duties not neglected, and this becomes a doubt of conscience, and falls into frequent practice, so as that it concerns them much for themselves, people, and little ones to be resolved in it, else they shall sin either by omitting a duty, or by doing a thing with gain-saying or doubting conscience, it is justifiable, though they bestow more than a hundredth part of their time and study upon it. And especially if the person be a Minister called to be a Guide to the People, and by special providence and solemn covenant led forth to vindicate the truth in such a time, when otherwise it is likely to be suppressed, and

the

the Assertors of it oppressed. In these and such like cases it may be unjustifiable, if a person do not spend more than the hundredth part of his time about this question; else neither the *Hussites* will be justified in spending so much time in opposing the half-Communion, nor the Protestants in opposing Transubstantiation, nor the Non-Conformists in opposing the Ceremonies of Bishops. Mr. *Tho. Goodwin preface to Mr.* Cottons *Dialogue for infant baptism*, saith truly, *The due application of baptism to all those persons Christ would have it administred unto, cannot but be apprehended by all that have any insight into the Controversies of these times, to be of very high importance.* Not that I like their Carriage that neglect other necessary things, and spend all their time, study, talk, and zeal about this, such hypocrisy I should declaim against with him, remembring what our Saviour said in a like case, *Matth.* 23. 23. *These things ought ye to have done, and not to have left the other undone.*

As for M. *Bs.* third Proposition concerning the grounds on which the point of infant baptism stands, *that they are of great moment*, because what he saith, rests on the heap of consequences he infers from the denial of infant baptism (of which there is scarse any one true) and the shewing them to be but vain surmises, depends on the dispute it self, I shall therefore respite the vindicating the truth from them, till I come to examine in this *Review* the arguments from Scripture urged on both sides, after which shall come in those from humane testimony and reason, unto which I now apply my self.

SECT. V.

The first argument from the institution, Mat. 28. 19. Mark 16. 16. *and the practice in the New Testament against Infant baptism is urged.*

MR. *B.* saith pag. 8. he will prove, 1. *That it is the will of God that some infants should be baptized.* 2. *that it is the will of God that all infants of believers ordinarily should be baptized.*

This

This latter doth better state the question, which is about the practice of those reformed Churches that baptize infants, whose doctrine is, that it is the privilege of a believers child. Yet Mr. *B.* and M. *Baillee* for some advantage chuse to undertake the proof of the former, whereas the true state of it is, as in my *Examen* s. 2. and Mr. *Ms. Sermon, Whether the infants of believers are to be baptized with Christs baptism of Water by the lawful Minister according to ordinary rule?* I hold the Negative, Mr. *Marshall*, Dr. *Homes*, Mr. *Geree*, Mr. *Blake*, Mr. *Baillee*, Mr. *Cobbet*, Mr. *Baxter*, &c. hold the Affirmative. My dispute is to this purpose.

The ordinary rule for baptizing is Christs institution, *John* the *Baptists*, and the Apostles appointment and practice: But neither according Christs institution, nor according to *John Baptists*, or the Apostles command or practice, or any other approved example in Scripture, is the baptizing of infants of believers; Therefore the baptizing of infants of believers by a lawfull Minister is not according to ordinary rule. The Major is confessed by all sorts, specially Protestants and Anti-Prelatists.

Mr. *Bs.* words are cited by me in my *Præcursor*, s. 16. and the force of his reason is shewed here before s. 4. to contain this Proposition, *What in baptism we have no warrant for by word or example in all the New Testament (since the solemn institution of baptism* Mat. 28.) *we are not to do*; and much more to like purpose may be gathered from other passages of his page 302, 303. and Mr. *M.* in his Sermon on 2 *Chron.* 15. 2. is very punctuall for Gods command to be observed in his worship. *The* 28 *Article of the Church of England* against reservation of the Bread &c. hath these words, *The Sacrament of the Lords Supper was not by Christs Ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped*, whereby it is apparent that reservation of the bread is condemned, because it is not by Christs Ordinance,

M. *Collings* Epi. to the Reader before his *Vind. Minst. Evang.* In things relating to the worship of God it is a general rule, in which our brethren and we have long since agreed, That nothing ought to be done without an express warrant in the Gospel.

Mr. *Rutherford*, *Due right of Presbyteries*, pag. 364. what the Apostles commanded not in Gods worship, that the Churches must not do.

Ordinance, though Mr. *Perkins in his right way of dying well confesseth it to be antient.* *Bellarmine* himself *tom. 3. cont. de sacr. bapt. l. 1. c. 8. Sacramentum non pendet nisi à Divina institutione.* *Chamier tom. 4. panstr. cath lib. 5. cap. 14. sect. 55. Iis solis baptizare competit, quibus Commissio data est baptizandi. Hæc propositio per se patet: quia baptismi institutio pendet à sola voluntate instituentis: itaque ex hac sola metienda: quomodo eucharistiæ. Lib. 8. c. 2. s. 3. Quod si igitur tota sacramenti essentia est ab institutione divina, profectò hac violata, non potest sacramentum consistere. C. 8. s. 14.* He cites *Calvins* words. *Institutio enim Christi est certa regula, à qua si deflectas, jam rectum non tenes. S. 21. At nos, contra hanc sceleratam audaciam ratum habemus illud Bielis in Canonem lectione 35. sacramentum irritum reputatur si contra institutionem celebretur. L. 7. c. 13. s. 17. sed non peccari in missa privata negatur; non enim aliter potest si contra institutionem admittatur: sic consentiunt omnes peccatum fuisse, cum baptizarentur mortui: quia videlicet institutio habuit doceri, baptizarique gentes: in quibus mortui nulli numerantur. Sic emendatum fuit, quod olim admittebatur, ut infantibus porrigeretur eucharistia: quoniam institutio habet, ut seipsum probet, qui de hoc pane sit esurus: similis omnino & communionis ratio; quandoquidem dictum, Accipite, edite.* Mr. *Selden lib. 1. de Jyned. Ebra. c. 13. pag. 500. Modorum & temperamentorum ejusmodi ex arbitrio Humano accessione, ut id quod esset institutum aliquod Divinum novaretur aut ullatenus mutaretur, nunquam ritè permissum est.* If all these testimonies satisfy not, the Apostle *Pauls* speech 1 *Cor.* 11. 22. yields us this truth, that the institution of Christ is that whereby an abuse in a sacrament is to be reformed, and therefore is the ordinary rule according to which the sacrament is to be administred. Whence the *New Annot.* on that place infer, *The only way to reform any abuses in the Church, is to have recourse to the word of God and first institution.* And even the *Assembly* it self *Confession of faith* chap. 20. make many things used by Papists, as private masses, half-communion, adoration, elevation, reservation of the bread, *contrary to the nature of the Sacrament, and to the institution of Christ,* and prove it only by these texts. 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. *Mark* 14. 23. 1 *Cor.* 11. 25, 26,

27,28,29. *Matth.*15.9. which are no proof without this Proposition, To vary from the institution in things appointed is evil, as being an humane invention, or worshipping of God after the commands of men, contrary to *Matth.*15.9. The Minor is confessed by Mr. *Cawdrey Sab. Rediv. part.* 4 *ch.*1. *num.* 59. *We have not in Scripture either precept or example of children baptized.* Mr. *M.* in his *Sermon* pag.35. *that there is neither expresse command or example in the New Testament that children should be, or were baptized,* and pag. 44. *It is said indeed that they taught and baptized, and no expresse mention of any other,* and a little after, *both John and Christs disciples and Apostles did teach before they baptized, because then no other were capable of baptisme:* But that we may not seem to beg what is to be proved, I further argue thus. The institution and practice of the Sacrament of Christian baptism is set down in the New Testament; But baptizing of infants of believers is neither according to the institution of Christ, nor any practice or example therein, *Ergo.* The Major is plain of it self: For Christian baptism being a Sacrament of the New Testament, must have its institution and example to regulate it, there or no where. It is frequently put into the definition of the Sacraments of the New Testament, that they are ordained by Christ himself, and for defect of Christs institution in the New Testament, sundry things are denyed to be Sacraments of the New Testament. The Minor is proved from the texts which speak of baptism, either of the institution or practise. From both which I argue thus. *Matth.*28.19. is Christs institution, Mr. *B.* calls it *The solemn institution of baptisme:* But the baptizing of infants of believers is not according to Christs institution of baptism *Matth.*28.19. *Ergo.* The Minor is proved, First from the Subjects appointed to be baptized, to wit disciples of all Nations. They that are not disciples of Christ are not appointed to be baptized. *Norton resp. ad Apollon. c.*2. *pag.*34. *non μαθηταὶ non sunt baptizandi: Matth.*28.19. *discipulate baptizantes.* But infants of believers are not disciples of Christ; Therefore they are not appointed to be baptized. That [*disciples*] included in the verb [μαθητεύσατε *make disciples*] as [πίστις] is *Rom.* 4. 4. in [ὀφείλημα] is the substantive to [αὐτῶν, *them*] is proved from the expression, *John* 4 1. where it is said [*when the Pharisees heard that Jesus*

sus

ſus ποιεῖ μαθητὰς καὶ βαπτίζει, maketh diſciples and baptizeth] This the Evangeliſt ſaith was done by the Diſciples of Chriſt. Now what they did before in *Judæa*, they were after appointed to do among all Nations, *Matth.* 28. 19. Therefore no other were appointed to be baptized than were baptized before, *Iohn* 4. 1. (ſaving only with greater extent) that is, diſciples made of, or among, or in all Nations. *Beza annot.* in *Mat.* 28. 19. *Diſcipulos facite, μαθητεύσατε, id eſt diſcipulos mihi facite ex omnibus gentibus, Make to me diſciples out of all Nations. Urſin Explic. catech. part.* 2. *q.* 69 *Verbum μαθητεύσατε quo Chriſtus utitur proprie eſt diſcipulos facite, quod declaratur a Ioanne c.* 4. 1. *The word* [*μαθητεύσατε*] *which Chriſt uſeth, is properly* [*make diſciples*] *which is declared by Iohn* ch. 4. v. 1. *Pareus Comment. in* Matth. 28. 19. *μαθητεύσατε, eſt idem quod μαθητὰς ποιεῖν, diſcipulos facere Chriſto, ut explicatur Iohn* 4. 1. *It is the ſame with to make diſciples to Chriſt, as it is explained* John 4. 1. The *New Annot. on Matthew* 28. 19. of the firſt edition (which is now altered in the ſecond edition, to hinder truth) *teach*] Greek, *make diſciples of*, as John 4. 1. *all nations*] *not Iews alone, but Gentiles alſo* Acts 10. 34, 35, 47. *Chamier Panſtr. cath. tom.* 3. *l.* 12. *c.* 9. *ſ.* 15. *It was the expreſs command of Chriſt, teach or make diſciples in all nations. Norton reſp. ad Apollon. c.* 2. *pag.* 35. *μαθητεύειν is to make diſciples*, Joh. 4. 1. *Cameron* in his *Lecture* on *Mat.* 19. 3. *προσηλυτεύειν, to make a proſelyte, is as Mat.* 28. 19. *μαθητεύειν is ſaid for* [*to make a diſciple*]. This is confirmed in that what is ſaid of *Joſeph* Mat. 27. 57. *ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐμαθητεύθη τῷ Ἰησοῦ*, rendred by the vulgar *Latin*, *Beza*, *our Engliſh*, *&c.* [*who alſo himſelf was Ieſus diſciple*] is *Iohn* 19. 38. *ὢν μαθητὴς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, being diſciple to Ieſus.* Whereby it is apparent that in both places, in *Matthew* the Noun [*diſciple*] is included in the Verb, though in *Matthew* 28. 19. it be uſed actively [*make diſciples*] in the other *Matthew* 27. 57. it is uſed paſſively [*he was himſelf a Diſciple*] The ſame is to be conceived of the two other places where the word is uſed *Matthew* 13. 52. *μαθητευθεὶς made a diſciple. Acts* 14. 21. *μαθητεύσαντες ἱκανοὺς had made many diſciples.* And this is further proved from the parallel place *Mark* 16. 15 16. where [*preach the Goſpel to every Creature*] anſwers to [*make diſciples all nations*] and [*he that believeth and is baptized*] anſwers to [*baptizing them*] which plainly ſhews the ſub-

ject of baptism to be disciples, and those disciples to be believers, as *Chamier* proves *panst: cath. tom.* 3. *l.* 12. *c.* 9. *s.* 15. But such are not infants of believers. *Ergo*, they are not appointed to be baptized. 2. Those only Christ appointed to be baptized to whom the Gospel was preached, and the persons taught; But such are not infants, *Ergo*. The Major is plain both by the words, *Mat.* 28. 19. *make disciples*, which is by teaching, and more plainly from *Mark* 16. 15. *Go preach the Gospel to every Creature*, which answers to [disciple all nations] and this is to precede baptism. This is confirmed by the Apostles practice, which shews how they understood Christs words, and how we should understand them, for they baptized none till they were taught, *Ergo* neither should we. Conformable hereto is the constant exposition & observation of former and later writers and Expositors, of whom as they have occurred to me I shall set down their words. *Athanasius Orat. contra Arianos. Ideoque salvator non quovis modo baptizandum præcepit, sed primum dixit docete, ac deinde baptizate in nomine Patris et filii et spiritus sancti, ut ex doctrina recta fides oriretur, et cum fide baptismatis integra initiatio perficeretur. Hieron. in* Mat. 28. 19. *Primum docent omnes gentes: deinde doctas intingunt aqua: non enim potest fieri ut corpus baptismi recipiat sacramentum, nisi ante anima fidei susceperit veritatem: Ordo præcipuus: jussit Apostolis ut primū docerent universas gentes: deinde fidei intingerent sacramento: et post fidem ac baptisma quæ essent observanda præciperent*: which words are also ascribed to *Hilarius* in *Matthew* 28. 19, 20. And the like to *Beda*, *Anselmus*, *Aquinas*, *Paschasius*, *Rabanus*, *Lucas Brugensis*, *Iansenius*, and many others on *Matth.* 28. 19. which were it necessary might be produced: whence the Ancients deduced, that persons were first to be catechized, and then to be baptized: which was constantly observed, except in case of present danger of death towards children of believers, untill some later ages. But because later Protestant writers are of more esteem with most of my Antagonists, I will adde some of them. *Calvin* in Matthew 28. 19. *apud Marlor. Baptizari jubet Christus qui nomen Evangelio dederint, seque professi fuerint discipulos. Ursin Cat. Explic. part.* 2. *q.* 69. *Quasi dicat colligite mihi Ecclesiam per verbum, et quos feceritis mihi discipulos toto corde credentes eos omnes et solos baptizate & mihi a reliquis separate. Pareus*

Com.

Com. in Matt. 28. 19. *Colligite mihi Ecclesiam inter omnes gentes, prædicatione vestra adducentes eos ad fidem. Alsted. Theol. polem. parte* 3. *pag.* 251. *Ut præcipitur ex coharentia sententiarum Matth.* 28. *docete omnes gentes (nempe prædicando Evangelium) baptizantes eos. Conferatur Marc.* 16. *Becm. Exercit. Th.* 17. p. 259, 260. *Doctrina præcedit, baptismus sequitur.* Mr. *Cotton, The way of the Churches in New England, chap.* 4. *sect.* 6. *And indeed the Commission which Christ gave his Apostles, holdeth it forth that they were by preaching to make disciples before they baptized them and their children.* This later is his own addition, the rest is right and to my purpose. But sure Christ did not appoint to preach the Gospel to infants, therefore he did not appoint to baptize them. For Christ appointed his Disciples to baptize none but they who were first preached to, and consequently they do it without Commission from Christ, who baptize infants ordinarily without preaching the Gospel to them. I suppose no man will conceive Christ appointed infants of a day old to have the Gospel preached to them, it had been a ridiculous injunction; therefore neither did he appoint them to be baptized. For both commands are joined together concerning the same persons.

Piscator observ. in Matth. 28. 19. Docete omnes gentes (nempe prædicando Evangelium, ut declarat Marcus) baptizantes eos, volt ergo ut prius constet de alicujus fide, quam is baptizetur.

Collings vin. Min. Evang pag 36. It is the first act in ministerial Commission Mat. 28, 19. first preach, then baptize.

3. The institution is, *To baptize into the name of the Father, Son, and holy Spirit*, But the baptizing of infants is not into the name of the Father, Son and holy Spirit; *Ergo* their baptism is not according to the institution. The Minor is proved from the right understanding of the meaning of the phrase of baptizing into the name of the Father, Son and holy Ghost, *Beza annot.* in *Matthew* 28. 19. *Into the name*] *that is the Father, Son and Holy Spirit being called upon.* And this interpretation is confirmed from the words of *Ananias* to *Paul Acts* 22. 16. *Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord*, where is injoined calling on the name of the Lord with baptizing, which explaineth what Christ had appointed, *Mat.* 28.

28. 19. *Of baptizing into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.* Or *to be baptized into the name is to be baptized* with the person baptized, his devoting himself to the Service of the Father, Son, and holy Spirit. This is gathered from the phrase 1 *Cor.* 1. 13. Were ye baptized into the name of *Paul? Beza annot.* in *Acts* 19. 3. *Baptizari autem in ejus nomen dicimur, cui nos per baptismum dicamus ac consecramus: quamobrem recte Paulus negat se in nomen suum quemquam baptizâsse.* Or *to be baptized into the name of the Father, Son, and Spirit, is to be baptized with profession of that doctrine, to wit, that Jesus is the Son of God,* Act. 8. 37. testifyed by the Father, Son and Spirit, *Mat.* 3. 17. 1 *John* 5. 5, 6, 7. as to be baptized into *Johns* baptism, *Acts* 19. 3. whether the same with being baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus, verse 5. as those conceive that expound the words as spoken of what *John* did, or different, yet it was with profession of doctrine, as *Beza annot.* in *Acts* 19. 3. *Baptizari in Ioannis baptisma significat doctrinam quam Ioannes annunciabat, ac baptismi symbolo obsignabat, profiteri, & baptismo adhibito amplecti.* I will add the words of *Grotius annot.* in *Matth.* 28 9. εἰς τὸ ὄνομα] *cum locutio, hac varias habeat ex Hebraismo significationes, eam his præferendam arbitror, quæ baptismo maximè propria est. Est autem baptizari in aliquem, vel in ejus nomen, se ei auctorare atq; devovere, & de ejus nomine appellari velle. Paulus* 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο, *respiciens illud Exodi* 14 31. *Crediderunt in Deum & Mosen servum ejus, id est, Mosi tanquam Dei ministro cum bona fiducia regendos se commisisse, sic Paulus negat quenquam baptizatum in suum nomen,* 1 *Corinth.* 1. 13, 15. *hoc est, sibi velut novi dogmatis auctori mancipatum. Maimonides de bello capta* טבילה בשם גירות: *baptizet eam in nomen proselytarum, id est, in eam religionem quam profitentur proselytæ. Christiani igitur tres sui dogmatis auctores agnoscere jubebantur, Patrem, filium & spiritum sanctum, nihilq; ut necessarium admittere, quod non ab eis esset profectum, id est, quod non à patre ortum, à filio prodiisum, à spiritu verò esset partim explicatum apertius, partim obsignatum. Administratur enim baptismus, ut loquitur Hilarius, in confessione, & auctoris & unigeniti & dom.* But infants of believers

vers do neither call upon the Father, Son, and holy Spirit, nor devote themselves to their service, nor profess the doctrine of Christ, Therefore they are not baptized into the name of the Father, Son, and holy Spirit, according to Christs appointment.

Mr. *M. Defence* page 266. calls these *petty reasonings*, and saith, *That baptizing into the name of the Father, Son, and holy Ghost shou'd be interpreted to be invocation of Gods name, and so to make baptism and prayer all one, is strange divinity.*

I reply, My words are perverted by him: I said baptizing is to be with the party baptized his invocation of the name of the Lord, not that baptism and prayer are all one, but that they should be concomitants, and together in the use of baptism after Christs appointment. And this is no strange divinity to others, however it be to Mr. *M.* The words of *Ananias Acts* 22. 16. *Beza* on *Matthew* 28. 19. shew it to be no strange or forced Divinity. *Becman Exercit. Theol.* 17. p. 251. hath the like, *In nomen hoc est invocato nomine Christi baptizamur. The New Annot. on* 1 *Cor.* 1. 13. *The third reason taken from the form and end of baptism, wherein we make a promise to Christ, calling on also the name of the Father, and the Holy Ghost.* The words of *Grotius* a learned man, whatever his other qualities were, shew it to be old Divinity. *Annot. on Matthew* 28. 19. he speaks thus, *Post has ergo stipulationes atq; responsiones, quas verba Sacramenti Tertullianus vocat ad militia morem alludens, sequebatur baptismus, cui accedebant preces in quibus nominabantur Pater, Filius, & Spiritus Sanctus. Orationem hanc proprie ad patrem directam indicare videtur Justinus,* ἐπονομάζεται τῷ ἑλομένῳ ἀναγεννηθῆναι καὶ μετανοήσαντι ἐπὶ τοῖς ἡμαρτημένοις τὸ τοῦ παντὸς θεοῦ τῶν ὅλων, καὶ δεσπότου θεοῦ ὄνομα, αὐτὸ τοῦτο μόνον ἐπιλέγοντες. *Deinde,* καὶ ἐπὶ ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματος πνεύματος ἁγίου ὀφωπίζομενος λέγεται. *Solemne ejus invocationis verbum erat Abba Pater, ut notat Chrysostomus* 8. *ad Rom.* 15. The words in *Chrysostome hom.* 10. ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ τοῦτο ἦν ἴδιλικον ῥῆμα, ἴσασιν οἱ μύσται, καλῶς ἐπὶ τῆς εὐχῆς τῆς μυστικῆς τοῦτο πρῶτον κελευόμενοι τὸ ῥῆμα λέγειν. That is, by *which we cry Abba Father. This holy Ministers know what it is, rightly commanding to say this word first at the mystical prayer,* meaning at baptism. *Grotius* goes on thus. *His si additus id quod Acts 22. 16. refertur ab Ananiâ dictum*

Paulo

Paule βαπτισθέντας ἐπικαλεσαμένους τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου, Videbis tum eum qui baptizabatur, tum eos qui baptismo aderant (neque enim in toto cœtu exercebatur primis temporibus, quod ostendunt, &c.) solitos orare Deum patrem ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ, quomodo ipse orare nos docet, John 14.13,14. Ut fidem ejus qui baptizabatur, & liberam illam christianismi professionem muneraret spiritu suo sancto per gradus quosdam, quorum initium erat, ὁ φωτισμὸς. *Grotius* notes to like purpose on *Luke* 3.21. where it is said, *Jesus being baptized, and praying, the Heaven was opened*; which shews Christ prayed at his Baptism, and thereupon the Spirit descended; which the Ancients conceived as a Rule, and is at least recorded as an Example to be imitated.

Mr. *Cobbet* in his *Just Vindic. pag.* 182. cals this *New Light*, which if he mean Ironically, (as it is likely he doth) he may hereby perceive, that he is mistaken, and for what he excepts against this Exposition, that *neither in the baptizing of the* Samaritans, *Acts* 8. was that Rule observed, *nor was it possible that the three thousand baptized in one day, Acts* 2. *should arise each of them, and call upon the Name of the Lord, as they were baptized*; it proceeds upon a mistake, as if no calling on the Name of the Lord were sufficient, but that which was set and solemn before the publick Assembly, whereas neither is Baptism necessary to be administred before the publick Assembly: *Grotius* proves out of *Justin Martyrs* words, and otherwise, that it was administred not as they now do infant-sprinkling in the publick meeting place, but in some place without, aside from the publick Assembly, and the calling on the Name of the Lord was or might be ejaculatory, whether in the heart onely, or by words, praying to the Father by Christ for the Spirit.

Mr. *M.* makes this inference from my words; *Then it seems if the party baptized call on the Name of the Lord by prayer, that's all that is intended by baptizing into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.*

But this is but another of his pervertings of my words: for in the same place I joyned with it, devoting themselves to the service of, and adherence to the Father, Son, and Spirit, which I proved out of 1 *Cor.* 1.13,15. which proves plainly that to be baptized into the Name of the Father, Son, and Spirit, notes not a Ministers Commission

mission from the Father, Son, and Spirit, nor a Form of words to be used by him at Baptism, whether the party baptized understand it or no, but in baptizing, engaging the party baptized to acknowledg the Father, Son, and Spirit, as Lord and Teacher, *Diod. Annot. in* 1 *Cor.* 1.15. *In mine own Name*] *as to binde them unto me to acknowledg me for their Head.* Hence *Johns* Baptism is the Doctrine he preached, and the baptized by him professed, *Mark* 1.4. *Acts* 10.47. & 19.3. and the Pharisees therefore were not baptized of *John*, *Luke* 7.30. because they should have professed *Johns* Doctrine, which they were against, if they had been baptized of him, as their Disciples did their Doctrine, and *Johns* Disciples did his. Clear therefore it is, that [baptizing into the Name] doth note not onely the act of the Ministers of Baptism, but also the party baptized his act of invocating, addicting, profession of Service and Doctrine, and obediently testifying it by that sign: for that is plain from the command, *Acts* 2.38. *Let every one of you be baptized in the Name of Jesus Christ*, ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι, which is the requiring of a duty from them conjoyned with repentance, and herefore to be baptized is not meerly passive, but implies a voluntary yielding of a person to it. And it is further proved from the words to *Paul*, *Acts* 22.16. where he is commanded, ἀναστὰς βάπτισαι καὶ ἀπόλουσαι, *Arise, baptise, and wash*, which all require voluntary action on his part, as well as ministration on *Ananias* his part, out of which this argument is formed: They are not baptized into Christs Name, or his Fathers, and Spirits Name, who do not perform the acts required in that expression; But infants of believers do not perform the acts required in that expression; therefore they are not baptized into Christs Name, or his Fathers, or Spirits, according to the meaning of it in the institution. So that this argument is not a petty reasoning, but a solid reason, to prove infants baptism not such as Christ appointed. As for Mr. *Ms.* frivolous question, *Were not the infants of the* Jews *devoted to God by Circumcision, though they could not actually devote themselves?* Though I am not bound to answer his impertinent questions, yet I will tell him they were; yet this is nothing to the business in hand, about the meaning of the Phrase [*to be baptized into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*] which manifestly implies the party baptized his act, which infants cannot

do. Whereas no where there is such a command [Be ye circumcised in the Name of Jesus Christ] nor is it all one to be circimcised, as to be baptized; which is still supposed but never proved.

4. I further urged, Christ bids the Apostles presently after Baptism, *Teach them to observe what ever he commanded*; But this direction could not pertain to infants, they could not be taught to observe Christs commands; therefore neither were they appointed to be baptized: Mr. *M.* denies that *they were enjoyned presently to teach them to observe what Christ commanded.* But the Text knits these together, Baptizing and Teaching, so as that they that were baptized should be taught, & that by them that baptized them; which the Apostles could not do, being to go up and down from place to place, to plant the Churches in all Nations, if they had been to baptize infants; for then they must have staid many years till they came to understanding to be taught to observe what Christ commanded. No man me thinks should imagine Christs appointment to be thus, Make infants disciples, and baptize them, and then after five, six, or ten years, when they are grown to some understanding, come again and teach them to observe what I have commanded, but that Christ did appoint them to teach them presently after Baptism, that is, in so many hours or days after that Ordinance was administred, as it could be well done. Nor doth Mr. *Cobbet* avoid this objection by saying, *pag.* 179. *then they must be presently taught the whole minde of Christ, which is impossible.* For [presently] is not restained to an instant, but comprehends a just latitude of time for the doing of the thing, onely it notes that the beginning of it is to be not long after Baptism, but sooner by much than it could be done to infants. Mr. *Baxter Plain Scripture Proof, pag.* 341. argues thus, *What Christ hath conjoyned, man must not separate; but Christ hath conjoyned Discipling and Baptizing,* (I add, *and Teaching*) *therefore we must not separate them.*

5. The institution of Christ is best understood by the command of the Apostles, the resolution of *Philip*, the practice of *John Baptist*, the Apostles, and other men sent by God to baptize; but the Apostle *Peter* commanded first Repentance and then Baptism, *Acts* 2. 38. *Philip* resolved the Eunuch demanding, *What hin-*

dereth

dereth me to be baptised? If thou believest with all thy heart, ἔξεστι, *thou maist*, it is lawfull or allowed thee, *Acts* 8.36,37. *John* the Baptist, the Apostles, and other holy men sent by God to baptize, baptized none but Professors of Repentance, Faith, and being Disciples of Christ, as may appear by the Texts mentioning their baptizing, *Mat.*3.6. *Mark* 1.5. *Luke* 3.10. *Acts* 2.41. & 8.12,13,38. & 9.18. & 10.47. & 11.17,18. & 16.15,31,32,33. & 18.8. & 19.5. & 22.16. Therefore Christs institution is of baptizing only Professors of Repentance, Faith, and being Disciples of Christ, and therefore not infants of believers. The *major* cannot be denied by those that confess that Scripture best expounds Scripture, and that the Apostles knew Christs minde, and did observe it. The *minor* is manifest from the Texts alleged. And Mr. *Rutherfords* words are expres to that purpose, *Divine Right of Church-government, cap.*5 *q.*1. *pag.*257. *We reade that* John Baptist *and the Apostles baptized none but such as confessed their sins, and professed faith in Christ Jesus.*

To this Mr. *M. Defence, pag.*227. says, *that it would be a hard task for me to prove that* John *baptized none but upon profession of Repentance.*

I reply, 1. It is proved already and confessed by Mr. *Rutherford.* 2. I did think Mr. *Ms.* own words, *Sermon pag.*44. *that* John *did teach before he baptized, because then no other were capable of Baptism*, did amount to as much, till Mr. *M.* to help himself, referred [then] to the time untill Parents were converted not to the time of *Johns* and the Apostles ministry, of which the objection was, to which in those words he answered. For the objection was, that *they always taught and made them Disciples, by teaching before they baptized any*; and Mr. *Ms.* words in his answer were, John *and Christs Disciples, and the Apostles, did teach before they baptized, because then no other were capable of Baptism*, which if not understood of the time of their Ministery, it was an answer besides the objection. 3. Mr. *M.* hath not yet shewed any other, but such baptized by them, and therefore it is probable in the highest degree of probability that no other were baptized by them. 4. I think an argument in this matter from the Evangelists relation negatively is good proof, unless we will suppose *John Baptist* and the Apostles were defective in their duty, or

the Evangeliſts in their narrations of that which frequently (if it had been their duty) would have occurred, and their ſtory lead them to mention, and it was of much concernment to the Churches of God in after Ages they ſhould.

2. He ſaith, *It would be hard to prove that* John *did impoſe or require confeſſion of ſin before baptiſm.*

Reply. I think not, 1. what they did, ſure was required of them, elſe it had not been an aceeptable thing, and by *John*, elſe he had failed in his duty, *Luke* 1.17. But they confeſſed ſin afore Baptiſm, *Matth.*3.6. *Mark* 1.5. *Ergo.* 2. He that preached repentance to them that came to be baptized, required confeſſion of ſins (which is a chief part of it) afore Baptiſm; But ſo did *John*, *Matth.*3.2. *Ergo.* 3. He that preached to them *to prepare the way of the Lord*, required confeſſion of ſins afore Baptiſm, for that was the preparing the way of the Lord by bringing perſons to confeſs ſins, and then to baptiſe them; But *John* did preach *to prepare the way of the Lord*, *Mat.*3.3. 4. He that preached the Baptiſm of repentance, required confeſſion of ſin to Baptiſm; But *John* did preach the Baptiſm of repentance, *Mark* 1.4. *Luke* 3.3. *Acts* 13.24. & 19.4.

To prevent this, ſaith Mr. *M.* *It is ſaid, he baptized them* εἰς μετάνοιαν, (*unto repentance*) *not* ἐν μετανοίᾳ, (*in repentance*) *as ſtated in actual repentance.*

But dare Mr. *M.* in good earneſt ſay that *John Baptiſt* did admit perſons to Baptiſm that were not in a ſtate of repentance? If he ſhould, I doubt not but to be able to prove the contrary from that which is ſaid of thoſe he baptized, *Matth.*3.6. *They were baptized of him in Iordan, confeſſing their ſins*; and *Mark* 1.5. *They were all baptized of him in the River of Iordan, confeſſing their ſins*; [*all*] muſt not be underſtood ſimply, for ſo it were not true, but, as the matter requires, with this limitation, all that were baptized were baptized confeſſing of ſins, which was a ſtate of repentance, *Matth.*21.32. the different ſtate of thoſe that believed *Iohn*, and thoſe that believed not, is expreſſed thus, *the one repented that they might believe*, and the other not. And by comparing it with *Luke* 7.29,30. it appears they onely were baptized that believed *Iohn*, and others not. But were it not Mr. *M.* had been minded to wrangle, there had been no need to have proved

ed this, His own words, *That there was a new Church to be constituted of those that should receive Christ*, Sermon page 44. shews none were to be baptized but penitents, unless they were to be Church members who were not in a state of repentance. Would *Iohn* admit manifest impenitents? Then the new Church should consist of impenitents, and so no difference between the Church and the world, them that receive Christ and them that receive him not, all should be Church-members. *Iohns* baptism and Christs is by Protestants asserted to be all one, saving that the one pointed at Christ to come after, *Acts* 19. 4. the other as already manifested by name, neither did admit any but penitents, and believers in shew. As for Mr. *Ms.* quirk, that he baptiz.d εἰς μετάνοιαν *Matthew* 3. 11. *unto repentance*, not ἐν μετανοίᾳ *in repentance*. 1. I might urge *Erasmus* his reading *ad pœnitentiam*, *at* or *upon their repentance*, as the like is to be expounded *Matthew* 12. 41. εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ιωνᾶ not [unto] but [*at the preaching of Ionas*. 2. There is no need, for both are true, and may be proved out of the text, that he preached repentance to be before baptism and after. That he preached repentance to be before baptism is already proved, and *Pareus* in his *Comment.* on *Matthew* 3. 5. disputing against *Maldonate* the Iesuite, who applies this confession of sins to Auricular confession, urgeth the tense ἐξομολογούμενοι, it is in the present tense, referring to the time of baptism, having confessed their sins, or then confessing their sins when baptized, not confessing their sins after as in Auricular confession at the sacrament of Penance as they call it. Hereupon he urgeth, *Non prius baptizabantur postea confitebantur ut inepte fingit Maldonatus*, and concludes, *that Iohn rejected the Pharisees when he saw their hypocrisy*, *v.* 7. and infers *that his auditors first in testimony of repentance confessed their sins, and then were baptized*, and gathers this doctrine, *To the Sacraments no impenitents are to be admitted.*

Its true that he baptized them unto future repentance, that is so as that they were required and professed to repent and change their lives. Therefore he required that they should bring forth fruits meet for repentance, *Luke* 3. 8. and directed particularly wherein verse 11, 13, 14. Initial repentance is prerequired to baptism, and continued repentance is to follow after, and therefore *Iohn*

Baptists

Baptists calling for repentance and preaching the baptism of repentance shew not only that this was the lesson they were all to learn, but that also as *Pareus* proves, that they must all manifest that they repented afore he baptized them, and that all did and were tied to make confession of sins, notwithstanding Mr: *M.* saying.

Master *M.* sets down the *judgement of very learned men who conceive their confession of sins was not because it is a necessary medium to all who should receive baptism, but to cleer his baptism from misconstruction, to thwart the opinion of justification by the works of the Law.* To which I say.

1. That were this granted, yet it avoids not my argument, who bring the matter of fact onely, it is enough for me at present if it appear that *Iohn* baptized none but penitents.

2. Yet the judgement of those very learned men is but their own saying, nor can it be right. For if *the end of Iohns requiring repentance was only to clear his baptism from misconstruction, because the men who came to be baptized of Iohn, were such as had been educated in an opinion of justification by works of the Law, & so more was required of them than of others, as it is usual to require more of an heretick for his admission into the bosome of the Church,* then he had required such confession of sins and repentance only of Pharisees and their Scholars, whereas he required it also of Publicans, Harlots, Souldiers, as may be seen *Luke* 3. 10,11,12,13,14. And indeed he required it of all for both ends, that he might contradict the Pharisees doctrine, and because it was a necessary prerequisite to his baptism, because his baptism was contrary to the baptism that initiated proselytes into *Iudaism*, in the nature of it, that is the doctrine taught by the Baptist, and professed by the baptized, the Pharisees baptism requiring observance of the Law for righteousness, and *Iohns* baptism requiring repentance for remission of sins, and therefore the Pharisees rejected it, *Luke* 7. 29, 30. so that in truth this judgement of those learned men about the reason of *Iohns* baptism proves against Mr. *M.* that repentance is to antecede baptism, and his allegation thereof may be retorted upon him.

6. To strengthen this argument from the institution of Christ and practise Apostolical, there are many passages in the Epistles, which

do

do prove that baptism was and ought to be with such profession and acts of the baptized, as do not nor can ordinarily be ascribed to infants of believers, and therefore they are not rightly baptized according to ordinary rule. *Ro.*6.3.4 *Know ye not*, saith the Apostle, *that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death, therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newnes of life*, now *to be baptized into death & Christs death* is by baptism to engage our selves to dy with Christ to sin, with profession of purpose of newnes of life and hope of resurrection. *Beeman. Exer. Theol.* 17. pag. 257. *Baptizari in mortem Christi dicimur quatenus stipulamur nos credere in Christum pro nobis mortuum & ipsius exemplo veluti enecare peccatum ne nobis dominetur.* But this could not infants do, therfore no infants were then baptized, and consequently ought not to be now.

1 *Cor.*12.13. *For even by or in one Spirit have we been baptized into one body, whether* Jews *or* Greeks, *whether bond or free, and have been all made drink into one Spirit*, or as some copies have it, *have been all made to drink or drench into one drink into one Spirit.* That here baptism with water and the drinking the cup in the Lords Supper are meant, is manifest, the Apostle arguing from the end of those two rites for the union and communication between all Christians, as 1 *Cor.* 10.16, 17. he had done in the Lords Supper, and *Eph.*4.4,5. he doth from baptism. And without that allusion the phrase is not intelligible. And the exception of the Antibaptists is vain, that it is Spirit baptism not water baptism, For it is indeed both, Spirit baptism from the Spirit as the cause, and water baptism together as the outward element. Now hence three Arguments arise against infant baptism.

1. All that were baptized into the body were baptized by one spirit as *the Concurrent cause* as Mr. *B.* saith rightly in his *plain Scripture proof, &c.* page 342. that is together *with the word*, as *Ephes.* 5. 26. is declared, by *preaching of which the Spirit was given*, Gal.3.2. and this was presumed of all, as 1 *Thes.* 1.2.4. and elsewhere. And Mr. *B.* truly saith in the same place, *That it was all that were thus baptized into the body.* But I subsume, infants were not thus baptized, *Ergo*, no infants were then baptized, and consequently ought not to be now.

2.

2. All that were thus baptized were also made to drink, or did drink themselves, or were drencht by their own act in the receiving the cup in the Lords Supper unto one Spirit in communion and testification of one Spirit, as 1 *Cor.* 10. 16, 17. But infants did not thus drink, *Ergo* infants were not then baptized.

3. All that were counted members of the body of Christ, or the Church, were thus baptized, and made to drink. But infants were not thus baptized, and made to drink, for if so, they received the Lords Supper, therefore were not then visible Church members, and consequently ought not to be so counted now.

Gal. 3. 26. *For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.* 27. *For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.* Where the Apostle proving that they were all the children of God by faith in Christ, because they had put on Christ, must needs intimate that it was by faith in Christ Jesus that they had put on Christ, and then the Apostles speech is this, As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have by faith in Christ Jesus put on Christ, and consequently so many as were baptized were believers, and therefore no infants were baptized for want of faith.

Ephes. 4. 4, 5. *There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism.* Whence I argue,

1. They that have one baptism, have also one faith; But infants had not one faith; *Ergo* they had not one baptism, and consequently are not to have it now.

2. One faith is placed before one baptism, therefore faith went before baptism in the Apostles daies, and consequently infants were not baptized.

3. They that were counted of one body had one faith; But infants had not one faith; therefore they were not counted of one body, that is Church-members, Mr. *Bs.* words p. 342. confirm this *Ephes.* 4. 5. *As the whole Church is one body, and hath one Lord, and one faith, so hath it one common baptism,*

Eph. 5. 26. *That he might sanctify it, cleansing it with the washing of water by the word,* whence Mr. *B Plain Script. proof,* p. 342. inferres, *the whole Church of Christ must in duty be washed with water.* Now I argue, 1. They who were washed with wa-

ter

ter, were cleanſed with the waſhing of water by the word, which word is the word preached, as where mention is made of baptiſm, there mention is made of preaching of the word going before it, and [*the word*] doth no where ſignifie the covenant or promiſe of God taken preciſely or abſtractively from the narration of Chriſts comming and invitation to repentance, but altogether as it was preached, as may be ſeen in *Peters* ſpeech, *Acts* 10. 36, 37, 38, &c. But infants were not cleanſed by the word; therefore they were not cleanſed by the waſhing of water.

2. The whole Church was cleanſed with the waſhing of water by the word; But ſo were not infants; therefore they were not parts of the Church, and conſequently are not now.

Col. 2. 12. *Buried with him in baptiſm, wherein ye have alſo been raiſed together through the faith of the operation of God who hath raiſed him from the dead.* Whence I argue. They who were buried with Chriſt in baptiſm were alſo therein raiſed together through faith, and conſequently were believers; But infants were not in baptiſm raiſed together through faith; therefore they were not buried with Chriſt in baptiſm, that is, they were not baptized, and by conſequence ought not to be.

Tit. 3. 5. is uſually expounded of baptiſm, as by Mr. *B.* pag. 342. ſo by many others. But if the *waſhing* there be meant of baptiſm, it is ſuch as was with *regeneration and receiving of the Holy Ghoſt*; therfore not of infants whoſe regeneration and receiving was unknown.

Heb. 6. 1, 2. Where the foundation is mentioned, this order is obſerved, firſt repentance, then faith, then baptiſm, then laying on of hands, then reſurrection of the dead, and laſtly eternal judgement, now if the Apoſtle kept a right order here uſed in teaching, and according to the event of things (as he ſeems to have done) then repentance and faith went before baptiſm: and ſo no infants baptized.

1 *Pet.* 3. 21. *The baptiſm that ſaves* is accompanyed with *the anſwer of a good conſcience towards God.* This ſaith *Beza* in his *annot.* on that text *alludes to the Cuſtome of ſtipulating or promiſing at baptiſm by the baptized*: which if right (as is probable) then it is manifeſt that the baptized did anſwer at baptiſm, which infants could not, and therefore were not baptized.

SECT. VI.

Mr. Blakes *exception against the Major, that such institution or example as I require for infant-baptism is unnecessary, is refelled.*

AGainst these arguments (chiefly the two first) brought to prove that infants are not to be baptized, according to the institution *Matth.* 28. 19. and the practise of the Apostles (besides what is alleged and refuted already) many things are alleged. Mr. *Blake Vindic. fœderis* page 411. construes the objection, that infant-baptism wants an institution, as if the meaning were that it wants an institution with limit to infant-age, and then talks thus at randum, *This Objection, if it have force in it, followed home, will overthrow all baptism at any age, and every other new Testament ordinance whatsoever: For according to this rule a person must bring a precept for one of his age to be baptized.* But this is M. *Blakes* mistake of the objection; For in it an institution is not required with limit to infant age, but such an institution as comprehends by any description ordinarily infant age. - *But then,* saith he, *upon the same account church-members in covenant of any age ought to be baptized, and so the institution is not in question (about that there is an agreement) but whether infants be in covenant, whether they be any church-members, is to be disputed, which already is satisfied.*

Answ. It is false which he saith that *there is an agreement about the institution,* I deny that the institution is, Baptize persons in covenant, except he mean persons in covenant by their own profession and promise, or that it is all one to baptize disciples and to baptize persons to whom God hath promised, or covenanted Christ: For then the Jews yet uncalled should be baptized, to whom Gods covenant is, *Romans* 11. 27. It is false also that *upon the same account upon which the institution of baptism with limit to infancy is waved, church-members in covenant of any age* (in Mr. *Blakes* sense) *ought to be baptized, and that the question is only whether infants be in covenant, whether they be any church-*

members. He knows well that I yield that infants are in the covenant of grace, in respect of Gods promise to as many of them as are elect, whether believers children or not, and that I grant that many of them are members of the invisible Church; yea he himself in his 43. *chap.* of *Vindic. fœderis sect.* 3. had disputed against my tenet, denying a connexion between the covenant and initial seal, and therefore this speech of his shews either his oscitancy, or his willingness to mislead.

He then repeats his arguments in his *Birth privilege* in the same words he then used to prove the institution to comprize infants, which were answered in my *Examen sect.* 13. and my answer there vindicated in my *Postscript sect.* 14, 15, 18. in answer to the 11 chapter of Mr. *Blakes* answer to my Letter. I will not here repeat what I then answered, but reply to what he excepts in his *Vindic. Fœderis* pag. 413. where he doth not shew insufficiency in what I say *Apol. page* 147. to answer his allegation of *Isaiah* 49. 22. But saies *he doubts not I abuse my memory.* Concerning which I yield it not unlikely my memory did fail me in that thing, of his alleging *Isaiah* 49. 22. as an argument by it self. I hope this may satisfy Mr. *Blake*, and the Reader, if he read the places in my writings here mentioned, may be satisfyed that it proves not any thing for Mr. *Blakes* purpose. Likewise for what I answered in my *Postscript sect:* 18. to his allegation of *Mat.* 18.5. & 10.42. *Mark* 9. 41. *Luke* 9. 47, 48. he refers to Mr. *Baxters* book page 22. I shall refer the Reader to my answer to Mr. *B.* here.

M. *Blake only adds, that the denyal that infants are within the verge of the Commission,* Mat. 28. 19. *involves the Apostles and all that are imployed in their work in succession, in a contradiction. The nations are to be discipled: Infants bear a part of the nation: and yet infants are in an incapacity wholly of it. See Mr.* Cooks *answer to the Challenges of the Anabaptists of* Stafford, *pag.* 14.

I reply, Mr. *Blakes* words are so obscure (as many of his speeches are) that I understand not his meaning when he saith, *The denyal that infants are within the verge of that commission* Matthew 28. 19. *involves the Apostles, and all that are imployed in their work in succession, in a contradiction,* whether he

mean thus, my denial involves the Apostles in a contradiction to their own sayings, or to Christs words: either way understood, I discern not any truth or shew of truth in Mr. *Blakes* words. Christs words are a command, and not an enunciation, and therefore there can be according to exact expression no contradiction to them; and for any sayings of the Apostles which should be involved in a contradiction by my denial, it is beyond any art of divination of mine to ghesse which and where they should be. And for his syllogism it is false, consisting of four terms, 1. *The nations*, 2. *to be disciples*, 3. *infants*, 4. *bear a part of the Nation*. If it were good I might from the parallel place *Mark* 16. 15. argue in the same manner, Every creature is to have the Gospel preached to it; Infants bear a part of every creature; therefore to infants the Apostles were to preach the Gospel. Nor is there any contradiction in these two Propositions, *The nations are to be discipled*, and yet *infants are in an incapacity of it*, no more than in these, *God hath granted repentance to the Nations*, Acts 11. 18. yet not to infants, *All nations and all people are exhorted to praise God*, Rom. 15. 11. *in him shall the nations trust*, verse 12, yet not an infant meant. The speeches are so plain *Acts* 15. 3. *declaring the conversion of the nations*, verse 7. *God made choice among us, that the nations by my mouth should hear the word of the Gospel and believe*, verse 14. *Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Nations to take out of them a people for his name*, verse 17. *That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Nations upon whom my name is called*, verse 19. *Wherefore my sentence is that we trouble not them which from among the Nations are turned to God*. Acts 20. 25. *As touching the Nations* (for the word translated Gentiles and Nations is the same in all these places) *which believe, we have written*, and yet in no one of these places are infants meant under the term [*Nations*] And when our Lord Christ expresseth what he said Matthew 28. 19. *Disciple all nations*, by the words *preach the Gospel to every creature*, Mark. 16. 15. as the comparing the texts shews, and interpreters confess; I know not how to conceive with what Spirit Mr. *Blake* is moved, who doth so often seek to impose his stale allegations so often and so plainly refuted. Will any man conceive that Christ bid them preach to infants, and yet

his

his bidding them to disciple all nations is as much as to bid them go preach to all nations? If men do swallow down such fancies, I can hardly judge but that they are willing to be deceived. In *Mr. Cookes* book in the place to which he refers me, I find no more then in Mr. *Blakes*, and therefore need give no other answer than what is given to him.

But Mr. *Blake* addes. 'For that part of the objection, that 'there is no example in the New Testament scripture of infant-bap-'tism, I answer, First, for an example of baptism with limit to 'any one precise number of years or daies, we have but one that 'I know (if that) in Scripture, and that is of Christ, who was '(as is computed) about the age of thirty when he was baptized, 'if this be prest and followed all must at that alone be for baptism, 'and no other of any age may be baptized. Mr. T. had many 'years above thirty over his head, when I heard him say, that he 'was satisfyed, that though an infant ought not to be baptized, 'yet being baptized in infancy, when in years he did make pro-'fession of the Gospel, this was valid, which he spake in justifica-'tion of his own baptism; though now (as errour is creeping) of 'an Antipædobaptist he is grown up to an Anabaptist, and is re-'baptized, and in his Præcursor glories in his shame of rebaptizing 'others.

Answ. The Objection as by me framed doth not intimate a pleading the necessity of an example with limit to any one precise number of years or daies, as a rule to be followed in baptism, but rests in the institution and examples in the new Testament as sufficient to direct whom to baptize, to wit disciples, repenting believers in Christ by profession, whatever be their age, nor did Mr. *Bl.* ever hear me press Christs age as the exact rule for the time in which Christians should be baptized; and therefore did not Mr. *Bl.* take occasion to vent his jerks and quips (in which he is frequent) he had forborn to recite my speech in that manner he doth. Concerning which I do not think I did then expresse my self, to wit in the year 1643. (for sure it was in that year that I spake with M. *Blake* now above nine years since) in the very words he sets down; I do rather conceive by the words in my *Exercit.* pag. 22. composed about that time, that I spake more cautelously. But had I said it, it only shews I received light by degrees, as in

all

all reformations it hath been. Neither am I an Anabaptist, nor do I rebaptize, and though I glory not in any thing of mine, yet count it not my shame, but my honour, that God hath used me as an instrument to reform the superstitious opinion and prophane practice of infant-baptism, or rather (as now it is used) sprinkling or perfusion, and do bless God with rejoicing, that amidst so many temptations, reproaches and other sufferings, my heart hath been obedient to Christs command of being baptized, and baptizing, though to his own shame, he makes it my shame that I have done my duty in this particular.

Mr. *Blake* adds. *There are many things of which we make no question, and yet we have no example of them. I instanced in the tryal of the suspected wife by the water of jealousie, there is no example for it in all the old Testament Scripture; and for womens receiving the Lords Supper, there is not a particular institution, or any particular precedent for it in the New Testament: See further instances in Mr.* Cooks *Treatise before mentioned, page* 21. *They cannot give us any instance of any one trayned up by believing parents for baptism, and assoon as he could give an account baptized, not one child of a believer brought up for covenant and not in covenant.*

Answ. I may say also there are many things of which we make no question, and yet we have no example of them: It is enough if either precept or example approved could be brought of infant-baptism. Of the tryal by the water of jealousie there was no need of example to direct, when the rule was so plain. Mr. *Cooks* instances are to no more purpose than Mr. *Blakes*, being brought against them who deny proof by consequence, which I do not. Their need be no example brought according to my principles of a believers child catechized first and baptized after, it is enough to us that such a one is comprehended in the institution being a disciple, Christ never requiring us to enquire whose children they are, but what is their faith and profession, and to baptize disciples and believers in him. If Mr. *Blake* mean [*by being brought up for covenant*] to be taught the knowledge of the true God, *Ishmael* the child of a believer was brought up for covenant and not in covenant. Of womens, who are Christian believers or disciples, receiving the Lords Supper, my speech *Examen pag.* 112.

was right, there is institution and example of it in the New Testament, and this is justified in my *Postscript* s. 11. But Mr. *Blake* hath a fling at my instances, though his fellow Pædobaptists count them very plain, he is minded it seems to be *ad oppositum* to me in all I say in this argument. The particular command for womens receiving the Lords Supper I said was Δοκιμαζέτω δὲ ἄνθρωπος 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eate*, this saies *Mr. Coleman is as cleer for women as men*; But *then*, saith Mr. *Blake John* 7. 22. *is Moses his command, the Jewes practice with Christs approbation, in the same comprehensive latitude in regard of both sexes, as in Saint Paul for receiving the Sacrament of the Lords Supper.* I answered, true, if the subject matter did not limit the word ἄνθρωπον to the male *John* 7. 22. it being a relation of the Jews practice, which was only to circumcise the male, which it doth not 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. *But* then saith Mr. *Blake*, *my expres formal command is lost, they are not expressed but included only, and by consequence, which will not be denied either to Mr.* Coleman, *or Mr.* Blake. *Answ.* This is enough for me which he grants, that women are included in that precept 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. though by consequence only, for then there is institution in the New Testament for their receiving the Lords Supper, and therefore this objection of Mr. *Blake* and others against my requiring either precept or example of infant-baptism in the New Testament in expres terms or by good consequence, by *requiring me to shew a like precept or example for womens receiving the Lords Supper*, is answered by his own grant, that there is such a precept for womens receiving the Lords Supper, as I deny to be for infant-baptism. Yet I still say it is more than by consequence, even an expres precept in formal terms for womens receiving the Lords Supper, which is 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. For I take that to be an expres command in formal terms, which is in the imperative mood, and in a word that

Mr. *Fox* in the Acts and Monuments of the Church relates how in the disputation at *Oxf.* 1554. with Mr. *Latimer* Dr. *Weston* objected this thing, and Mr. *Latimer* answered, he found a woman receiving the Lords Supper 1 *Cor.* 11. 28.

Mr. *Will. Cook* Pont. uncov. pag. 16. The word ἄνθρωπος notes the species or kind of man distinct from

according to Grammar construction comprehends both men and women, there being no circumstance restraining it to the male. And in this sense Mr. *M.* saith truly in his Sermon pag. 35. *Express command there is that they should teach the heathen and the Jews, and make them disciples, and then baptize them*, though Jews are only comprized under the general term [*all nations.*] other creatures, without difference of age or sex.

Mr. *Blake* goes on. *He further saith, that* 1 *Cor.* 10.17. *is an express example in formal terms of womens receiving the Lords Supper; we being many are one bread and one body, for we are partakers of one bread. I demand of Mr.* T. *whether the Apostle speaks in the person of Christians or in the person of women? not of women sure, for he takes in himself, and he was a man, and then the formality of an express example falls. When it is said that the whole house of Israel is circumcised in the flesh, Mr.* T: *will not yield that there is a proof, not by any consequence, that women, though of the house of Israel were virtually circumcised: but all partaking of one bread, there is a proof formal and express that they were at the Lords Supper.*

Answ. An expresse formal example is mentioned 1 *Cor.* 10.17. of womens receiving the Lords Supper, there being relation of partaking the bread in the indicative mood, and the term [*we all*] according to Grammar construction the matter not excluding them comprehending women as well as men. For the Apostle under [*all we*] expressly comprehends all *the many that were one bread and one body*, who are all Christians both Jewes and Gentiles, 1 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. Mr. *Blakes* demand makes a disjunction of members coincident, which is illogical; However to it as it is I say the Apostle speaks in his own person, not in anothers, yet he speaks of the persons of all Christians both men and women, and he takes in as expressly the women as the men, and the formality of the example is of one as well as the other. As for the other passage alleged by Mr. *Blake* the Predicate [*circumcised in the flesh*] being necessarily understood of actual circumcision, there is a necessity to understand the Subject [*the whole house of Israel*] synecdochically, else the speech would not be true. But tropes are not to be made but where there is a necessity to make good the speech, or to make

make it agree with the ſcope, circumſtances and other expreſſions: of which there is no neceſſity 1 *Cor.* 10. 17. to verify the ſpeech of the Apoſtle, but that it is true of women as well as men, and muſt be ſo underſtood without a trope, and therefore there the ſpeech is to be expounded according to the plain Grammatical meaning as expreſſed formally without the like trope.

Mr. *Blake* ſaith of me. *He brings Acts* 20. 7. *that the diſciples on the firſt day of the week came together to break bread. Here is an example as expreſs and formal. Mr.* T. *cannot infallibly prove by help of conſequence much leſs expreſsly that there was a woman there. As that night meeting there might be none but men, as at the firſt inſtitution. It can never be an expreſs example till it be made appear that none are diſciples but women.*

Anſw. I had thought when it is ſaid, *it is appointed unto men once to dy, Heb.* 9. 27. *death paſſed upon all men, in that all have ſinned,* Rom. 5. 12. it had been expreſs and formal for womens and infants dying though there be other men than women and infants, and yet in both places [*men*] in Greek is in the maſculine gender, [*Diſciples*] in the Acts note all Chriſtians *Acts* 11. 26. *Tabitha* is named a diſciple *Acts* 9. 36. and therefore there being no reaſon to make a trope *Acts* 20. 7. in the word [*Diſciples*] Chriſtian women as well as men are comprehended. And *by breaking bread,* ſay the *Aſſembly at Weſtminſter Anſwer to the reaſons of the diſſenting brethren* page 67. *Sacramental breaking of bread is underſtood generally by all, Acts* 20. 7. The like is ſaid by *Chamier Panſt. Catholicum.* 4. *l.* 7. *c.* 6. *ſ.* 13. And it is confirmed, 1. from the text, the words importing that the breaking of bread is there meant which was the end of their cuſtomary meeting on the Lords day; But this was Sacramental, *Ergo.* 2. From 1 *Cor.* 10. 16, 17. where the Lords Supper is called *breaking bread* as the uſual known term among Chriſtians. This ſeems to me infallible proof, that women were there, or which is to my purpoſe, that uſually they did meet with other diſciples to break break. As for what Mr. *Bl.* addes, *That if I had the texts in hand of a whole houſhold baptized, they would be ſufficiently formal for infant-baptiſm,* I tell him no: for I could not have withſtood the clear light to the contrary, from the

words *Acts* 16. & 18. and elsewhere, which limit the *whole house* to persons that did *hear the word, believe, receive, fear God, &c. Amping. dialog. contra Anabap.* page 206. *Idem quoq; vobis responsum volumus ad loca illa, Act.* 16. 34. 1 *Cor.* 16. 15. *Tit.* 1. 11. *ubi quædam de totis familiis enuncian-tur, quæ nonnisi de adultis accipi possunt.* It is false that *the Commission Matthew* 28. 19. *is to baptize Nations*, but disciples in or out of nations, as is proved above. *Providence hath not ordered that nations including infants have been brought into the Church* as Christ appointed, to wit by preaching the Gospel: but the national Churches are gathered (otherwise than Christ appointed) by human laws and infant-baptism. I value *as much the Churches practice as ever*, but it is false *that in no controverted thing the Church is found so unanimous as in this of infant-baptism.* It is more unanimous about Episcopacy Prelatical, use of the sign of the cross, and many other things, as may be seen in Mr. *Sprint of Conformity pag.* 85. *&c.* I shall in convenient time I hope shew the mistakes of Pædobaptists plea for Infant-baptism from antiquity.

The other speech of Mr. *Blake, That which will speak for infants to receive them into Heaven, will speak also to receive them into the Church by baptism*, is not true. For Election, the Covenant of Grace, a secret work of an initial, habitual, seminal or actual holiness or faith, being supposed, may speak to receive them into Heaven, yet not to baptism. Nor doth it follow *that if want of faith exclude them from baptism, then by the text Mark* 16. 16. *the same want of faith excludes from salvation.* For (as I answer in my *Præcursor* §. 6.) a want of faith dogmatical excludes from baptism, and yet excludes not infants from salvation.

Sect.

SECT. VII.

Mr. Ms. *exceptions, that Matthew* 28. 19. *is not the institution of baptism, that onely disciples are not appointed to be baptized, that this was a rule only for a Church to be constituted, are refelled.*

THere are many other exceptions against the argument from the institution *Matth.*28.19. to be considered. *Mr. M.* in his *Sermon page* 44. saith, 1. *That of matth.* 28. *is not the institution of baptism.* 2. *It was instituted long before to be the seal of the Covenant.* 3. *Its only an inlargement of their Commission.* To which in my *Examen* I said,

1. If this be not the first institution, yet it is an institution, and the institution of baptism to us Gentiles, and therefore the rule by which Ministers are to baptize, there being no other institution that I know of to regulate our practice by; but such as is gathered from *John Baptist*, the Apostles, and some preachers in the Acts of the Apostles, their practice and sayings.

2. By requiring him to shew another institution, else Paedobaptism cannot be acquitted from will-worship. To this M. *M. Defence page* 225. *having referred me to part* 3. *s.*13. *where he saith, all this is abundantly answered,* saith, *This inlargement of their Commission is very unfitly called by me an institution of baptism to us, their Commission at the same time was inlarged to preach to the Gentiles, will you call that an institution of preaching? And that the method of preaching to us Gentiles must be fetch out of this place? I know you will not.*

Resat. 1. By institution I conceive is meant no other than commanding, ordaining, appointing, and I find the words used as equipollent so promiscuously in the Assemblies confession of faith *chap.*27, 28, 29. in the larger and shorter Catechism, in the Directory about baptism, that sure Mr. *M.* was either very forgetful of what past in the Assembly, or very much disposed to cavil when he excepted against my speech as unfit, in calling *Mat.*28.19.

the institution of baptism. The Assembly *Confess. of faith ch.* 27. *art.* 3. call it the word of institution, *chap.* 28. *art.* 7. allegeth no other text to prove the ordaining and appointment of baptism by Christ, but *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. Mr. *B.* calls it *page* 342. the solemn institution of baptism, yea in the disputes with Papists and others about the author, minister, form, use of baptism, it is so common a thing to call this the institution of baptism, yea the regulating institution, the words therein are called the words of institution even in the Directory, that I admire Mr. *M.* should put in this exception had he not a mind to wrangle or to find a knot in a bulrush. I will recite *Chamiers* words, *Panstr. Cath. tom.* 1. *l.* 9. *c.* 10. *s.* 39. *Dico hanc ipsam formam baptizandi in nomine patris & filii & spiritus sancti & solam esse & optimam constare ex Evangelio: ubi nimirum institutionis est descriptio. Nam quis ignorat quaecunq; instituuntur à Christo non tantum optimè institui, sed etiam sic, ut non debeant aliter.* But he tells me *he knows I will not call that Matthew* 28. 19. *an institution of preaching, nor affirm that the method of preaching is to be fetcht out of this place.* To which I reply, He is deceived, I do call it an institution of preaching, and therein follow his Collegue Mr. *Rutherford Due right of Presbyteries* pag. 454. *That which we allege is an institution for preaching and baptizing,* Matthew 28 19, 20. and before him *Parens* in his *Comment.* who intitles this part of the chapter, *institutio ministerii*, and from hence with the generality of Divines fetch the method of preaching. But saith he, *This was only an inlargement of their Commission. Answ.* I find that the Apostles had commission to preach, *Mat.* 10. 7. and that they did baptize, *John* 4. 1. which I doubt not they had Commission for: But be it so, yet however *Mat.* 28. 19. they had their Commission inlarged in the extent of the persons to whom they were to preach and baptize, and this Commission is an institution of those works: so that frivolously it is denyed to be an institution because it was an inlarged Commission, when the enlarged Commission was all one with a renewed institution, and must needs be a rule about preaching to, and baptizing of Gentiles, and therefore the institution of baptism to them. *But it was instituted long before to be a seal of the Covenant. Answ.* I deny not but *John Baptist* was appointed

to baptize by God *Mat.* 21.25. *John* 1.6. and the Apostles by Christ: but where there is any institution of baptism so expressed as to regulate our practise afore that *Mat.* 28.19. I find not, and therefore know no solemn institution by which we are to be guided in the use of it afore this. *But it was long before instituted to be the Seal of the Covenant*: for this he refers us to that which he had said before. *Answ.* What ambiguity, uncertainty, and falsity there is in Pædobaptists speeches about the Covenant, being in Covenant, seal of the Covenant, connexion between the Covenant and seal, will be shewed in that which followes. For present I know no place assigned by Mr. *M.* in his *Defence part.* 3: *f.* 13. wherein he shews that baptism was institued long before the time of the speech *Mat.* 28.19. to be the seal of the Covenant. I have read over that section, and do aver that I find it so empty of any either proofs or answers to my *Examen*, that his words in my apprehension are meer trifling. If it be thought I wrong a man of such repute, let any man shew me a word in all that section (in which he saith *he hath answered all this abundantly*) in answer to what I say that *Matthew* 28 19. is the institution of baptism to us Gentiles, and the rule by which ministers are to baptize, and that there is no other institution, and I will forfeit my credit. He neither in all that section, nor elsewhere, that I know, shews either any other or foregoing institution of baptism to us Gentiles, or any other but this with *John Baptists*, the Apostles, and some forenamed their practice and sayings for a rule of baptizing: onely p. 212. he dictates thus. *Sir, since it is apparent that here is no new Commission for any new method in their work, but only an enlargement of their Commission to apply their Ministery to new persons, how could they understand our Saviours meaning to proceed any other way to the Gentiles than among the Jews?* &c. But to whom is it apparent? and when, either sleeping or waking? where is the old Commission that we must understand this by, so as to proceed the way to the Gentiles that was taken among the Jewes? Is it the Commission of circumcising *Gen.* 17? If that be it, then baptism is not a Sacrament of the New Testament onely but of the old, then it is not a new administration, then the Commission of baptizing is to any parent, though no minister, to baptize, then it must be done the eighth

day

day, to males only; were Christs words thus to be understood they had been a meer riddle: where or whence it is apparent that ever the Apostles conceived that in executing the Commission *Mat.* 28. 19. they were to proceed according to the Commission about circumcising? I have shewed *Examen part.* 3 *sect.* 14. that it rather follows to the contrary that they did and were to proceed clean otherwise. And therefore that the Apostles should understand the institution *Mat.* 28. 19. by the institution of circumcision *Gen.* 17. is so wild a conceit, that I cannot impute it to any thing but meer dotage in the asserter, there being no one word in the Commission or the executing of it throughout the Acts of the Apostles that doth shew that Christ had reference to it, or the Apostles so understood him. Yea if that of Circumcision *Gent.* 17. be an institution of baptism, by like reason that of the Passeover *Exod.* 12. must be an institution of the Lords Supper, and then the Lords Supper should be instituted afore the night in which Christ was betrayed, and the Lords Supper should be from *Moses*, and regulated by the Ordinances of the ceremonial Law *&c.* If Mr. *M.* mean by the foregoing institutution the manner of the Jewish Doctors in baptizing proselytes children with the parents, it shall be shewed hereafter, especially in answer to Dr. *Hammond*, that there is nothing therein for infant-baptism now, it being done to no Jewes or their infants many ages before Christs incarnation, and therefore not out of respect to the Covenant *Gen.* 17. nor as a privilege from thence, but meerly as a rite to purge them from the uncleanness of Gentilism, nor ever done to the infant posterity of the proselytes of righteousness after the first time of being made proselytes, nor ever used to proselytes of the gate. And yet had the use been such as that infants of Proselytes after their first entrance on the Jewish profession had been baptized, yet there is no commission in Scripture for it, though *Rabbins* would fetch it, some from *Gen.* 35. 2. some from *Exod.* 19. 10. some from the flood, nor is there any thing in the institution of Christ, or Acts and sayings of the Apostles, that shews that Christian baptism was conformed to the Jewish baptism in this, and therefore I conclude, that there is no other institution besides *Mat.* 28. 19. *Mark* 16. 15, 16. together with the Apostles, *John Baptists*, and others forenamed sayings and practice, that is a rule to us about baptizing, and if infant-baptism be not here appointed, it

is

is besides the institution, and so irregular.

But Mr. *M.* allegeth further, *that it is not said that only disciples are to be baptized.* To which I replyed *Examen page* 132. it is not said 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. Let him only eat that can examine himself, nor here only preachers in office are to baptize, nor only two to be one flesh, nor let only wine be drunk in the Eucharist, or water used in baptism, yet Divines make these speeches exclusive. M. *Ball* of the *Covenant par.* 2. *c.* 2. *p.* 252. *when difference or distinction is contained in some term, the proposition is for sense exclusive no less than if it were expressly noted.* Against this Mr. *M.* excepts *Defence pag.* 215. *That the practice and example of Christ and* John *is sufficient to make a positive rule affirmative but not exclusive, and the reason is plain, they possibly might not meet with all persons and occasions, as though no proselyte of the gate were baptized till Acts* 10. *nor any till they made actual confession of their faith and repentance, nor any rule given that the receiving the extraordinary gifts of the holy Ghost should without any other confession be a sufficient warrant to baptize any, yet* Peter *upon the very pouring out of those gifts, without requiring any further confession either of faith or repentance, baptized* Cornelius *and all his Company.*

Ref. 1. M. *Ms.* confessions are to be noted, that *none till they made actual confession of their faith and repentance were baptized till Acts* 10. *nor any rule given that the receiving the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost should without any other confession be a sufficient warant to baptize any,* which do grant that till then there was neither rule nor practice of baptising any without actual confession of their faith and repentance, which is in effect a grant of the Minor, in my argument, denying any institution or practice in the New Testament of infant-baptism, for there is no other rule or practice of infant-baptism after *Acts* 10. otherwise than that before.

2. It is to be observed, that Mr. *M.* deals not rightly with me in that he makes me to have framed the exclusive rule from practice, whereas I joined institution with practice, and shewed neither to be for infant-baptism.

3. If the non-including of persons or things in the institution or practise of baptism be not exclusive, then the institution is not our rule,

rule, then there is no will-worship, or it is no sin to swerve from it, we may add to Gods worship infant-communion, and innumerable other things rejected may be lawful, then do preachers, especially Mr. *M.* unjustly urge the Parliament, and others, to reform invented ceremonies, and Protestants contend against Popish rites in baptism, mass, &c.

4. However Mr. *M.* conceive, yet men abler than Mr. *M.* do frequently assert negative arguments from institution. I will name one who hath few fellowes, *Chamier Panst. cath.* in the words lately by me here recited, and *tom.4.l.5.c.9.s.24. Hæc testimonia sunt institutionis: quæ etsi non prohibent totidem verbis alios liquores: tamen eo ipso quod non ponat excludit. L.7. c.10.s.38. quamquam in hoc genere rerum quæ nihil sunt nisi ex institutione validissimam esse aportet argumentationem negativam si inde sumatur.*

But Mr. *M.* saith, *John the Baptist and the Apostles might not meet with all persons and occasions.*

Answ. Tis true, they baptized no Emperours or Kings, because none were converted, yet they had a rule to baptize them if disciples: But this could not be the reason of their not baptizing infants, sith innumerable believers had infants in the times of the Gospel story, and Acts of the Apostles, and yet no mention of baptizing any. Do not Mr. *M.* and other Pædobaptists plead that the little children brought to Christ were infants of believers, and yet there's not a word of their being baptized? As for Mr. *M.* instance to prove no necessity of practice to warrant infant-baptism, though I grant if there were institution without practice it were enough, yet is it not rightly brought. It supposeth *Peter* baptized *Cornelius* and his household upon the very powring out of extraordinary gifts, without actual faith and repentance required; And I grant he required them not: but yet withal it is manifest he did not baptize meerly upon the powring out of extraordinary gifts without them. For the text *Acts* 10.46,47. expressly saith, *they magnified God*, ere he spake of their baptizing, and *Acts* 11. 17. *that they had the like gift as themselves who believed on the Lord Jesus*, and they gathered thence that the *Gentiles had repentance unto life granted by God.*

But it is objected by Mr. *Cobbet*, *Just Vindic. part* 2. *cha.* 3. sect.

sect. 2. *that Mark* 16.16. *none but true believers are meant, then if the term be exclusive none but such are to be baptized.* 2. *that those believers had signs following them, verse* 17.

Answ. The rule is, disciples by profession are to be baptized, to which is equipollent [believers by profession] I say not that believers only who are such as those *Mark* 16. 16. are to be baptized by us: But yet comparing *Mark* 16. 15. 16. with *Mat.* 28. 19. I gather that a disciple and believer are terms equipollent, and so it helps me to understand the term [disciple] as answerable to the term [believer] And though by reason of the matter predicated *Mark* 16. 16. the believer there is only a true believer, yet the term often is given to believers only by profession, and we find such warrantably baptized, and that is enough for our direction: though we are to require more, yet we are not to forbear baptism till we know there is more. We acknowledge only true believers have right before God to baptism: but in the face of the Church believers by profession have right to baptism, and are to be taken by us for true believers upon their profession, till they be discovered to be otherwise. As for verse 17. it doth not say these or some of these signs shall follow every of them that believe: but they are true if they followed some of them that believe, sith the terms being indefinite in matter contingent, the Proposition is true if onely particular. *Indefinita propositio in materia contingenti æquipollet particulari*, say Logicians.

But there is an objection *ad hominem* against my self, that I have said that if I knew an infant were actually sanctified, &c. I would baptize him, if so, then an infant is not excluded out of the institution.

Answ. I grant that an infant barely as an infant is not excluded out of the institution, but as ordinarily not known to be a disciple or believer. If an infant were known to be a disciple or believer, I would baptize him, as I would one who having his tongue cut out who is known to be a believer otherwaies. But then I have added that this would be upon extraordinary manifestation onely, and so not according to ordinary rule, and therefore justifies onely that extraordinary fact, not the ordinary practice of infant-baptism, which hath no rule ordinary or extraordinary.

But then saith Mr. *M. page* 215. shew us your extraordinary rule.

Answ. When I do thus, or challenge this, I shall: in the mean time it is enough that my concession doth not infringe my argument against baptizing infants ordinarily without ordinary rule.

Mr. *M.* hath yet another exception in his *Sermon, page* 44. *That no other are mentioned to be baptized but disciples, or believers, because a new Church was to be constituted, and then all were to be baptized upon profession of faith, after the children came in by their right by vertue of the Covenant.*

Ref. 1. when I come to examine Mr. *Ms.* Conclusions I shall shew, that there is no such Covenant as to give right to believers infants to be baptized; yea that title to the Covenant did not give right to Circumcision, and therefore this is a vain pretence.

2. He assigns that for a reason why no other were baptized, which was not a reason: For in the Jewish Church which was already constituted, and which Christ did join himself to, and to whose children they say did belong the Covenant, yet while other were baptized all the time of *John* and Christs Ministery on earth, no one infant was appointed to be baptized, no not those infants *Mark* 10. which Christ blessed, and which were (if Pædobaptists say true) believers infants in Covenant.

3. It is a vain pretence, that there is no mention of baptized infants; because they had no right till their parents were converted: For neither when they were converted is there any mention of the infants baptism.

4. The institution *Mat.* 28. 19. expounded by the practice of *John Baptist* &c. is the standing rule for Churches at first planting, and after increasings, nor can any other rule be produced distinct from this, and therefore neither at first conversion, nor after settlement of Churches, are any to be baptized according to ordinary rule till they be disciples of Christ, or believers by profession.

Scil.

SECT. VIII.

The exceptions of Mr. Cobbet, *Mr.* Blake, *&c. against the order of teaching afore baptizing, of Mr.* M. *Mr.* Hussey, *that baptizing is discipling, are refelled.*

AGainst the argument from the order of teaching first and then baptizing, it was excepted that it is said *Mark* 1. 4. *John did baptize and preach*, which objection in my *Examen* was removed by the words of *Beza par.* 4. *f.* 1. To which I add, that the reason is manifest from the text why the one was put after the other, not because he did baptize any afore he had preached, but because *Mark* having expressed his baptism, it was needful he should shew the difference between *Johns* baptism and the Jewish or Phasaical baptism.

To this Mr. *M.* returns thus much. *Christs order is* (*say you*) *teaching should go before baptizing; is not that the same with this; That men must be made disciples by preaching before they be baptized?* To which I only say,

1. That the arguments are not the same as I made them, the first being taken from the term [*αὐτὸς* them] the other from the order of teaching afore baptizing.

2. However I take that which Mr. *M.* grants, that *it is the same to teach, and to make disciples by preaching before baptizing.* But Mr. *Cobbet jnst vindic. part* 2. *ch.* 3. *sect.* 2. allegeth something against this argument. He grants *some things in this order of Christ are perpetual*, but he will not *have all to be presidentiall to all Churches and times, because it is said* Mar. 16. 17. *in the same speech, that miraculous signs should follow them that believe.*

But if this were good, then the rule should only hold while such gifts remain, which no churches now have, and so he must fall into the opinion that makes water-baptism a temporary ordinance, and those things which he grants perpetual, as *viz.* preaching the Gospel before baptism is to be administred by such as preach, discipled inchurched persons are to be baptized, that in founding

churches the first members are to be visible professors of the faith in reference to church estate, that baptism is with water applyed to the persons baptized, and that into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, must be temporary as well as teaching before baptizing: If the one be perpetual notwithstanding this reason so is the other, and presidential to all churches and times.

But saith Mr. *Cobbet*, *there is a distinction to be made in baptizing at the gathering of Churches, and when they are gathered: the order must be observed at the former, not the later.*

Answ. 1. If it was to be so at first gathering of churches, why did not those in *New England* observe it then when they first gathered their churches? surely they were not rightly gathered for want of baptism if this be the rule at gathering of churches. Nor can they plead their baptism they had in the National and Parochial churches of *England*; For by their principles, baptism belongs to the children of believers, not as such, but as in church-covenant, and church-members, and therefore they baptize not any but the children of church-members in covenant, and yet most of them had their baptism in the churches of *England*, and their parents no church-members and so neither they nor others that gather churches in *Old England* do keep to their principles in the gathering of their churches.

2. But besides what I said before to this objection, *Mat.* 28. 19. there is no such distinction made, and we are not to distinguish where the law doth not, yea all the institution, and every thing in it was to be observed in the churches of Christ in gathering and gathered at all times, as is manifest from the promise annexed of being with them alwaies to the end of the world, which shewes that he would have that rule continued to the end of the world, and to encourage them therein he promiseth to be with them. To say with Mr. *Saltmarsh* in his *Sparkles of glory* and some others, it is to be read [*to the end of the age*] is frivolous, [*Matthew*] 13. 39, 40, 49. *Matth.* 24. 3. the very words shew it to be meant of the last time at Christs comming to Judgement.

But (saith Mr. *Cobbet*) *the Commission James* 5. 14. *to anoint with oil, is not perpetual.*

Be

Be it so, that that appointment of the sign of a gift of miraculous cure now ceaseth, yet it doth not follow that the institution *Mat.* 28. 19. in which a sign of a perpetual duty is instituted, is temporary.

But saith Mr. *Cobbet*, *There are variations in the mention of Christs last Commission about the Lords Supper, and therefore another analogy of faith and comparing Scriptures with Scriptures is to regulate us in this point of Sacramental order, and so in the other.*

To which I answer, 1. That the variations Mr. *Cobbet* sets down are none of them about the order of the actions appointed by Christ pertaining to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, and therefore not pertinent to the present business.

2. If Mr. *Cobbet* will not have the order in the institution to be moral and perpetual about the Lords Supper, then they do ill in his Judgement that contend against Papists, Prelates and others to have the Lords Supper reduced exactly to the first pattern as a constant rule, there being such variations as disable it from being a rule.

3. I grant that analogy of faith and comparing Scriptures with Scriptures is to regulate us in this point of Sacramental order: But till Mr. *Cobbet* shew that in any other Scripture or analogy of faith there is a rule that persons should be baptized afore they be taught, his reasoning is not to the present purpose.

But then saith he, *If order must be observed so strictly, baptizing must go before salvation*, Mark 16. 16. *repentance may be before faith*, Mark 1. 5. *confession before faith*, Romans 10. 9. *if the place in* Mark *must be so closely stuck to without comparing it with the Scriptures of the old Testament, then we must preach the Gospel to Dogs, Cats, &c. since it is expresly said preach the Gospel to every creature.*

Answ. 1. That if it follow not that every thing set before is first in order of time or nature, yet what is first appointed to be done in the solemn institution of Sacraments, is to be done first, as taking, blessing, breaking bread, before eating, so teaching the baptized afore baptizing as the Apostles practice shews, who best understood Christs appointment. As believing upon preaching is to go before salvation, so baptizing ordinarily and regularly

ly (for which I now contend) and yet in special cases as persons may be saved without personal actual believing upon preaching, so without baptism. To avoid the inference of preaching to Beasts, we need not go to the old Testament *Mat.* 28.19. *Col.* 1.23.&c. yield sufficient light to shew, that by [*every creature*] is meant all nations of men, or Gentiles, as well as Jews.

But (saith Mr. *Cobbet*) *if it be absurd to say the Gospel is preached to little ones, what shall we say of Christs speech* Mat. 19.14. Deut.30.6. Acts 2.38,39. Luke 1.76?

I answer, This may be said, that all these are frivolously alleged to prove that Christ should appoint the Gospel to be preached to infants (which were to make Christ as ridiculous as the Legends do *Francis* the Fryer) sith none of them mention any speech or preaching to little infants, though some of the speeches are of or concerning infants. As for what he further adds, *It was no absurdity that infants were circumcised, Christ laid his hands on infants, Peters feet were washed, though these acts were not then understood.* I grant it, and say, if Christ appointed infants to be baptized, I should not count it an absurdity, but sith his express institution is, that teaching should go before baptizing, till that order be shewed to be altered, it is a prophane abuse of the ordinance of baptism to baptize those who are not taught.

Mr. *Blake Vindic. fœderis page* 243. speaks thus, *This is the weakest of all arguments, to reason for a precedency of one before another from the order in which they are placed in Scripture, so we may say* John *baptized before he preached the baptism of repentance, for his baptizing is mentioned before preaching of baptism* Mark 1.4. *So we may say we must have glory first and vertue after, for so they are placed by the Apostle,* 2 *Peter* 1.3.

Answ. Though in Histories of facts sometimes things are set down last which were done first, yet in setting down institutions, order and every circumstance is observed, so as thence to conclude it irregular not to observe the order used in the primitive institution, 1 *Cor.*10.16. *the cup of blessing* is mentioned before *the bread we break*, and yet it would be counted a disorder and sinful to administer the wine before the bread, because in the mention of the institution the three Evangelists and *Paul* observe exactly the order

order as well as the use of the elements, as delivered by the Lord. In like manner when Christ appoints, and the constant practice of the Apostles expounds his words thus, that first persons be made disciples and believers, and then be baptized, sure it is an act of transgression of Christs command to do it otherwise, especially considering that by so doing the prime and chief end of baptism, to wit, to signify the baptized persons engagement to repentance and faith in Christ, is thereby evacuated.

Mr. *Blake* saith *Vindic. fœderis pag.* 136. *God is a God of order, and he will have order observed,* & p. 164 *God will not suffer that disorder that the leading Sacrament should come after.*

I may more truly say, God will not suffer the disorder of Mr. *Bl.* to have baptism go before and faith follow, when by *necessity of precept*, as he speaks there, Christ having instituted it and commanded it, discipleship and believing are put before baptism *Mat.* 28.19. *Mark* 16.15,16. and the Apostles so taught and practised *Acts* 2. 38. 41. & 8. 12. 37. & 10 47, 48. & 11. 17. & 16. 15, 33, 34. & 18. 8. Glory is put before Vertue 2 *Peter* 1.3. without disorder, if either the meaning be as *Heinsius* in his Preface to his *Aristarchus sacer* on *Nonnus* conceives, he hath called us by his glorious power, or if the ordinary reading be retained, though Vertue be before glory, yet we are called to glory first as the end, and then to vertue as the means, the end being first in intention, though last in execution.

There is another exception which I counted in my *Examen* p. 126. a very absurd one, and such as I presumed none that had any wit would entertain it, to wit that making disciples *Matth.* 28. 19. is to be by baptizing them, and yet Mr. *M.* in his *Defence* pag. 212. goes about to maintain that *the Jewes children were discipled when circumcised*, & *pag.* 213. *that baptizing may be well rendred discipling*, and allegeth *Spanheimius* for it. Mr. *Hussey* vents it as very remarkable and advantagious to prove infant-baptism. But against this toy I argued in my *Examen* page 131. 127.

1. No *Lexicon*, nor I thought expositor do expound [μαθητεύσατε *make disciples*] that is circumcise or baptize them.

2. That the word plainly signifies so to teach as that the persons taught

taught do learn and accordingly professe the things taught.

To this Mr. *M.* replies, 1. *That better Criticks than my self say that μαθητὰς ποιεῖν is a Rabbinick phrase, and from their use of it it is best to be understood, and that with them it signifies to admit scholars, not because they were taught, but that they might be taught.*

Answ. But Mr. *M.* neither names the *Criticks*, nor brings proof for what they say, nor if it were all granted would serve his purpose to prove that ever [disciple ye] is as much as [circumcise ye, baptize ye] I grant there is great use to be made of the *Talmuds* and *Rabbins* in expounding many passages in the New Testament, but in expounding this term there is no need of using them, when the use of it in other places, and comparing it with other Scriptures are sufficient to cleer it, yet if Mr. *Ms. Criticks* look over all the *Talmuds* and *Rabbins* I presume they will not find one passage wherein the making of a disciple or admitting of a Scholar was ever applyed to an infant. And though Mr. *Hussey* ridiculously tell us of *taking children to School, and counting them for Scholars, who carry a hornbook to School, though they be put there only to play and keep them from harm*, yet neither do any so admit as Scholars infants of a day or eight days old, nor is [a Scholar] all one with [a disciple] the latter word being from learning, the other from vacation from other imployment that he may learn, nor is making a disciple all one with admitting a Scholar.

Rightly saith *Beeman: Exercit. Theol.* 17. *pag.* 260. *verbum μαθητεύειν (quod omnes libenter admittunt) ex nativa origine est discipulos facere μαθητὰς. Atqui hoc ipsum non nisi accedente doctrina fit. Qui enim discit tanquam μαθητὴς ab alio ex ratione τῶν πρός τι dicitur itaq; discipuli sunt qui docentur & discunt. pag.* 261. *nec ulli discipuli sunt nisi qui docentur. Dum igitur Christus Apostolos jubet μαθητεύειν ante omnia & quidem de necessitate jubet docere.*

But 3. Mr. *M.* refers me with a blind direction to *Spanheimius* to consult with, which however I have done, as I find his words *Dub. Evang. part.* 3. *dub.* 27. and I say as in my *Apology* page 100. besides the mention of his words there need no other refutation.

For

For 1. it is false, that [*to make disciples*] *signifies the end of their sending, and not the act they were to do*, whereas it plainly notes the first act they were to do: and if it had been the end of the act of baptizing and teaching, it should have been thus [baptize and teach them all things, ἵνα that ye may make all nations disciples.]

2. *Spanheimius* there makes [μαθητεύσατε *make disciples*] to answer to [ποιεῖ μαθητὰς *he maketh disciples, John* 4. 1.] But there it is another thing than baptizing, for making disciples and baptizing are knit together as two distinct things, and the making disciples there was by preaching, as the story of the Evangelist shews, therefore making disciples *Matthew* 28. 19. is by preaching, and is not barely baptizing.

3. His own words do refute the reason of his analysis. For he allegeth this reason, because *if* τὸ μαθητεύειν *should simply signify only to teach, there would be found a tautology in Christs words thus; Go teach all Nations, baptizing them, teaching them.* But this absurdity is not avoided by his own exposition. For he himself saith, *non significat solum docere, sed & discipulos facere*, now if it signifie at all to teach the tautology is alike, if we say, Go, not only teach, but also make disciples baptizing them, teaching them, for by his own words teaching is twice commanded. Nevertheless in my exposition (commonly received) there is no tautology, Go, make by teaching or preaching the Gospel (that Jesus is the Christ) disciples, so as that they learn him to be the Messias, and profess him, as Mr. *M.* expounds *John* 9. 27. *will ye be his disciples?* and then baptize them, and after teach them to observe all that I have commanded. So that here is a double teaching injoined, one to preach or teach them the Gospel, that Jesus is the Christ, as *Philip* did the Eunuch, *Acts* 8. 36, 37. and then baptize, and then teach duties commanded by Christ. And for what *Spanheimius* saith, *That this may in its manner be fitted to infants. For when parents do give their names to Christ for themselves and their families, their whole house is discipled, their children as well as themselves*, it is false. For then if a parent give his name to Christ for himself and his family,

and the whole house is discipled, thereby it will follow, that the wife, child, servant, though infidels, are discipled, and so infidels should be Christs disciples. But no where is in Scripture any made a disciple but by his own act of learning. As for what Mr. *M.* adds to shew *that without teaching first, by initiating into a Master a person may become a disciple*, it is insufficient to that end. For 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. though all *our Fathers be said to be baptized into Moses*, yet not to be discipled, and the term ἐμαθητευσα *was discipled*, *Matth.* 27. 57. doth not note a bare entring into Christs School without teaching or hearing of Christ, much less such an initiating as they give to infants without any act of their own, and *John* 9. 27. Mr. *M.* himself paraphaseth thus, *will ye be his disciples, will ye profess him?* which is an act of their own, of which infants are not ordinarily capable, and it supposeth some teaching and learning, at least this, that Jesus is the Christ.

2. I argued from *Mark* 16. 15. to which our Translators refer in the margin at *Matthew* 28. 19. as clearing the meaning of it, and generally interpreters shew thence how they were appointed to make disciples, to wit, by preaching the Gospel, and so Mr. *M. Sermon page* 35. *Express command there is that they should teach the heathen and the Jews, and make them disciples, and then baptize them*, and *Defence page* 210. *Their commission was to preach and baptize*, and hereupon from *Matth.* 28. 19. is gathered, that none are to baptize but preachers. Whence I argue, If the making disciples were to be by preaching the Gospel to them who were made disciples, then by making disciples is not meant baptizing, nor baptizing to be rendered discipling. For baptizing and preaching the Gospel are not all one; But the making disciples is appointed to be and was by preaching the Gospel to them who were made disciples; *Ergo* discipling is not by baptizing.

3. I argued from *John* 4. 1. in which it is confessed by the *New Annot. edit.* 1. on *Mat.* 28. 19. [*made disciples and baptized*] answer to [*make disciples baptizing them Mat.* 28. 19.] now *John* 4. 1. making disciples is one thing, and baptizing is another thing, though coupled with it; therefore the making disciples is not baptizing, but a distinct thing.

4.

4. The Commission of Christ is to be understood according to the Apostles practice, unless we will say that either they understood not, or followed not Christs appointment; But their practice was *to make disciples first by preaching, and then to baptize, and no other mentioned*, as Mr. *M.* grants in his *Sermon page* 44. *Ergo.* I truly said, nor need Mr. *M. wonder at it*, or call it *a wild consequence*, as he doth *Defence* page 214. that if the Apostles had understood Christs Commission as Mr. *M.* doth, baptize according to the rule of circumcising, they might have saved a great deal of labour in preaching to the baptized afore they baptized them, and in baptizing females, sith the rule of circumcising did not require either. And though I grant it to be true, *that male and female are all one*, yet in the rule of circumcising a difference is made, and if that be the rule of baptizing infants, then in baptizing them male infants should be baptized and not female.

5. If making disciples be by baptizing without preaching before to the baptized, then non-preaching ministers may and do baptize rightly though they preach not the Gospel; But this I suppose will be denyed by Mr. *M. Ergo.*

6. If making disciples be by baptizing without preaching to them, then the *Spaniards* in *America* who drove the *Indians* into the water to be baptized, without teaching them or preaching the Gospel to them, did rightly, For they followed Christs rule thus expounded; But that is absurd; *Ergo.*

7. Mr. *M.* and other Pædobaptists say that the commission *Mat.* 28. 19. was the commission for first constituting the Churches of the Gentiles: If then the Comission be to be understood, make ye disciples by baptizing them, without first preaching to them, then he had appointed them to constitute or plant the first Churches without preaching, and then the Apostles gifts of tongues &c. were unnecessary, they might have constituted Churches by hands, baptizing them only without the use of those gifts; but these things are absurd, besides other absurd consequences w^ch follow on the exposition that discipling is baptizing, or baptizing discipling, *Mat.* 28. 19.

Lastly many of their own grants and expositions before recited do so cross this conceit, that as I said before, I thought none that had any wit would embrace it, so now I wonder that such men as have taken it up did not better make use of their wit, to

decline so witlesse a shift. Onely I perceive any thing will serve turn to keep up the credit of Infant sprinkling.

SECT. IX.

The exception of Mr. M. *Mr.* Blake, *Mr.* Cobbet, *nations are appointed to be baptized* Matthew 28. 19. *and so infants, is refelled.*

But there is yet another exception against my argument from *Matthew* 28. 19. followed by many, that *Christ bids them make nations disciples and baptize nations, & consequently infants at least the species.*

Against this I opposed, that all nations simply are not appointed to be baptized, but disciples of all nations. So *Beza annot.* on Matthew 28. 19. *Make to me disciples out of all nations. The New Annotations on the Bible* on *Matth.* 28. 19. first edition, *teach*] Gr. *make disciples of, as* John 4. 1. *all Nations, not Jews alone but Gentiles also,* Acts 10. 34, 35, 47. Mr. *Baxter plain scripture proof &c. pag.* 327. *when Christ saith* [*make me disciples of all nations baptizing them*] *he means* [*sincere disciples*] *Georg. Pasor Lexic. ad verbum* μαθητεύω Matthew 28. verse 19. μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, *docete omnes gentes, h.e. colligite mihi discipulos ex omnibus gentibus.*

Mr. *Blake* himself saith, *Answer to my letter ch.* 11. *sect.* 1. *he is ready to subscribe to this interpretation as I lay it down in words by preaching the Gospel to all nations make them disciples, and baptize those that do become disciples of all nations.* As for his exceptions, *that the verb is transitive, that* ἔθνη *nations is in the accusative case, that it is boldness to put it into the Genitive, that then the whole of the nation should not be appointed to be baptized, and so not infants,* I have answered them in my *Postscript sect.* 14. And I further prove that the nation entirely is not appointed to be baptized.

1. For then the infidels of the nation should be to be baptized, for they are a part of the nation.

2.

2. Then the Apostles were not to baptize regularly till they baptized a whole nation, yea all nations together, for so it is construed by them who make nations entirely the subject of baptism according to Christs institution.

3. The Apostles practice is an infallible comment on our Lord Christs words. As they practised, so Christ meant; But they baptized not any entire Nation, Countrey, City, or Tribe, but believers or disciples out of them; therefore no other were appointed to be baptized. 4. If the baptizing of all the parts of a nation, or a nation entirely, were appointed by Christ, then there might be some rule to know when a nation is discipled, chosen, so as that it ought to be entirely baptized; But there is no such rule, *Ergo*.

To none of these do I find any thing replyed by Mr. *M.* but by telling me *I fall to my old artifice of framing many senses* (which yet in this point were but two) for which he blames me, as if it were blameable: whereas it is the only way to cleer truth to shew the divers senses of a speech, for avoiding of ambiguity, according to that saying, *Qui benè distinguit benè docet, he that distinguisheth well teacheth well*, and his not distinctly answering by shewing in what sense his speech is meant tends to nothing but the hiding of truth.

Then he tells me, *That I vent my Criticisms, and undertake to shew that* μαθητεύσατε *signifies to teach* cum effectu, *or to teach till they were made Scholars* (my word was disciples) *and that they were not to baptize till they were disciples, and then saith, But Sir, what need all these things? The meaning is plain that other nations should be taken in likewise as the Jewes according to Isaiah* 19. 24. *when other nations should by receiving and professing the Gospel come under Gods wing, they should partake of the same Covenant which the Jews had before enjoyed, he would henceforth be the God of them and their seed.*

Whereto I reply, 1. That in his upbraiding me with venting my Criticisms, as he calls them, about the word [*disciple ye*] he excepts against me for doing that which was necessary to be done, to wit, to cleer the meaning of the word, by which the sense of the text is manifested.

2. When he should answer the thing I alleged and proved,

that

that nations are not appointed to be baptized without any other circumscription, but disciples or believers in them, he repeats his dictates as obscurely as before, bringing a text impertinently, which doth not at all say, that all the nation of *Egypt*, that is, every man, woman, and child, that is an *Egyptian*, shall be his people, but *such as know the Lord, do sacrifise, vow a vow, return to the Lord*, verse 21, 22. which was fulfilled either when after the return from captivity, in *Babylon*, many of the *Egyptians* became Jewish proselytes, who were very probably many when *Ptolomy Philadelphus* appointed the Bible to be translated into *Greek*, as *Josephus l.* 12. *Antiq. c.* 2. relates, or if it were fulfilled in the time of the Gospel, the stories of the Church refute that conceit, that the whole nation of *Egypt* were a national Christian Church, as the Jews before Christs comming, so as that all the people, men, women and children were Christians, though it be true that God had his Church at *Alexandria* in *Egypt* somewhat early, of which *Mark* is said to have been Bishop (of which more may be seen in *Selden* on *Eutychius*) and if that passage 1 *Pet.* 5. 13. *The Church that is at Babylon elect together with you*, be meant of *Babylon* in *Egypt*, it is plain that the Church there was an elect company chosen out from the rest, and therefore not the whole City, men, women and children, and consequently not a nation entirely; nor is there a word either in *Matthew* 28. 19. or in the places Mr. *M.* compares with it *Mark* 16. 15. *Gal.* 3. 8, 9. *Rom.* 1. 16, 17. or *Acts* 11. 18. to prove that any other of the nations should partake of the Covenant the Jewes before had enjoyed, than those that receive the Gospel, believe and repent, or that they that believe should partake of the promises of the Covenant as it was national, and contained the promises made to *Abrahams* natural seed, or that he would henceforth be the God of the Nations professing the Gospel, and their seed: But the texts all of them prove plainly that the term [*nations Mat.* 28. 19.] is limited to those of the nations, that were disciples, or *did believe*, *Mark* 16. 16. that *did repent*, *Acts* 11. 18. *that believe*, *Romans* 1. 16, 17. As for *Gal.* 3. 8. I admire that not only Mr. *M.* but also the *Assembly at Westminster* in their *Confession of faith* chap. 28. art. 4. to prove *the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized*, should

cite

cite *Geneſis* 17. 7, 9. with *Gal.* 3. 9, 14. which if it were alleged any thing to their purpoſe to include infants as *Geneſis* 17. 7, 9. then [nations] muſt be taken to comprehend all of the nation, and [*the bleſſing of Abraham*] meant of viſible Church-membership: wheras the text expreſly expounds [*all nations*] to be meant of them [*which be of faith*] and [*the bleſſing*] to be [*juſtification, and the promiſe of the Spirit through faith*] inferring from thence, that *God would juſtifie the heathen through faith*. Yea it is ſo frequent to underſtand the term [nations] ſynecdochically for a part of nations, that I find no fewer than eighty times, and of theſe at leaſt eight in *Matthews Goſpel*, the word [ἔθνη nations or Gentiles] in the New Teſtament, taken ſo as not to include infants, in the ſpeeches in which it is uſed. But of this I have ſaid enough in my *Præcurſor ſect.* 22. in my *Poſtſcript* to M. *Bl.* f. 14. M. *B.* in his *Præſeſt. Morat.* f. 22. ſaith, *that my ſpeech he excepts againſt* [that no one Countrey were diſcipled] *was meant by me not onely of a paſt event, but alſo of a duty, that it is not the Miniſters duty to endeavour the diſcipling of any whole nation (for then he muſt endeavour to diſciple infants) nor a part of the work of that commiſſion*; and this I confeſs is true, and I ſtill think it; yea if it were as Mr. *B.* would have it, that Chriſt had bid them diſciple the whole nations, even infants, then he had bid them preach the Goſpel to infants, which had been a command of a man not in his wits, and which the Apoſtles never obeyed, and therefore I muſt blaſpheme Chriſt if I expound the words as Mr. *B.* doth; nor doth any promiſe of Chriſt foretel that he will make the whole of a nation, even the infants, diſciples. What is in his addition *page* 339, 340. I know not: I had thought I had all his addition to his third edition when I had his *Friendly accommodation*, and his *Præſeſtinantis morator*; what the reaſon is I know not, but I cannot yet get his additions: yet I conceive in his addition there is but a greater heap of impertinent texts.

He ſaith of me, *As for what he ſaith of* Moſes *and Magiſtrates, if you peruſe what I have ſaid to that already, I think it will appear that he is no where more vertiginous than in this.*

To which I anſwer, I ſaid that if Chriſt would have had a whole

whole nation made his Church as the nation of the Jews was, comprehending old and young he had used Emperours and Kings to gather his Church as he did Moses to gather the Jewish Church in the Wilderneſſe by his authority, not Apoſtles and Preachers by perſwaſion. What he ſaith to it in his firſt edition, ſhall be (God aſſiſting) in its place fully anſwered, I may more truly ſay that in this conceit of his, that Chriſt ſhould bid the Apoſtles diſciple infants, there is giddineſs, if not an higher degree of folly. And my ſpeech is ſo agreeable to reaſon, that if I be vertiginous in it, I ſhall then begin to turn Sceptique, and queſtion whether any thing be certain.

As for what Mr. *Blake* ſaith about the rule of knowing a choſen believing nation, giving title to infants of that nation to be baptized as the Jewiſh infants were circumciſed, I think there is no need to add any more to what I ſay in the *Poſtſcript* ſ. 15. ſith he confeſſeth page 67. *as the nations are diſcipled, ſo they are to be baptized, and the infants of a nation are baptized by vertue of a privilege from their parents, not from the nation:* Though Mr. *Rutherfords* words *Temperate plea ch.* 12. *concl.* 1. *arg.* 7. *Due right of Presbyteries ch.* 4. *ſect.* 6. *p.* 1. 260, 261. *do intimate that the children in a choſen nation are holy with the holineſs of the choſen nation, though father and mother be as wicked as the Jewes that ſlew Chriſt,* who were certainly unbelievers, and they muſt ſtand to this if either they will juſtify the ordinary practice of baptizing any infants of any Atheiſtical, profane Scoffers, Perſecutors, & Blaſphemers of God and Religion, if they were baptized in infancy and are called Chriſtians, or ſtand to their principle, that the commiſſion is to baptize all nations in the ſame latitude that the Jewes infants were to be circumciſed, which was and ought to be done, though the parents were ſuch as *Ahab* and *Jezabel.* But however thoſe of the Congregational way, who ſay *we are freed from the pædagogy of the Jewes, and deny that now there are national Churches by inſtitution as the Jews were, and that it is ſufficient now to make a member of the Church becauſe one is by birth of this or any other nation, as then it was, becauſe one was born of the nation of the Jewes,* as Mr. *Burroughs vindic.* againſt Mr. *Edwards aſperſions pag.* 23. me thinks ſhould reject the interpretation of

making

making disciples all nations, in like wise as the one nation of the Jews were circumcised, which was by vertue of their birth, according to Gods appointment, as descended from *Abraham*, or as joined to that people.

Yet Mr. *Cobbet Just vindic. part* 2. *ch.* 3. *s.* 4. argues thus. *All nations are the subject to be discipled and baptized by commission, and therefore at least all the specifical parts of the nations, all sorts of persons in the nations, but not all of every sort.*

To which I reply, The consequence is not of any validity, all nations, therefore all sorts of the nations, It follows not, *all nations shall serve him*, therefore all sorts of the nations, *all nations compassed me about*, therefore every sort of persons in a nation.

But, saith Mr. *Cobbet*, *I would know then why the collective nations are mentioned under that title of nations rather than that of grown persons of the nations.*

To which I answer, the reason is because the thing said, sufficiently shews who of the nations are meant, and it is very frequent to restrain the extent of speeches *pro subjecta materia*, as the matter spoken of will bear it with truth and sense. And that this is usual in the use of the term [nations] is shewed before.

As for what Mr. *William Cook* saith in his *Font uncovered* page 14. *children are not to be excluded* Mat. 28. 19. *because children are a very considerable and essential part of a nation*, it is frivolous, For

1. If he mean by children infants, it is false that infants are an essential part of a nation, it is possible there may be a nation which may have for some time never an infant in it.

2. If it were true, yet it is not to his purpose till he proves that [*nations Mat.* 28. 19.] is not taken synecdochically for a part of the nations, those that are of age to understand preaching of the Gospel, but that it must comprehend every essential part in its full latitude.

And in like sort Mr. *Nathanael Stephens* his reasons taken not from the text, but from his own conceit, *That* [*nations*] *must be taken as* [*nation*] *was in the application of it to the Jewish Church, and that otherwise there should be a shortning of the Covenant*, they have been often answered and shewed to proceed upon such mistakes as these, that the Church of Christians was to be modelized after the fashion of the Jewes, and the use of

baptiſm was to ſeal ſuch a national Covenant, and that title to a Covenant made by God gives right to baptiſm. And for his inſtances page 9. of his *Precept for infant-baptiſm*, to infringe our argument from *John* 4. 1. to prove that *Mat.* 28. 19. only diſciples actually made are the ſubject appointed to be baptized, they all proceed upon a miſtake of the reaſon, as if from the example there were gathered an univerſal rule, whereas it is onely brought, Firſt to explain the meaning of the phraſes *Mat.* 28. 19. of making diſciples and baptizing them. Secondly, that example is brought not by it ſelf alone (as Mr. *Stephens* brings it) but together with the inſtitution, and all the examples in the New Teſtament to prove infant-baptiſm irregular, but his ſingle inſtances do not infer. And whereas page 10, 11. he takes on him *to ſhew a certain rule to know a diſcipled nation*, he ſhould have added initiating infants of that nacion to baptiſm, and ſets down *their publique profeſſion*, he cleers not the difficulty, except he tell what profeſſion and whoſe makes it a publique profeſſion, whether when the repreſentative of it profeſſeth, or the King, or the Major part, or every perſon of underſtanding, and if he mean theſe wayes or any other, how he can acquit the Apoſtles from ſwerving from Chriſts rule, never looking after any other than perſonal profeſſion, nor baptizing any infant upon his imagined rule, and if as he ſpeaks, *as the parents do now receive the faith, ſo far they and theirs muſt go under the account of a diſcipled nation, if they profeſs to bring up theirs in the faith*, then though the children and ſervants be profeſſed infidels, yet the parents and maſters being believers, and promiſing to educate theirs in Chriſtianity, theſe ſhall be baptizable becauſe part of a diſcipled nation; And when he ſaith, *Not only the families of thoſe that truly believe, but the families of others alſo that are willing to yield to the Chriſtian education, and to live under the tuition of a Godly Magiſtracy in the Commonwealth, and the inſtruction of a powerful Miniſtery in the Church; ſo far forth as they are willing to be guided by the Lawes, and the Government of the Church of Chriſt, and are no worſe, ſo far they muſt go under the notion of a diſcipled nation: and parents and children both be the lawful ſubjects of baptiſm.* He ſpeaks nothing but riddles leaving it to his Reader to ſtudy what he means by ſo many [*ſo fars*] whether

he

he thinks all these do amount to a profession of the faith, whether these do make a man a Christian compleat, or onely an half Christian, what he means by [*and are no worse*] and how such a submission, as for ought I can perceive may stand with grosse ignorance of Christ, and at some times, as in *Constantines* and *Theodosius* his times was in *Pagans*, afore the Inquisition in *Spain* in many *Jews* and *Saracens*, and is at this day in *Spain*, yea and *England* in many that know nothing of Christianity, nor have any savour of the faith of Christ, can make a discipled nation, and entitle to baptism, not shewing any Scripture for what he saith, but *Abrahams* circumcising, *Gen.* 17. 12, 17. which how impertinent it is to this point of baptism, is, and shall be more fully shewed hereafter.

But I am necessitated yet to say something more to my teasing, and eager Antagonist Mr. *Blake*, who speaks thus *Vindic. fœd. pag.* 194. *Mr.* T. *in his Apology sect.* 14. *pag.* 143. *would fain fasten another interpretation on these words, and make the Commission not to sound according to the Letter of the words, nor yet according to the successe by grace attained, but to his liking and therefore is put to it to change the word* μαθητεύσατε *into* ποιεῖτε μαθητὰς, *& then all nations must either be put by apposition* ποιεῖτε μαθητὰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, *or with the preposition* ποιεῖτε μαθητὰς ἐν πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν, *and so instead of disciple all nations, it will be make disciples in all nations. This he thinks is very tolerable, because to disciple and to make disciples is all one. But though they may be one in themselves, yet it makes a main difference in the phrase, and with the additions of his preposition inverts the whole meaning of the words, as to the thing in controversie, which is such a violence offered to the Text, that is not to be endured in him, that is about to draw a Logical argument for his advantage against his adversary.*

Answ. What I do in expounding Christs words is not onely tolerable, but necessary to be done to cleer the meaning of them. I do no more than *Beza*, the *New Annot.* and others. Mr. *Blake* me thinks allowes my exposition in these words a little before. *The Apostles were to make disciples, to bring men into Covenant with God, and being discipled to baptize them, sealing them as Gods in Covenant; So John* 4. 1, 2. *when the Lord*

knew that the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than Iohn, though Iesus baptized not, but his disciples. Here John *made disciples & baptized them being made, the disciples of Jesus made disciples, and baptized them being made; an outward work then to make profession of the faith is sufficient to make one a disciple and to bring him into the verge of the Covenant.* In which he plainly asserts, that Christ appointed and the Apostles practised the making disciples by an outward work to make profession of faith, and baptized them so made. Now if this be the meaning of Mr. *Blake*, I see not wherein there needs be difference between us. For whether we read make disciples all nations, or make disciples of or in all nations, and this making disciples by an outward work, and profession of faith upon that outward work are that which makes one a disciple, and these are to be baptized that are thus made disciples, I shall not stick to yield that Christ appointed, and the Apostles practised by the outward work of preaching to make disciples by the outward work of profession of faith, the whole of all nations, and baptized them wholly being made disciples by profession of faith. And I mean this as *Pareus* on *Mat.* 28.19. *Tertium mandatum est de baptizandis omnibus gentibus, hoc est sacramento baptismi initiandis & consecrandis omnibus iis qui Christo nomen darent.* And herein I make the Commission to sound according to the letter, and according to the success by grace attained, without the least interverting the whole meaning of the words, without any violence offered to the text. Nor do I expect any thing in this matter to be indured in me but what I find agreeable to speeches of *Beza*, *Pareus*, the *New Annot.* and M. *Blake* himself.

Yea but the text is to be expounded so as to comprehend every age of men, and the term [all nations] is to comprehend the whole of every nation.

Answ. It is clear by comparing *Mat.* 28.19. with *Mark* 16.15. that [*make disciples all nations*] answers to [*preach the Gospel to every creature*] which later term is in shew more comprehensive then [*make disciples all nations*] But I suppose Mr. *Bl.* will not be so absurd as to conceive that any other than of humane kind are meant thereby, nor that any other of them are meant thereby than those that were capable of hearing and understanding it, me thinks he should not conceive Christ bid them preach the Gos-

Gospel to every deaf man, every natural fool, or mad man that have at no time use of reason, or men that wilfully would not hear: yea methinks Mr. *Bl.* should yield further, that when Christ bids them preach the Gospel to every man that is fit to hear, he did not intend to charge them, that they must preach the Gospel so as that every intelligent person of mankind in the world must hear it from their mouth: For then it had bin their sin being a breach of Christs cõmand, if every person of natural understanding, whether of Jews or Gentiles, did not hear the Gospel from them; which must have tied them either to sin, or else to search out every Countrey, Continent, or Island be it never so small, every house in every City, village, wilderness, and to preach Christ to them, wherever they were, which had been according to the course of ordinary humane abilities altogether impossible for them to do. I conceive Mr. *Bl.* will yield that in what sense it is meant *Col.* 1.23. *the Gospel was preached to every creature under heaven*, that is it was preached to all sorts of persons that were hearers without difference of Jews or Gentiles, in the same sense Christ bids them [preach the Gospel to every creature] & [make disciples all nations] being the same command as the comparing the texts shews. If [every creature] be not meant of every creature universally and distributively, but of any sort or number of men indefinitely, to whom they might and it was fit to preach, in like manner in the same command thus expressed [disciple all nations] by [all nations] are not meant *omnes gentes totaliter totæ*, all nations whole and wholly, but any persons indifferently in any nation whom they might, and were fit to be made disciples by preaching, and to baptize them that were professing disciples of Christ so made, which is the only sense that the success by grace attained to makes good. Neither did the Apostles in the event preach the Gospel to every humane person capable of hearing and understanding, they came not to every Village, Isle, civil or barbarous, sure not to every house, yea sometimes they were restrained, as *Paul* from preaching in *Asia*, *Bithynia*, *Acts* 16. 6, 7. nor was there ever by the Apostles or any other the Gospel preached so successfully as that there was ever one whole nation, I mean *totaliter totæ*, comprehending every individual humane person of that nation, discipled thereby, so as that every one of the nation, not one excepted, did

upon

upon hearing the Gospel, freely, or of their own accord, soberly, or in their right wits, seriously, or not in jest, understandingly, or knowing what they spake, become disciples of Jesus, confessing him to be the Christ the Son of the living God.

But Mr. *Blake* goes on *Vindic. fœderis* pag. 195. [" And as it is against the letter of the text, so it is plainly against our Saviours scope and end in giving this Commission. Mr. *T. Examen page* 130. saith, This enlargement unto all nations in this place was in opposition to the restriction *Mat.* 10. 5. now in that nation to which there they were limited, the whole of the nation was in covenant, all the Land was the Land of *Immanuel*, *Isa.* 8. 8. And consequently so it was to be in other nations by vertue of this happy inlargement, or else the opposition is utterly taken away, the meaning of the words clouded, and the Apostles at a losse for understanding of them; for having spent their pains before in a nation all disciples, and now having a commission for the discipling of all nations, how shall they understand the words, unlesse the whole of the nation where they come are to be discipled? "]

Answ. The nation in which the Apostles according to the commission *Mat.* 10. 5, 6. before spent their pains, were the people of Israel, and to say *that nation were all disciples*, understanding it of disciples of Christ, and of every person of that nation, is to say the snow is black; For the contrary is manifest by expresse Scripture *John* 1. 11. & 7. 5, 48. & 9. 28, 29. & 10. 20. & 12. 37, 38. But, saith he, *The whole of the nation was in Covenant*, I grant that the whole of the nation were in the Covenants at *Horeb*, *Exodus* 19. and in the plains of *Moab* by *Moses* his edicts from God *Deu.* 29. But what is this to prove that the Apostles spent their pains in a nation all disciples, every person or persons, even the infants of that nation were disciples of Christ. Were all of the Jewish nation when the Apostles preached to them, disciples of Christ, because in *Moses* his time many hundreds of years before all were engaged in the covenants at *Horeb*, and the plains of *Moab* by *Moses* authority? It is but a new non-sense gibberish to make these terms synonimous to be disciples of Christ, and to be in covenant according to the manner of the Jewes being in covenant. And the reason of

Mr.

Mr. *Blake* is as frivolous, *All the Land was the Land of* Immanuel, *Isaiah* 8.8. therefore *The whole of the nation were in covenant, that nation were all disciples* of Christ.

For first it is plain that [*the Land of Immanuel*] there is not the people, but the ground or earth they inhabited, because it is that, *The breadth of which the King of Assyria did fill with his wings*, that is his forces, and *did pass through*.

2. How doth Mr. *Blake* prove that it was called *The Land of* Immanuel, because *the whole of the nation was in Covenant*? It might be called *Immanuels* land, when the *Assyrians, Chaldaans*, and other strangers inhabited it, *Israel* being expelled, because of Gods title to it, and the people might and shall be in covenant when they shall not be in the Land.

3. But it is in my apprehension a meer whimzy, to infer the whole of the nation was in covenant in *Isaiahs* days, therefore the nation of the Jewes were all disciples of Christ when the Apostles spent their pains in preaching according to the commission *Mat.* 10.5,6.

4. There is no less dotage in the rest of his frivolous speech, that it ["is plainly against out Saviours scope and end in giving the commission Mat. 28. 19. to understand, make disciples in (*I said of*) all nations, that if the whole of the nation be not in covenant in other nations as in the Land of *Immanuel* by vertue of this happy enlargement, the opposition is utterly taken away, the meaning of the words clouded, and the Apostles at a losse for the understanding of them. "]

All which are but vain words. The meaning is plain enough, as I conceive, it was understood so by the Apostles, and hath been so by Expositors, as I have shewed; even by the chiefest of the Pædobaptists, without any such construction as Mr. *Blake* makes.

Mr. *Blake* goes on thus. ["And hereto accord the prophecies of the Scripture, for the calling of the nations of the Gentiles, God shall enlarge *Iaphet*, and he shall dwell in the tents of *Sem*, *Gen.*9.27. *Sem* was wholly in covenant not by pieces and parcells, but universally in covenant, *Iaphet* is to come in succession into covenant in like latitude; *Psal.*28. Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance and the uttermost

most parts of the Earth for thy possession. It is not some among the nations of the heathen that are to be the inheritance of Christ, but the heathen. To which agrees *Revel.* 11. 15. The Kingdomes of the Earth shall become the Kingdomes of the Lord and of his Christ; *Immanuel* of old had one, now he shall have more Kingdomes; And they become his no other way, than by discipling; Gods Ministers are his men of War for subduing and captivating them, 2 *Cor.* 10. 4, 5. and Kingdoms are promised them, not some in a Kingdom. *Alexander* would not sit down with such a conquest, neither would Jesus Christ. If to possess some in a Kingdome be to possess a Kingdom, then Antichrist of long time hath had his Kingdom; All Kings shall bow down before him, all Nations shall serve him, *Psal.* 72. 11. All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee O Lord, and shall glorify thy name, *Psal.* 86. 9. Thou shalt call a nation which thou knowest not, and nations that knew not thee shall run unto thee, *Isaiah* 55. 5. There God calls the nation, and the nation doth answer Gods call. In that day Israel shall be a third with *Egypt*, and with *Assyria*, even a blessing in the midst of the Land, whom the Lord shall blesse, saying, Blessed be *Egypt* my people, and *Assyria* the work of my hands, and *Israel* my inheritance. There *Egypt* and *Assyria* are in equipage with *Israel*, all three sister-Churches; *Israel* without any prehemінence, either Israel then was not a nation of Disciples, a nation wholly within covenant, or else there are to be national Churches, the whole of the nation to be discipled and brought into Covenant. ,,]

Answ. Mr. *Blake* saith, *The prophecies of Scripture accord hereto, that* Mat. 28. 19. *they were to make all in a nation disciples, the whole of the nation was to be discipled, and that the words were not otherwise to be understood.* If this reason were of force, where any thing is said of the nation it must be understood of the whole of the nation, of every person in it or of it, even the infants. Which how monstrous and wild a conceit it is will appear by multitudes of instances. Matth. 21. 43. *The Kingdom of God shall be given to a nation* (contradistinguished to the Jews) *bringing forth the fruits of it*: If Mr. *Blake* say right, there is a prophecy of a nation, the whole whereof every particular

particular, even infans ſhould bring forth the fruits of the Kingdome of God, *Mat.*24.9. *Ye ſhall be hated of all nations for my name ſake*, that is, the whole of all the nations, and if ſo, then of the Chriſtians even themſelves, who are a part of the nations. Beſides, if this were the meaning, the prophecy of Chriſt would be contradictory to the prophecies Mr. *Blake* brings, in the latitude in which he expounds the word [*nations*] Mat.24.7. *Nation ſhall riſe up againſt Nation, and Kingdom againſt Kingdom*, that is, if Mr. *Blakes* futile dictates were ought worth, the whole of the Nation and Kingdom, even the infants, ſhould riſe up againſt the whole of another Nation and Kingdom, even the infants. *Acts* 11.18. *God hath given repentance to the Gentiles, or nations*, that is, according to the rate of Mr. *Blakes* expoſitions, the whole of the nations, even the infants. *Acts* 15.3. *The converſion of the Nations*, that is, of the whole of the nations, even the infants, *ver.* 17. *All the nations upon whom my name is called*, that is, the whole of the nations, even the infants. The inſtances are ſo many to ſhew the futility of Mr. *Blakes* reaſoning, that I hope either he himſelf will diſcern his folly, and thoſe that magnify him, his weakneſs herein, or elſe me thinks the impudence of ſuch reaſoning ſhould be exploded.

But to ſhew further the vanity of his dictating, rather than diſputing, He mentions *Gen.* 9. 27. as a prophecy of the calling of the Gentiles, but he takes it as preſuppoſed, but proves it not; and what exceptions ly againſt it will appear in that which follows in anſwer to Mr. *Cobbet*. And then he ſaith, *Sem was wholly in Covenant, not by pieces and parcels, univerſally in Covenant*, if he mean it of the Jews, in the ſenſe wherein being in covenant is as much as being diſciples of Chriſt by profeſſion, it is moſt palpably falſe: for they diſclaimed it, *John* 9. 28. But were it granted that they were in Covenant wholly, yet where is there a word to prove that *Japhet* is to come in ſucceſſion into covenant in like latitude.

Again he ſaith, *Pſal.* 2.8. *It is not ſome among the Nations of the heathen, that are to be the inheritance of Chriſt, but the heathen.*

In which ſpeech either he deals deceitfully or unskilfully. For whereas to [*it is not ſome among the nations*] he oppoſeth [*but the hea-*

heathen] he should, if he would speak congruous sense, have said [all of the heathen] for [all] is opposed to [some] But instead thereof he saith [but the heathen] which is either to delude the unwary Reader in that indefinite expression, as if it were all one with an universal, or to trifle, sith [some of the heathen] may be called [the heathen] it being but an indefinite term, and doth not stand by any rule of Logick necessarily for [all heathen] and therefore it is all one as if he had said, It is not among some of the nations, but among some of the nations. Besides, what sense is there in these words [*some of the nations of the heathen*]? What are the heathen but the nations? *Heathen, Gentiles, the Nations*, are all terms of the same sense, answering to the same words in *Greek* ἔθνη, ἐθνικοὶ, and therefore to say [*some of the nations of the heathen*] is all one as to say [some of the nations of the nations] which is to trifle. Then *Revel.* 11. 15. is brought in, which prophecy is not to be fulfilled till the seventh Angel sounds, till then he shews not *That Gods Ministers have Kingdoms promised them, not some in Kingdoms.* And even then *The nations were angry, and the Wrath of God was come, and the time of the dead to be judged*, vers. 18. which sure was not in *Johns* daies, nor is it to be imagined to be fulfilled in our daies. His talk of Christ as emulating *Alexander* the *Great*, is most vain. Christ conquers those whom his Father hath given him, be they fewer or more, and sits down with that conquest, untill his foes be made his footstool, but it is most false that there is any Scripture that tells us, that all the Kingdomes of the world shall be Christs, so as that the whole of each nation shall be disciples of Christ, or willing subjects to him. For then at his comming he should have no enemies to put down, none to condemn. No doubt Antichrist, yea and the Devil too, hath had of long time a Kingdom, some its likely in most or every Kingdom, yea even where Christs Kingdom hath been. Doth not Christ say, *The Angel of the Church of* Pergamus *dwelt where Satans throne was*? Neither *Psal.* 72. 11. nor *Psal.* 86. 9. nor *Isai.* 55. 5. saith, *That the whole of the nation shall be disciples of Christ*, and if the prophecies were understood in that latitude, they were most palpably false. Nor is *Isa.* 19. 24, 25. certain to be a prophecy of the call of those people in the times of the *Messiah*, but may be understood of the succession

of

of Proselytes thence after the return from the Captivity, and if it were, yet there is not so much as the term [nation] nor is it absurd to deny *Israel* to be a nation of disciples, or a nation wholly within covenant, as being within covenant is equipollent to being disciples of Christ; nor can national Churches, consisting of the whole of a nation, even the infants, be proved thence, or by any History. The whole of the nation to be discipled, and brought into covenant, is a meer phantastick dream.

M. *Bl.* yet ads, *These prophecies or a great part of them I produc'd in my Answer of Mr.* T. *passing by other in silence (as having nothing to reply) he marvels that I am not ashamed to produce Psalm* 72. *ver.* 11. *Psalm.* 86. *ver.* 9. *to prove that the whole of the nations, even infants, must be included, Matth.* 28. 19. *As if it were foretold that the whole nation, even infants, should come before God and worship. It is strange if Mr.* T. *be ignorant, that prophecies in the old Testament of the glory of New Testament times, are in Old Testament phrases by way of allusion to the worship of those times, set forth to us. Now it was the practice of the people of the Jews, for their males of growth and strength to appear before the Lord, and neither females nor infants, as* Ainsworth *on Exod.* 23. 17. *observes, yet they appeared in the name of females, and their females and children were in Covenant together with them, Deut.* 29. 11. *so that as the rest of the prophecies to which Mr.* T. *hath nothing to say, so these two prophecies (against which he excepts) speak fully for the discipling of nations in the New Testament times.*

Answ. Mr. *Blake* construes my omitting to except against the allegation of the other prophecies besides *Psalm* 72. 11. *Psalm* 86. 9. as if *I had nothing to reply*, whereas being indeed in that writing necessitated to be brief, I thought best to answer those that seemed to have most shew for him: But now he is answered in all. I said I marvelled he was not ashamed to produce them as he did: but he seems past shame.

He saith *Vindic. fœd. pag.* 329. *That an eminently learned man lately observed that I had* donum impudentiæ. Who that eminently learned man is I know not, nor do I care. Till there be given a reason of this censure it cannot better me, but will have a shew

of malignancy to me, if not vanity also in the Censurer and Relator. And ill will seldome speaks well: He may bestow his censure more rightly elsewhere. I say still, it is a shameful thing to abuse Scriptures as Mr. *Blake* doth to understand by nations the whole of the nation, even infants, when, if they be so understood the Scripture should in that sense be most palpably false; for it should foretell a thing that neither was nor will be. I conceive my self not ignorant of what Mr. *Blake* saith, and though I grant all he saith, yet it covers no part of his shame in abusing the text. For even in his allusion, the whole of the nation, females and infants, did not appear before the Lord, and therefore were the extent of the prophecies as large as that they are conceived to allude to, yet the whole of the nation, even infants, were not included. And this is enough to shew the futility of his talk about discipling nations, which in his sense never was. Nor is there one reason given by Mr. *Blake* for his exposition, and reasons sufficient are given for mine, and I may retort Mr. *Bls.* words upon him, *All indifferent men may challenge their reason that heed him*, and when I am taken with such frivolous dictates as his are, I expect my friends should conclude that I doat.

SECT. X.

That infants of believers are not disciples appointed to be baptized, Mat. 28.19.

THe last exception against the *minor* in my Argument [that infants of believers are not disciples of Christ appointed to be baptized *Mat.* 28.19.] is by denying it, and asserting on the contrary that they are disciples and appointed there to be baptized. But this is so sorry a shift, so contrary to the notation and use of the word in the New Testament in the text, to the Apostles practice which best expounds Christs commission, to their own or fellows confession elsewhere, that it looks like the putting a face on a thing when there is small hope to hold it.

Mr. *Rutherford Divine right of Presbyteries* page 268. *See*

you

you doubt not of a warrant for baptizing children who are not disciples; For then the Apostles from this place had no warrant to baptize the infants of believers.

Nevertheless because such men as Mr. *Cotton*, and Mr. *Baxter* have put this text in the front to prove infant-baptism by it, I shall lay down sundry arguments against that abuse of the text, and then examine what they say about this. That our Lord Christ did not mean by [disciples to be baptized *Matth.* 28. 19.] infants either of believers or unbelievers, I prove.

1. from the notation of the word μαθητὴς a verbal noun, which comes from μεμάθηται *hath learned*. Mr. *B. Plain Scrip. proof* &c. *pag.* 92. acknowledgeth it to have *denomination from the act of learning*. Mr. *Blake Vindic. fœderis pag.* 205. *They are still stiled in New Testament-Scriptures, Believers from the faith that they profess, Saints from the holiness to which they stand engaged, Disciples from the doctrine which they profess to learn, and Christians from him whose they are, whom they serve, and from whom they expect salvation.*

Whence I argue. They are not disciples as *Mat.* 28. 19. who do not learn or profess the learning of Christs doctrine; But infants do not learn Christs doctrine; *Ergo* they are not disciples. The *major* is proved from the notation and use of the word before confessed, and intimated in that speech of the Apostle *Eph.* 4. 20. which shews, that to be a Disciple is to be one that learns Christ. The *minor* is manifest, from the want of capacity to learn, and from sense, to which it is apparent that they regard not, heed not, understand not any thing of Christ, as by other signs, so by the difficulty to teach them when they come to years.

To this what Mr. *M.* replies is answered before: Mr. *B. part* 1. *chap.* 2. saith *You must understand that one may be called a disciple,* 1. *in a large sense relatively, as being of the number of those that belong to Christ as Master and King of the Church, and destinated or devoted to his oversight and rule, and teaching, for the future: thus believers infants are disciples, of which I shall give you proof anone.*

2. *Sometimes the word is taken in a narrower sense for those who are actually learners. But commonly applied to men at age it includeth both relation and subordination, and also actual learning*

ning, but the former principally: but applied to infants it intendeth the relation at present and actual learning, as one end of it intended for the future.

To which I reply, 1. I take it for granted that it is sometimes taken for those who are actually learners.

2. That the term [disciple] commonly applied to men of age includes actual learning.

3. That applyed to infants it intendeth the relation as present, and actual learning as one end of it intended for the future.

Wherein letting passe the uncouth expression that [the word intendeth an end] and taking his meaning, I observe,

First, that he makes the term [disciples] to be meant in one manner, when it is said of men of age, and another when of infants. Which me thinks is as absurd as that he chargeth Mr. *Bedford* with *pag.* 300. that he made one end of baptism in the aged, another in infants, one covenant to parents, and another to infants, as if the aged were one sort of disciples meant *Mat.* 28. 19. and yet the same word includes another sort of disciples in a clean different sense. It would be known of which sort of disciples he understands it, for certainly there is but one sort of disciples there mentioned: and if he will stand to his words in that place, he must understand it of disciples upon instruction.

Secondly, That he sets down the sense of a word, and yet produceth no place for the present where the distinction is put, but refers us to another place, which his Reader must seek, and when he hath sought all his book he shall find but one text *Acts* 15. 10. and that miserably abused by him. Of which in its place.

Thirdly, That he acknowledgeth *page* 92. and here, that the denomination is from the disciples act of learning, yet will have it imagined that an infant may be a disciple without his own actual learning, onely from his belonging to Christ by Gods covenant, and mens destination and devoting to learn hereafter. But it is to me unconceivable that the denomination which is from the act inherent in the person should be without the act inherent in the person from some acts of another, and those acts not putting the form denominating in actual being, yea when oftentimes the form denominating is never in act. For by Mr. *Bs.* doctrine, Gods covenant, and mans devoting make a disciple, and yet I think notwithstanding

withstanding the covenant, and mans devoting, many thousands, yea the most part of infants whom he would have baptized never actually learn by reason of death or disaffection, yea many expresly renounce it. Were Gods covenant absolute to every true believers infant that he shall be a disciple, yet for the present it doth put nothing actually in the person to whom the promise is made, no more than election doth put actually any thing in the elected. *Prædestinatio nil ponit in prædestinato, Aq. p. 1. q. 23. art. 2. Gods purpose of a thing doth not put it in being,* Mr. *Bl. Vindic. fœd. pag. 89.* Most truly Mr. *Cobbet Just Vindic. part. 2. cap. 2. Election doth neither make a man holy, but only intentionally, nor give him actual Church right.* And this may in like manner be said concerning Gods promise or covenant, by it self considered, it doth assure something for the future, but put nothing in present being. The covenant is to a person afore he is born, as to *Isaac* and *Jacob*, shall it be said, that afore they were born they were actually disciples, and had actual Church right? I confesse they might be called disciples or believers in possibility, but not actually. Gods election and promise denominate a man elected and a child of the promise (which are terms of the same extent, *Rom. 9. 8.*) but not justifyed, converted, regenerated, or actually a believer, disciple, or visible Church member. But this is yet more inconsistent with Mr. *Bs.* hypotheses, who when he assigns the covenant which he will have to make an infant actually a disciple, makes it onely the conditional covenant of grace (as I shall shew hereafter) and that covenant is upon condition of faith, and this he will have to belong to all men whether believers or unbelievers, and me thinks he should not say all men are actually disciples, visible Church members, though God hath made that covenant with them which he seals in baptism, which he often saies to be only the conditional covenant, and reckons it my prime errour that misleads me in the point of baptism, that I make baptism seal the absolute covenant of grace. And yet he chargeth Mr. *Bedford p.* 300. 301. as with an absurdity following his tenet that baptism should seal one covenãt to the Father, another to the son. If then the covenant make not others actually disciples, then neither infants. *Idem quà idem semper facit idem.* Again, a conditional covenant cannot make an actual disciple, till the condition which is actual

faith

faith be put. *Conditionale nihil ponit in esse.* Therfore the cõditional covenant sealed in baptism cannot make an actual disciple. Nor is it to be said, the parents faith is the condition of the covenant for the child.

For 1. it being not the condition of the covenant to the parent that another should believe for him, neither is it the condition for the child, except Mr. *B.* will fall into the absurdity he chargeth on Mr. *Bedford*, that one covenant should be to the Father, and another to the child, sealed in baptism.

2. A child, the father believing, shall be actually a disciple before it is born, for a conditional proposition, the condition being put, becomes absolute. Now it is his child, and he believing afore it is born; *Ergo.*

In like manner it may be said of anothers devoting or destinating an infant to be a disciple, that is no act of the person denominated, it can only make a disciple intentionally; a persons devoting is but his wish, or desire, or promise, and shall that make a child actually a disciple? yea destinating and devoting is before the child is conceived or born, as *Hannah* did devote *Samuel*, was *Samuel* therefore actually a disciple and visible Church-member afore he was born? many of those whom the parents destinate and devote to be actual learners in after time, yet never are such: yea many of them are expres disclaimers and opposers of that doctrine; shall these be called actual disciples, from their parents wish, or hopes, or promise?

Again, he makes the term [*disciple*] *applied to an infant to note a relation present, actual learning as one end of it intended for the future.* I confess that [disciple] notes a relation between the teacher and person taught, yet it seems to note a passion as its form or quiddity, so that if any should ask who is a disciple, I should say, one that hath learned, and what it is to be discipled, it is to be taught or learned, and so doth import a passion, and is to be put in that predicament, and the relation is as they say *secundùm dici*, not *secundùm esse*. But were it granted that the whole essence of a disciple did consist in relation, I would fain know what shall be the foundation of his relation. Logicians say, To relation there is requisite a foundation, as begetting, two terms, as Father and Son, and a respect arising between them from

tha

that foundation, as fatherhood. It is an unheard-of thing that a relation should be without a foundation, a Father without begetting, an actual Father without actual begetting. It is true, a man may be potentially a Father without actual begetting, but to make an actual Father without actual begetting, is *oppositum in opposito*. Mr. B. *Saints everlasting rest, part* 1. *ch.* 8. *sect.* 2. *To be the people of God without regeneration is as impossible as to be the natural children of men without generation.* Now what should be the foundation of the relation of a Disciple of Christ but learning of Christ, of an actual Disciple but actual learning, I know not. Future learning, being acording to Mr. *B. the end intended*, is not in being, perhaps will never be, and therefore it is in my apprehension a most illogical and absurd conceit which Mr. *B.* hath hatched, to obtrude upon us such a notion of a Disciple, as supposeth a relation without a foundation, and contrary to *Grammar*, to call a person a Disciple who hath learned nothing, no not so much as to know or own his Teacher. To say a person may be a Scholar afore he learns, serves not turn, to avoyd the force of this Reason: For the term [Scholar] coming from σχολὴ, leasure or vacation from other exercise, may be without actual learning, but μαθητὴς is a Verbal Noun from μεμάθηκα, *hath learned*, and Disciple *à discendo*, from *Learning*; and therefore as it is absurd to call one learned, or a Learner, without Learning, so it is absurd to call one a Disciple without actual learning. But I rest not on the notation alone, but proceed to the use of the word μαθητὴς, *a Disciple*.

2. I argue thus. The word [*Disciple*] *Matth.* 28. 19. is to be understood as it is understood all along the *New Testament*; But all along the *New Testament* it is applied to those that addicted themselves to some as Teachers, followed them, learned of them, no where to an infant, who doth none of these. *Ergo*, Infants are not Disciples, meant *Matth.* 28. 19. The *major* is plain from the rule of understanding words, that it is to be according to the use of them. The *minor* is proved thus. The *Disciples of Christ are understood as the Disciples of John, and the Pharisees, Luke* 5. 33. *as the Disciples of Moses, John* 9. 28. *of the perverters, Acts* 20. 30. But in all these places, and in all the rest, they are termed Disciples of *John*, the Pharisees, *Moses*, and the perverters, who addicted themselves to them, followed them, learned

of them, no where an infant, who doth none of these; Therefore the term [Disciples of Christ] notes onely such, and no where an infant.

3. I argue thus. They that are not termed believers, are not Disciples; But infants of believers are not termed believers; Therefore they are not termed Disciples. The *Major* is proved from the equipollence of the term [Disciple] and [believers] in the New Testament. *Calvin institut. lib.3. cap.2. sect.6. Cui respondet quod passim Evangelistæ fideles & discipulos ponunt tanquam synonyma, ac præsertim Lucas in Actis Apostolorum sapius, Acts* 6.1,2,7. & 9.1,10,19,25,26,38. & 11.26,29. & 13.52. & 14. 20,22,28. Which thing is strongly disputed by *Chamier*, 2. *Panst. Cath. tom.3. l.12 c.9. s.15.* against the Papists implicite faith, that none are believers but disciples who learn and know. Which he confirms from *Matth.28.19.* in these words, *Nimirum diserte mandatum erat Christi mandatum, Matth.*18. μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. *Docete, sive discipulos facite omnes gentes.* The *minor* needs not proof, believing being an act of the intellectual part, supposing the use of reason which infants ordinarily have not, at least in such things they cannot be sayd ordinarily to be believers; nor is the term believer any where in Scripture applied to them. Rightly saith the same *Chamier, Panstr. Cat. tom.4. l.12.c.9. sect.53. Infantes potentia tantùm fideles sunt, actu nemo nisi adultus.*

4. This is further confirmed by comparing *Matth.28.19.* with *Mark* 16.15,16. where the same Commission is expressed, given at the same time, in somwhat different words, which therefore without all contradiction the one expound the other. Now what is sayd *Matth.*28.19. [*Make Disciples of all Nations*] is in *Mark* 16.15. [*Preach the Gospel to every creature*] and what is sayd *Matth.*28.19. [*baptizing them*] is *Mark* 16.16. [*Whosoever believeth and is baptized shall be saved*] which apparently shews that [*them* or *Disciples*] are the same with [*believers*] and consequently not infants.

5. Which is further confirmed by *Philips* answer to the Eunuch, telling him, that *if he did believe, he might be baptized, Acts* 8.37. which shews that *Philip* understood Christs Commission to be to baptize believers and none else; But infants are not such ordinarily; Therefore they are not ordinarily to be baptized.

Mr.

Mr. *B.* himself *pag.*300. saith, *Now for the aged a Disciple and believer are all one, Mark* 16.16. what Mr. *Blake* speakes *Vindic. fœd: pag* 453. of infants being Disciples *as to the participation of* Ordinances, and elsewhere of being believers virtually, though not formally, is without Scripture proof, which terms none Disciples barely from right to participate of ordinances, but from Learning, nor any believers who are not so formaly, nor do I know in what sense infants may be called virtually believers, Then a thing is sayd to be virtually such, though not formally, when it hath, though not the quality in its kinde, yet hath it ability to produce it, as the sun they say is not hot in its self formally, yet it is hot virtually, because it can produce it in another; But I presume he will not say this of an infant that he is virtually a believer because he can produce it in another. If he mean it in another, sense, he should shew how an infant may be said to be virtually a believer; and prove that sense out of Scripture, and not abuse men with a nonsense distinction, if he mean to cleer truth. I shall need no better proof against him, to shew infants are not to be termed Disciples and believers, than his own words, *Vindic. Fœd. p.*205. *All visible Professors that except the terms of the Covenant are believers, Saints, Disciples, Christians; so they are stiled in New Testament Scriptures, believers from the faith that they profess, Saints from the holiness to which they stand engaged, Disciples from the Doctrine which they profess to learn, and Christians from him whose they are, whom they serve, and from whom they expect salvation:* of which terms according to his own explication none can be attributed to infants of believers.

6. That infants of believers are not Disciples appointed to be baptized, *Matth.*28.19. is proved from the means of making Disciples, to wit, by preaching the Gospel to them, as appears by *Mark* 16.15. For what is *Matth.*28.19. *Make Disciples of all Nations,* is *Mark* 16.15. *Preach the Gospel to every creature.* Whence I argue, Those Disciples which Christ hath ordinarily appointed to be baptized, are such as are made such by preaching of the Gospel to them. Rightly saith Mr. *Collings Vindic Vindic. pag.*145. *How is one made a disciple, but by conversion? and when is a man converted, but when he is brought to believe?*

But infants of believers are not made disciples by preaching of the Gospel, as is of it self manifest, and acknowledged by the adverse party, who make them Disciples by an imaginary Covenant, and their parents profession; *Ergo*, they are not Disciples appointed by Christ ordinarily to be baptized.

7. Those are appointed to be baptized, and no other, whom the Apostles did baptize, for the Apostles practice shews how they understood Christs Commission, and rightly saith Mr. *Norton*, *respon. ad Apollon. c. 2. pag. 34. 35. Religio est nobis judicare Apostolos in baptizando observâsse regulam à Christo latam Matth. 28. 16. religion binds us to judge the Apostles to have observed in baptizing the rule made by Christ: Matth. 28. 19.* But they baptized no other than repenting and believing Disciples of Christ, no infants, *Ergo*.

To say that in Christs and the Apostles daies there were no infants which they might baptize, is neither true, nor consistent with their own allegations of *Mat. 19. 13, 14. Acts 2. 39. & 16. 15.* To say that at first gathering the Church they were not to do it, but after, is to make them faulty in not observing the commission of Christ, as they expound it, that even in the first planting of the Church they were to baptize disciples immediately and remotely such, as Mr. *Baxter* speaks; and to hold that the Apostles practice is not our pattern, and that the first Church was not best ordered, though it was indeed the purest reformed Church, and therefore the solemn covenant ties us to endeavour the establishing the worship of God according to it. To say, infants were baptized by them but not recorded, is without proof, or any likelyhood of truth, and tends to derogate from the fulness and perfection of the Scriptures.

Out of all which I conclude, that infants, even of believers, are not disciples appointed *Matth. 28. 19.* ordinarily to be baptized.

Sect.

SECT. XI.

Mr. Cottons *allegations in his Dialogue, the first chapter, to prove infants Disciples, are shewed to be insufficient.*

AGainst this Mr. *John Cotton* in his *Dialogue*, intituled, *The Grounds and Ends of Baptism*, &c. *chapter* 1. disputes thus.

That all the children of the faithful (*or which is all one, all the children of the Church, for the Church is a congregation of the faithfull*) *that they are all of them disciples, may appear by the testimony of the Prophet* Esay, *who speaking of the times of the Church in the New Testament, All thy children* (*saith he*) *shall be taught of God*, Esa. 54. 13. *and if they be taught of God then are they disciples, for that is the meaning of the word disciples. Disciples are taught or learnt of God.*

Answ. 1. It is supposed but not proved that the text Isa. 54. 11. is meant of the Church of the N. T. and not of the people of the Jews after the Captivity.

2. The phrase of [*children of the Church*] is not a Scripture-phrase, nor that I know is the Church made a mother; though *Jerusalem, which is above be called the Mother of us all*, Gal. 4. 26. which seems to be meant of the Evangelical Covenant.

3. It is supposed that to be children of the Church, and to be children of the faithful, are one, yet Mr. *Cobbet* in his *Just Vindic.* makes them only the Church seed, who are children of persons inchurched, otherwise, though the parents be faithful, yet they are not the Church seed. Besides to be [children of the Church] is not all one with to be natural children of believers. For the Church doth not beget or bring forth by natural seed, but by spiritual, to wit, the word of God, 1 *Peter* 1. 23. and children are begotten in the womb of the Church by the Spirit, and therefore said *to be born after the Spirit*, Gal. 4. 29. by the promise or covenant of the *free woman*, v. 30. And indeed the *New Annotations* on *Isaiah* 54. 13. hath thus, *And thy Children shall be taught of the Lord*] *By the outward Ministery of the word, and inward*

inward co-operation of the Spirit, Jerem.31.34. John 6.45. 2 Cor.13.3. 1 Cor.2.10. 1 John 2.20,27. Calvin Instit. lib.3. cap.2.§.6. Denique non frustrà Deus apud Isaiam hâc notâ discernit filios Ecclesiæ ab extraneis, quod omnes erudiet [verbo] ut sint ab ipso edocti.

4. It is supposed that the Church whose children those are is the visible church as such.

Whereas 1. in Scripture no Church is called the Mother but *Hierusalem above*, Gal.4.26. *which is the mother of us all*, and that is either the Evangelical covenant, or the invisible Church. The Churches children are Christs seed, and they are those *whom his Father hath given him*, *Heb.* 2.13. made disciples by his Word and Spirit. Our Lord Christ where he cites this passage of the Prophet, *John* 6.45. applies it to those that *are drawn of the Father, and whom he will raise up at the last day*, ver.44. who are only the children of the invisible Church. *Diodati annot.* on *John* 6.45. *all*] *not all and every particular person, as it appears by* ver.44. *&* 65. *but all the elect and children of God.* Not is Mr. *Cotton's* shift, rather than answer, of any moment, when he saith, *For look what promises are made to the invisible Church, they are for their sakes offered to all the members of the visible Churches, whereof the lively members are the chief.*

For 1. He doth alter the term in the objection, which was [*made*] not [*offered*] wherein both he, and Mr. *George Philips* before him, deal not rightly, so speaking as that it may be taken, that *to be in covenant, to have the covenant made*, is all one with *to have it offered*: Whereas it is offered not only to the children of the visible Church, but to many professed unbelievers, as *Acts* 13.46. Now this answering is a way to delude Readers, when the objection is, that the promise is made only to the children of the invisible Church, to answer *the promises are also offered to the members of the visible*, and when it is expected that it should be proved the promise is made to conclude *that it is offered.*

2. Mr. *Cotton* dare not say that promise to be made to any but those that are children of the invisible Church, and therefore it can be meant of no other, and so no other taught of the Lord and disciples, which will not reach to the natural children of visible inchurched believers.

3. [*Thy children*] is not all one with [*thy infants*] Mr. *Cotton* denies not, that the meaning in part may be of men of years, and if so no necessity to understand it of infants, and then his argument falls, which is to prove infants to be disciples.

4. Besides, our Lord Christ, where he cites *John* 6.45. the prophet, leaves out the word [*children*] and applies the teaching of God onely to true believers. *Omnes*, saith *Grotius*, *quibus sermo Evangelii annuntiatur.*

5. Were it granted Mr. *Cotton* that all believers infants were taught of God by secret indiscernable teaching, yet this being such, cannot be applyed to the disciples meant *Mat.* 28.19. who are disciples by preaching the Gospel, and known to be such by their profession.

But Mr. *Cotton* tells us, *The infants or children of the faithful are not to be excluded from the number of the children of the Church. For the same Prophet speaking of the same Church, fetcheth in infants among the blessed ones of the Church, and blessed with such spiritual light and life from Christ, as if they had lived an hundred years in the Church* Esa. 65.20. *There shall be no more* (saith he) *thenceforth an infant of daies, nor an old man that hath not filled his daies. For the child shall dy an hundred years old, but the sinner being an hundred years old shall be accursed. How shall the child dy as at an hundred years old, but that he is so well instructed, and inlightned by Christ, and thereby as capable of enterance into heavenly glory, as a grown disciple of an hundred years old?*

Anſ. 1. Were M. *Cottons* paraphraſe granted, yet the concluſion followes not thence, that therefore infants are diſciples to be baptized according to *Mat.* 28.19. or as he ſpeaks, *children of the Church.* For *to be ſo well inſtructed, and enlightned by Chriſt, and thereby as capable of entrance into heavenly glory as a grown diſciple of an hundred years old*, may agree by extraordinary inſpiration to one that is only of the inviſible Church, and not of the viſible Church as diſciples meant *Mat.* 28.19.

2. Mr. *Cotton*, when he ſaith, [*how ſhall the child dy as at an hundred years old*] doth ſlily intimate as if [*as*] were in the text: whereas it is not ſo, but יָמוּת *the child or boy ſhall dy an hundred years old*, or *the ſon of an hundred years.* Which without any

allegory

allegory hath a plain sense as the *New Annotations* expresse it, *He that is now a child shall attain to those years ere he dy.* Which was accomplished in the return from the captivity according to the prophecy of *Zechariah* ch. 8. 4. and therefore we need not run to any allegorical interpretation, nor refer it to the times of the *Messiah*, either after the resurrection or afore, of which *Hieronym. in Locum.* *Vide Grotium annot. in Zec.* 8. 4.

3. Were an allegory allowed, yet not only in *Hieron*, but also in *Calvin*, *Piscator*, and others, there are variety of senses different from Mr. *Cotton*, so that in alleging these texts he trifled more than became so grave a man. But he goes on thus.

'The Apostle *Peter* reckoneth infants of the Church for disciples *Acts* 15.10. If the infants of the Church had not been disciples, the false Apostles could have pretended no power to have put that ordinance upon them.

Answ. 1. [*infants of the Church*] is a phrase the Scripture useth not, and it serves only to possess the unwary reader with this conceit, as if the children of believers inchurched, as they speak, were children of the Church; whereas none is a child of the Church till taught the Gospel and made a believer.

2. It is untruly suggested, as "if the false Apostles pretended power to circumcise infants of Christian disciples from this that the infants were disciples": But *ver.* 1. 5. shew plainly that they alleged that the Gentile disciples were tied to observe the law of *Moses*, and so to be circumcised; both they and their children.

But, saith he, 'Peter acknowlegeth them disciples, but the yoke of circumcision was too heavy for them; as drawing upon them the yoke of the Ceremonial Law.

Answ. There is not a word of *Peter* acknowledging the infants disciples, but the believing parents; nor is the yoke of circumcision said to be too heavy for them now, as if it were not so formerly, but it is said to be such as neither the Apostles, nor their Fathers were able to bear, much less Gentiles.

But, saith Mr. *Cotton*, 'Christ *Mark* 10. 14. *Luke* 18. 16. 'Of such (little children) is the Kingdome of God, which 'argueth

'argueth that even little children are members of the Church 'here.

Answ. It is proved in my *Postscript* f. 20. that *Matth.* 19. 14. *the Kingdom of heaven*, in *Mark* 10. 14. *Luke* 18. 16. *the Kingdom of God*, is meant of the Kingdom of Glory: But it follows not that therefore infants are members of the Church here, many belonging to the invisible Church, which belong not to the visible, and *vice versâ*, as abortives, still born infants, converts at the point of death, *&c.* are of the Kingdom of Glory, who are never members of the visible Church here.

But, saith he, 'Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of 'God, as a little child (to wit, as a little child receiveth it, for so 'much the Grammer construction requireth) he shall in no wise 'enter therein.

Answ. It is untrue, that the Grammar construction requireth, that it should be understood thus, that a little child receiveth the Kingdom of God, but only this is meant, that none shall enter into the Kingdom of God, but such as have such an humble mind, free from ambition, as a little child hath, as our Lord himself expounds it, *Mat.* 18. 3, 4.

But, saith he, 'Christs testimony of them and his carriage to-'wards them, shew that little children born in the Church are ac-'counted disciples of Christ, and therefore commanded to be bap-'tized with their believing parents.

Answ. Mr. *Cotton* himself confesseth, that it doth not appear that their Fathers, who brought them, were baptized themselves; how are they then said to be children born in the Church, or to be baptized according to rule? wherefore his own words shew it to be uncertainly, and therefore insufficiently alleged to prove that the infants of believers are among the blessed ones of Christ, such as of whom his Church and and Kingdom consisteth, and so come under the fellowship of his disciples, whom Christ commandeth to be baptized. And in very truth in that there is nothing apparent, whether the parents brought them or others, whether the parents were disciples or not: nor is any thing at all ascribed to the parents but to Christs indulgence in this action, and it appears Christ did not command them to be baptized, nor spake any thing as intituling them to discipleship and baptism, though he

he said, *Of such is the Kingdom of God*, this text is not only impertinently brought to prove the discipleship and baptizability of believers infants, but also makes to the contrary, that infants are not disciples nor baptizable, sith if they had been so Christ would have so declared on this occasion, which was opportune for it.

But there is yet another argument in that chapter of Mr. *Cottons*, and it is to this effect, 'That the Commission *Mat.* 28. 19. ap-'points believing parents to be baptized, and would infer, that in 'Gods account, and in Scripture phrase, parents themselves are 'not reputed of God to be baptized, if their children remain un-'baptized.

Answ. But will any man believe Mr. *Cotton* in this, that 'in 'Scripture phrase parents are not reputed of God to be baptized if 'their children remain unbaptized? Scripture speaks of thousands baptized, and mentions not the baptizing of any of their children under that relation as their children, shall we believe Mr. *Cotton* that those phrases of Scripture, that say they were baptized, speak false? and that they were not reputed of God to be baptized, because there is no mention of their childrens baptism? many believers were baptized their children being infidels, *Mat.* 10. 35. were not the parents reputed in Gods account baptized because the children were against it? But let us hear Mr. *Cottons* goodly proof in his own words.

"Surely, *saith he*, in the old Testament a man was accounted of God as uncircumcised himself, if his children were uncircumcised: for so it is written in *Exod.* 12. 48. that if a man will come and keep the Passeover, all the males in his house must be circumcised: and the reason given, is, for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof, which plainly argueth, that a man is uncircumcised himself, and (as an uncircumcised person) is to be debarred from the Passeover, until all his males be circumcised. If then our Lords Supper come in the room of the Passeover, and our baptism in the room of circumcision, look as he that had not circumcised his males was accounted as one uncircumcised himself, and so to be debarred from the Passeover, so he who hath not baptized his children is accounted of God as not baptized himself, and so to be debarred from the Lords Supper.

Answ.

Answ. That baptism and the Lords Supper come in the room of Circumcision, and the Passeover, is often said, but never proved. But if it were granted (though I still deny it) yet Mr. *Cottons* inference is not good, till it be also yielded, that every rule of Circumcision, and the Passeover is a rule to us about Baptism and the Lords Supper, which me thinks he should not maintain. Nor do I think he can give any reason why in this the rule should bind more than in others. Yea did he consider it, he might have perceived, that if the proportion be stretched according to this rule, no parent must be counted baptized, nor to eat the Lords Supper, except he had not only all his children baptized, but also all his Servants. For the males to be circumcised were not only children, but servants also, and so those must be baptized who are out of covenant, and a national church must be formed like to the Jews, which I think were hated of him as the blind and the lame were of *Davids* soul. And methinks it should follow, that if it happen (as it may happen many waies, especially in new *England*, where many baptized persons may not have their children baptized, because the parents are not Church-members) the infants be unbaptized the parent is to be baptized again, because counted of God, and according to Scripture phrase, if Mr. *Cottons* dictates hold, unbaptized.

Which being absurd, I count his inference ("If therefore you forbid baptism to children, you evacuate the baptism of their parents, and so make the Commandment of God, and the Commission of the Apostles, and the baptism of believers, of none effect, together with that other passage of his *pag.* 4. If godly parents do withdraw their children from the covenant, and the seal of the Covenant, they do make void (as much as in them lyeth) the Covenant, both to themselves, and to their children also. And then will the Lord cut off such souls from his people, *Gen.* 17.14.) to be meer Mormoes or bugbears to fright children, though I am afraid they are used for a further evil end to incite Magistrates against Antipædobaptists, and to justify their hard dealing with them in new *England*.

That which Mr. *Cotton* addes, "That if we gather no infants are disciples from *Mark* 16. 16. compared with *Matth.* 28. 19. because believer and disciple are terms of the same sense, and in-

fants not believers, it would follow, that no infant were capable of salvation any more than baptism", I have answered in my *Precursor* §.6.

That which he speaks of the Gospel, *That the promise of being God to believers and their seed is to be preached as Gospel according to Mark* 16.15. and *if his allegations of Acts* 16.31. *Luke* 19.9. *Gal.* 3.16,17. be right, and his words true p. 22. *God hath promised salvation to believers, and their seed, and house also*, is so palpably false, that Mr. *Marshal* and Mr. *Geree* do both disclaim it as contrary to Protestant doctrine, as I shew in my *Apology* §.9.

That which he saith *pag.* 24. ("That the expounding baptizing into the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost *Mat.* 28 19. thus, baptize them into the true and orderly profession of that which they have been taught and believed, is to assert that we are to be baptized into the name of Creatures for profession is an act of our own and so a creature, which he counteth an effect of Gods judgement taking men in their own wilines, while they turn the glorious name of the blessed Trinity into the weak performance of a Christian duty, is a frivolous quillet unfit for so grave a man, *James ch.* 5.14. *To anoint with oyl in the name of the Lord, id est*, saith *Beza, invocato nomine Domini*, the *New Annot. by calling on the name of the Lord*, which is a work of their own: Do they therein turn the name of the glorious God into a Creature? But enough of this childish chapter of Mr. *Cotton*, in which I find so little worth answering, that were it not for the esteem he had, and his acquainting me with this piece in his letter to me, I should have chosen to have let it passe as not worth the labour bestowed in answering it.

Mr. *William Cook* in his *Font uncovered* pag. 13. *brings Acts* 21.4,5. *To prove that infants in their mothers arms were reckoned among disciples, and makes the enumeration there to answer Deut.* 29. 10,11,12. *Ezra* 8. 21. *And whereas it might be said that the children are distinguished from the disciples, he prevents this by retortion their wives are distinguished from disciples, yet might be disciples, so the children.*

Answ. 1. The places are no way parralel in the matter, not exactly in the enumeration made, in the former there is mention

of

of servants, none here, all were of duty there to enter into covenant the whole nation together, not so here, in the later place no mention of wives, and the business was a solemn humiliation for them upon their return from captivity, but here only a courteous accompanying of *Paul* to the ship.

2. I grant the wives are not necessarily excluded from being disciples, nor children by the enumeration *Acts* 21. 5. nor are they necessary to be included: but how doth Mr. *Cook* prove the the children, babes carried in armes, or such little ones as had not abilities of understanding? More likely, this thing being done by common consent, the wives and children were of years to conceive what they did, whether already baptized disciples or persons catechized and expectants it is uncertain.

I shall now, finding nothing needing more answer in Mr *Cobbet part* 2. *ch.* 3. *s.* 4. but what will fitly come in when I answer Mr. *Baxter*, pass on to the answering Mr. *Baxters* third chapter *of the first part of his plain Scripture proof*, &c. where he thus argues.

SECT. XII.

Mr. Bs. *allegation of Acts* 15.10. *to prove infants disciples is fully answered & his arguments retorted.*

ALL that are Christs disciples ordinarily ought to be baptized; But some infants are Christs disciples; Therefore some infants ordinarily ought to be baptized. He tells us how he means by [*disciples*] which meaning of his is before proved not to be the meaning of the text, and then saith, *His major is evident in the text from the conjunction of the two commands: Go make me disciples, baptizing them. If any shall be so quarrelsome against the plain text to say, It is not all disciples that they were commanded to baptize, but only all that were made disciples, and this making was onely by teaching.*

I answer, 1. *If I prove infants Disciples, I sure prove therby they were made so, or else they they had never been so.*

2.

2. *By teaching the parents and children were both made disciples, the parents directly, the infants remotely or mediately: if they be proved once to be disciples, it will easily follow it is by this way. He that converteth the parent, maketh both him and his infants disciples incompleat or in title; This therefore lies on the proof of the Minor.*

3. *But I would say more to this, but that Mr.T. (as I understand) hath in his Sermons professed, That if we will prove that infants are Christs Disciples, he will acknowledge that they ought to be baptized: the like he granted to me; and well he may.*

Answ. 1. It is well Mr.*B.* grants that to *go make disciples, baptizing them, are two Commands*, and that *there is a conjunction of them*, whence it follows, that he appoints not baptizing till the making of disciples, nor of any but disciples made as Christ appointed.

2. It is no quarrel against the plain text, but the very plain doctrine of the text to say, *It is not all disciples (visibly or invisibly, directly or remotely, compleatly, or incompleatly, in reality or in title) that they were commanded to baptize*, but only all that were made disciples, and this making was only by teaching *or preaching the Gospel to them Mark* 16.15.

3. It is true, I have often granted, that if it be proved infants are Christs disciples made by preaching to them the Gospel, they ought to be baptized. But when I granted this, it did not come into my thoughts, that Mr.*B.* would ever have hatched, much lesse have printed such wild nonsense fancies as here he doth, of a disciple by title without learning, like a King of *Jerusalem* without reigning, or the Popes Bishop of *Chalcedon* without overseeing, of teaching remotely in the Parents conversion without any personal teaching in themselves. For which fancies he neither brings a text of Scripture, nor any approved Author, nor any other besides himself thus speaking. Such distinctions are but meer abuses as are without any instance of such an use of terms. And to shew the grossnesse of this foppery of Mr.*B.* which a School-boy may easily discern that hath gone no further than *Qui mihi discipulus*. I argue thus,

1. If he that converteth the parent maketh the infant a disciple, then

then either because the infant is an infant, and then every infant should be made a disciple by that conversion; or because his child, and then every child is made a disciple, yea though he be a professed infidel; or both, and then it would be shewed what grant there is to the child while infant, which ceaseth when grown up: where the relation of a disciple in his sense is appropriated only to infant child. Yea all the plea is, *by teaching the parents and children were both made disciples*, therefore this relation comes from being a child of such a one: But the professed infidel child is the child of the Father; therefore also a disciple in title, and to be baptized after Mr. *Bs.* doctrine.

2. If children be made disciples remotely and mediately according to the command *Matth.* 28.19. in that the parent is converted, and that the teaching of the parent is the teaching of the child, then it follows, he that teacheth the Father hath done his duty of teaching, though he teach not the child himself, and so a preacher need not at all go and catechize each child but only preach to parents. It would be ill with *Kederminster* if it should be so there. But this follows according to Mr. *Bs.* exposition of Christs command *Mat.* 28.19.

3. It will follow as well, that he that baptizeth the Father baptizeth the child, for there is a conjunction of these commands, and the baptizing is to be correspondent to the teaching; if then the teaching the parent is the teaching the child, then is the baptizing the parent the baptizing the child according to the command, and so the command is only to baptize in another him who is taught in another, and it is a gross transgression of Christs command to baptize him in himself, who is only a disciple in another.

4. Forasmuch as Mr. *B.* doth not limit the childs being a disciple or teaching remotely to the next parents being converted, he that shall teach the Grandfather, great Grandfather, *&c.* teacheth the child, makes him a disciple, yea according to his doctrine *pag.* 101. he that converts the Master of the house makes his servants, and those that are at his dispose, though not his children, (whom he would have baptized) disciples, for sure he would not have them baptized that are not disciples. Now I appeal to any man of understanding whether this be not as gross and pernicious

a deluſion as *Hart* the Jeſuit held (ſo much exagitated in the conference by Dr. *Raynold ch. 2. diviſ. 7.*) *That the Pope preacheth by another*, to ſay he that teacheth the parent teacheth the child. Aſſuredly had I ever dreamed that Mr. *B.* had ſuch phantaſtick, if not frantick notions, I had denyed his *major*, and do now expreſly deny it in his ſenſe, *All that are Chriſts diſciples incompleatly, in title only, remotely by the parents converſion without their own ordinarily ought to be baptized*, and expect it to be proved by him *ad Græcas Calendas*. Nor would I have laid the ſtreſs of the argument on the proof of his *Minor*, if I had underſtood his deceitful gibberiſh, by which he deteſtably abuſed many people, and perverted Chriſts words. But it is my lot to anſwer ſuch a writer and I follow him.

He next goes about to prove his *minor* thus, [" That ſome infants are Chriſts diſciples, and ſo called by the Holy Ghoſt is moſt evident to any that will not groſly pervert the text or overlook it, in *Acts* 15.10. why tempt ye God to put a yoke on the neck of the diſciples, which neither our Fathers nor we were able to bear? now who were theſe diſciples? no doubt thoſe on whom the falſe Teachers would have laid the yoke. And what was that yoke? It is plain it was Circumciſion, as neceſſary and as engaging them to keep the Law. And whom would they have perſwaded thus to be circumciſed? Why both the Parents and Children in that Age, and only the Children in all following Ages ordinarily. So that thus I argu, Thoſe on whoſe necks the falſe Teachers would have laid this yoke, were Diſciples: But ſome, yea moſt of thoſe were infants on whoſe necks they would have laid this yoke: Therefore ſome Infants are Diſciples, and ſo called here. The *major* is plain in the Text. "]

Anſw. The *minor* of Mr. *Bs.* Argument, that *Infants are Chriſts Diſciples*, ſhould not be underſtood of Diſciples in that ſenſe, that Chriſt appoints Diſciples to be baptized, *Matth.* 28.19. Diſcipleſhip in Mr. *Bs.* ſenſe in title without learning, by remote teaching in the Parents converſion, being a ſenſe unknown to the Scripture, and a meer figment of Mr. *Bs.* brain, is falſly ſaid to be aſcribed to infants by the Holy Ghoſt, or to have any evidence in Scripture for it: nor do I think any do more *groſly pervert the Text*, *Acts* 15.10. or *overlook it more than* Mr. B.

But

But let us look a little nearer on Mr. *Bs.* arguings: he premiseth three Questions, and answers them; concerning which I grant his answer to the first, *that those were Disciples on whom the false Teachers would have laid the yoke.* In his second Question and the Answer ly sundry fallacies, 1. in that he puts the Question about the yoke what it was; whereas the Question that should have cleared the difficulty had been, what was the putting on of the yoke, (which Mr. *B.* doth I fear sophistically omit) the point in question being who are meant by [*Disciples*] and it being resolved by Mr. *B. Those on whom the false Teachers would have laid the yoke*, the Resolution must be not by knowing barely what the term [*yoke*] imported, but by knowing how they would lay the yoke, or what the act was of the false Teachers, termed, *laying a yoke on their necks.* Were the act effected or attempted, or intended onely, it's that we must know what act it was, whether such as Infants were the passive subjects of, or whether such onely as persons of age were capable of? And here I conceive two ways they might be said to lay the yoke, one by cutting with their own hand off the little skin of the privy member, either of Parents or Children, or both, according to the rite of *Moses* Law; the other by teaching, perswading, charging Parents that they and their Children should be circumcised, or else they should not be saved; the former had been an act of their hands, this latter of their tongues; the former onely can prove infants to be meant by [*Disciples*] if this latter be meant, then infants are not meant by [*Disciples*] for they were not subjects capable of that act. There was no act either effected or attempted on infants but onely the act of the hand using an instrument to cut off the skin. If they had attempted to act on infants the later way, by telling sucking children, you are to be circumcised, and to keep *Moses* Law, they had done rather like mad men than cunning Seducers. Mr. *B.* himself, when in the next words [*And whom would they perswade to be circumcised?*] and when after he confesseth, *that which the false Teachers did, was Teaching*, doth plainly intimate that the false Teachers act, in putting on the yoke, was onely of the tongue, not of the hand, and therefore not infants the passive subject of it, and so not meant by Disciples. Yea, the Text it self clears what their act was, when it says, *v.1. They taught the brethren, v.24. They troubled*

them with words, subverting their souls, saying. And this is enough to shew the foppery of Mr. *Bs.* and others, arguings hence to prove infants Disciples, had they any minde to heed what is spoken. Those onely are meant by Disciples who were Patients or passive subjects of the act of laying on the yoke: that is Mr. *Bs.* own *major* in effect: but infants were not such, for they were not taught, nor troubled with words, nor had their souls subverted by the sayings of false Teachers; therefore they were not the Disciples meant *Acts* 15.10. 2. Concerning the Answer to the Question, as he lays it down, [*That the yoke was Circumcision, as necessary, and as engaging them to keep the Law,*] it may be meant either of the command concerning Circumcision, and so it is granted that the yoke was Circumcision, that is, the command of Circumcision propounded, and taught as necessary to the Disciples, that they might be saved, and engaging them to keep *Moses* Law; or by Circumcision is meant Circumcision in act, or actual Circumcision, as passively received in the flesh, and this it seems Mr. *B.* understands, sith it was it which was to be put on infants, and it onely, in which sense it is not meant *Acts* 15.10. as I have shewed. 3. The terms [*as necessary, and ingaging them to keep* Moses *Law*] may be understood variously, either as necessary and ingaging them in the opinion of the circumcised, so that the sense is, they would have laid the yoke on the necks of the Disciples, so as that the Disciples should have received circumcision with this opinion that thereby they were ingaged to keep *Moses* his Law, and in this sense it is true, the yoke was the command of Circumcision to beget this opinion, or else in the opinion of the Teachers or Circumcisers onely, and so it is false, that the yoke was actual Circumcision as necessary, and ingaging to keep *Moses* Law, they did not onely teach or circumcise, so as to have an opinion of this necessity, but so as to indeavour to possess those they would lay the yoke on, that it was necessary, and they were ingaged to keep *Moses* Law. As for his Answer to the third Question, according to the plain sense of the words, it is false, *that they would have perswaded the children,* I mean infant children, *to be circumcised:* For though they would perswade the Parents to be circumcised, and then to circumcise their children, yet that they would have perswaded the children, that is, that any of them went to an infant

and

and would have perſwaded him to be circumciſed, is falſe, and the thing would have been ridiculous.

As for the argument from *Acts* 15.10. as it was framed by Mr. *M.* I did *Exam. pag.* 135. deny the *major*, and gave my reaſon, it is not ſaid, they would put it onely on Diſciples, it is more probable they endeavoured to put it on the necks of all, whether Diſciples or others, as a thing univerſally neceſſary to ſalvation, *v.*1. which Mr. *M.* in his *Defence* overthrows not, but puts it off without anſwer, onely imagines that then I cannot evince from *Matth.* 3 5,6. *Acts* 2.42, *&c. that John and Chriſts Diſciples baptized onely penitent believers.* But I preſume Mr. *M.* will be better adviſed than to make it alike argumentative to prove all were Diſciples on whom the falſe Teachers would have put the yoke, from *Acts* 15 10. and to prove that there was Baptiſm in the New Teſtament but of penitent believers, from the perpetual courſe of the hiſtory thereof, in the former Diſciples being onely mentioned occaſionaly in condemning a fact done to them, in the other are ſet narrations of Acts done in the Church of God, and therefore there would have been a defect in the narration if there had been any other than penitent believers then Baptized,

But Mr. *B.* pleads thus, *If any will ſay, that it is not all, but ſome of thoſe on whom they would have laid the yoke that are here called diſciples, that is onely them at age, I anſwer, Then it is but ſome onely whoſe Circumciſion the Apoſtle and the Synod doth conclude againſt, that is thoſe of age. For he ſpeaks againſt Laying the yoke on none but Diſciples, And then for any thing the Apoſtle ſaith, or this Synod, all infants might be circumciſed ſtill: which is a moſt groſſe abſurdity, when the very buſineſs of this Synod was to decree againſt the neceſſity of Circumciſion and the Law.* To which I replied, I denied the *major* as expreſſed by Mr. *M.* thus [*all they upon whoſe necks thoſe falſe Teachers would have put the yoke of Circumciſion are called Diſciples and to be called Diſciples*] becauſe I conceived they would by their teaching put a neceſſity of circumciſion even on unconverted *Jews* who are no Diſciples, yea upon all perſons whatſoeuer, holding of all ſorts of perſons that *except they were circumciſed and kept the Law of Moſes they could not be ſaved.* And in like ſort I deny the *major* of Mr. *Bs.*

Argument if it be universal, *all those on whose necks the false Teachers would have laid the yoke mentioned Acts* 15.10. *were Disciples.* Nor is it plain in the Text, there is no more plain in the Text but this, that the persons expressed *Acts* 15.10. on whom the false Teachers would have layd the yoke were Disciples. but it doth not follow that they would have layd the yoke on none other than are there expressed, as when it is sayd, *Christ would have gathered the children of Jerusalem, Matth.* 23.37. though none but the children of *Jerusalem* are there expressed, yet it follows not all are the children of *Jerusalem* whom he would have gathered. Nor doth that imaginary grosse absurdity follow which Mr. *B.* would fasten on this deniall of his *major.* For 1. there are in the Syneds letter both *v.* 24. Condemning the false Teachers Doctrine, and *v.* 28. 29. laying no other burden on them to whom they wrot, plain passages exempting old and yong from Circumcision, though *v.* 10. were left out. 2. Even in that, *v.* 10 *Peter* reproves their putting a yoke on the neck of the aged, he doth determine parents not bound to circumcise their children, and this is a conclusion against Circumcision of infants, as A canon against Priests marriage is a Law against their wives living with them; and the concluding against a practise in some upon a common reason, to others is a general prohibition, as the Apostles determination *Acts* 6.2. is a determination against the like in others. But however, this is enough to answer Mr. *Bs.* Argument; and some perhaps would yield his *minor*, yet I deny it, and doubt not to shew that in the thing wherein he is most confident, in so much that in his Epistle before his *Saints Everlasting Rest*, he makes me with others play the Devil in accusing my own children as no Disciples, when God saith the contrary, (*O utinam!*) *Acts* 15. 10. he is an egregious Trifler.

To prove his *minor*, he thus argues, *I prove it was the Infants also, thus, If it were Infants also whom the false Teachers would have had to be circumcised as necessary, and as engaging to* Moses *Law, then it was infants also on whom they would have laid the yoke; but it was infants also whom they would have had circumcised, &c. Therefore, &c. The Antecedent is undeniable. But it is the Consequence Mr.* T. *denieth; for he saith, It is not Circumcision as necessary, and as engaging to* Mo:s *Law, which was*

the

the yoke, but it was the Doctrine of those Teachers. But was Mr. T. of this minde when he wrote these words? Exam. p. 101.

Answ. 1. Should the Conclusion be granted him, *that they were infants also whom the false Teachers would have had to be circumcised, &c.* yet sith he grants, that they would have had the Fathers circumcised, they onely may be meant by [*Disciples*] though Circumcision were yielded to be the yoke. 2. Circumcision is no way necessary, that I know, but as commanded, nor engaging to keep *Moses* Law, but as taught, and yielded to: And therefore I know not what sense Mr. *Bs.* words have, *that it was infants also whom the false Teachers would have had to be circumcised as necessary, and as engaging to* Moses *Law*, but one of these, they would have them circumcised, having this opinion, that it was necessary, and did engage, or that they taught Circumcision as a necessary command, and as engaging to *Moses* Law, and in this latter sense I should not have sayd, (if I did say it) that it is not Circumcision as necessary, and as engaging to *Moses* Law, which was the yoke, but it was the Doctrine of those Teachers; but rather have sayd, it was Circumcision as necessary, and engaging to *Moses* Law, which was the yoke, that is, the Doctrine of those Teachers. But because Mr. *Bs.* expression is dubious, or nonsense, and that which he mainly bends himself to prove, *is*, that it was not the Doctrine which was the yoke to be put on Disciples, (for then there would have been no colour to expound [*Disciples*] of infants) but Circumcision in act, or acted on the flesh, though as a blinde he add those words, *as necessary and engaging to* Moses *Law*, therefore I denied the Consequence, as if those words were left out, which indeed he himself leaves out in the proof of his Antecedent, proving onely they would have had them circumcised, without saying any thing, to prove they would have had them circumcised under this formal consideration or respect, as yielding to the necessity of it, and engaging themselves thereby to keep *Moses* Law. But if he put in those words in the *minor*, in this sense, I deny it also. As for the Consequence there is no proof brought for it to confirm it, but by overthrowing the reason I gave of denying it, so that had I given no reason of denying it, there had been brought no proof. But as yet I do not appre-

hend, though I had granted him, that Circumcision was the yoke, and not the Doctrine, (which I do not) that yet it would have followed, that if the false Teachers would have had the infants circumcised they were those also on whom they would have layd the yoke, for they might have attempted to lay the yoke of Circumcision on the Parents, and so the laying on of the yoke might be onely the circumcising the Parents, though they would have also the infants circumcised. But it being true, that I gave that reason of my denial of Mr. *Bs.* Consequence, that I may the more abundantly shew the futility of his foolishly magnified dispute, I will engage with him even upon that point also. And to clear my meaning, it is true, *Exam. pag.* 101. I said, the yoke, *Acts* 15.10. was Circumcision, as Mr. *M.* himself declared, *pag.* 39. of his *Sermon*, and all the legal Ceremonies, and the reason why I used that expression was, because I alleged Mr. *Ms.* words. But that I meant not Circumcision in act, or as acted on the flesh to be the yoke, but Circumcision in command, as commanded and imposed on the conscience, appears by the words following: if it be a privilege to be free from Circumcision it is a privilege to be free from any Ordinance in the room and use of it, it was the Ordinance then, I made the yoke. And my minde is expressed thus, *pag.* 135. The putting the yoke of Circumcision is not actual Circumcision in their flesh, for that they were able to bear for many Ages, but the necessity of it on mens consciences to salvation. In my *Antidote*, *sect.* 6. I deny it to be actual Circumcision, but sometimes call it the doctrine or opinion of the necessity of it. In my Book of *Scandalizing* I call it the Ordinances of the *Jews*. In my *Præcursor*, *pag.* 10. the doctrines and commands: but most plainly I express my self in my *Præcursor*, *pag.* 74. in my Answer to the 27*th* absurdity Mr. *B.* chargeth me with, *pag.* 208. of his *Plain Scripture Proof*, *&c.* where I make it the yoke of Doctrine, or the command of Circumcision, and shew, that not onely *Grotius*, but also *Pareus*, *Piscator*, *Diodati*, *the new Annot.* so expressed it. This then is my constant judgment, 1. That the *Yoke*, *Acts* 15.10. is not actual Circumcision or Circumcision in act, that is, as acted on the flesh,

Ames. Bell. Enerv. Tom. 4. *l.* 6. *c.* 7. *Th.* 11. *Protest. Acts* 15. 10. *Lex Mosis dicitur jugum importabile*, *& Chamier*

which

which alone serves for Mr. *Bs.* turn to prove infants Disciples, for no more would they have done to infants. 2. That *the putting the yoke* is teaching the necessity of it, or the command of God still binding their consciences, of which act the infants were not subjects recipient. 3. That the yoke as from the false Teachers was the Doctrine, or command of Circumcision and other Precepts of the Law, which sundry learned men in their notes on *Matth.* 11.29. gather to be meant by the yoke, comparing these places with 1 *John* 5.3. what is *Matth.* 11.29. called Christs yoke, is 1 *John* 5.3. called his Commandments, and doctrinal commands, or as the expression is, *Matth.* 15.9. *Doctrines, commands,* are called *Burdens, Matth.* 23. *Luke* 11.46. *Rev.* 2.24. As it is taken passively, that is, to be received by the person yoked or taught is the opinion of the necessity of these unto salvation, or as Mr. *B.* himself after cals it *the judgment* of it. 4. That by the Disciples are meant the converted Christians of the Gentiles called *the Brethren, v.*1. those *that from the Gentiles turn to God, v.*19. *The brethren of the Gentiles, v.*23. Mr. *Blake Vindic. Fœderis, pag.*208. *Complaint is made, Acts* 15.10. *that those that urged the necessity of Circumcision put a yoke on the necks of the Disciples, which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear; they urged it upon all in visible profession, and not upon regenerate ones alone.* 5. That by *their necks* is meant not their flesh or skin, but their consciences. Let's now see what Mr. *B.* brings to prove the yoke *Acts* 15.10. to be actual Circumcision, or in act, that is, acted on their flesh, and not the doctrine or command of Circumcision, or that the putting the yoke was in their flesh by cutting off the skin, not in their consciences by teaching.

*Paulr. Cob. tom.*3. *l.*11. *c.*15. spends a whole Chapter to prove against the Papists that the yoke there is the Moral as well as the Ceremonial Law. Yea, Mr. *B.* himself *Direct.*10. *for peace, pag.*71. hath these words, *They were therefore said to be in bondage to the Law, and the Law was said to be a yoke, which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear, Acts* 15.10. *Vide Pareum Bell. Castig de Justific. l.*5. *c.*14. is the common Doctrine of Protestants to interpret the yoke of the whole Law, intolerable, because of the curse.

1. Saith he, *The Text saith so three times over, [that it was Circumcision as necessary and engaging to* Moses *Law, that was*

that

that yoke] *v.*1. *They taught the brethren, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of* Moses *ye cannot be saved:* and *v.*5. *They taught, it was needfull to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the Law of* Moses: and *v.*24. *saying, Ye must be circumcised, and keep the Law.*

Answ. There's not a word in either of the three Verses, that says so expresly, or by any good consequence, that the *yoke v.*10. is Circumcision actual or in act, that is, acted or to be acted on the flesh. Mr. *B.* me thinks if he could have made any good inference from thence, for his Conclusion, should have formed it, being not ignorant that in my *Antidote* I bring these very verses and words to prove the contrary.

2. Saith he, *It appears evidently from the same, v.*10. *the yoke which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear, that which neither their fathers nor they were able to bear, was the yoke there meant: but it was Circumcision as necessary, and engaging to keep the Law, and not the Doctrine of the false Apostles, which their fathers and they were not able to bear, therefore, &c. The* major *is in the Text; the* minor *is plain;* 1. *In that there is no mention in the Scripture of the Fathers being so burdened with that false doctrine; but that there is mention enough of their being burdened with the Law, and Circumcision as engaging to it.* 2. *It was true and good Doctrine before Christ which these false Apostles taught,* viz. *that except they were circumcised, and kept the Law, they could not be saved: I mean as to the* Jews *it was true, (for I will not now meddle with that great controversie whether the Gentiles were bound to keep* Moses *Law, I know not what* Grotius, Franzius, *&c. say on one side, and* Cloppenburgius, *and many more on the other.)*

Answer. This passage I also allege against Mr. *Bs.* opinion, in my *Antidote sect.*6. to prove that it is not Circumcision in act but in command or doctrine that is there meant by the yoke. But that we may determine the thing it is to be considered: 1. Who [*We and our Father*] are: 2. In what part or respect, and how it was intolerable. Doubtless by [*we*] the Apostle means the modern *Jews*, and by [*our Fathers*] the *Jewes* of former times. The intolerableness *was not to their flesh*, as *Diodati* speaks, *for the labour in observing it*, for though it be true that it was very irksom

ſom to obſerve Circumciſion, and the Rites of *Moſes* Law, yet Circumciſion was poſſible to be born, eſpecially by an infant, though, in the end and intent of the circumciſers it was done as neceſſary and engaging to keep *Moſes* Law, yet the infants being not ſenſible thereof, it was not intolerable to them. And the Apoſtle *Paul*, *Phil.* 3.6. ſpeaks of himſelf, as *touching the righteouſneſs of the Law, blameleſs.* But it was intolerable *to their mindes and conſciences, by reaſon of the imperfection of it to quiet the conſcience, and the condemnation it bound to for not keeping it in*, ſaith *Diodati locum*. And therefore it was the Command and Doctrine that was intolerable to perſons on whoſe conſciences the Law was impoſed, not the acting Circumciſion, or Circumciſion acted, which alone was put on infants, and conſequently the yoke is not what was impoſed on infants, but on perſons taught and commanded. As for Mr. *B*s. reaſons, the firſt he himſelf anſwers by his ſecond. For he ſaith *that doctrine was true to the Jews before Chriſt*, therefore ſure the Fathers were acquainted with it, it was doctrine known among them whether the Scripture mention it or no; and whether it were true or falſe if it were received by them it muſt needs be burdenſome to them. And for his ſecond: 1. *That it was true doctrine to the Jews before Chriſt that except they were circumciſed after the maner of* Moſes *they could not be ſaved, and that it was needfull to circumciſe them, and to Command them to keep the Law, v.* 1. 5. is in my apprehenſion diametrally oppoſite to *Pauls* doctrine, *Gal.* 2. & 3. & 4. & 5. *Rom.* 3. & 4. & 10. *Phil.* 3. concerning the non-neceſſity of obſerving the Law for juſtification, juſtification by faith without the works of the Law both in *Abrahams, Davids, Moſes* his time. 2. If the *doctrine were true to the Jews*, it was the more intolerable, it would ly the more heavy on their conſciences, finding themſelves unable to obſerve it; therefore this reaſon is againſt Mr. *B.* and proves the doctrine was the yoke.

But he adds, Mr. *T. ſaith it was the Phariſees doctrine of being juſtified by the Law which was the yoke. But I anſwer,* 1. *the Phariſees were not of ſo long continuance as to be the burden of the Fathers by their doctrine.* 2. *theſe in the Text taught but a neceſſity that thoſe who believed in Chriſt ſhould be circumciſed and keep the Law: ſo did not the Phariſees.*

Answ. 1. Those in the Text taught not onely a necessity that those who believed in Christ should be circumcised, and keep the Law, by way of Precept, but also of means, that *except they did so, they could not be saved*, and that was still taken by the Apostle in the Epistles to the *Romans*, *Galatians*, *Philippians*, as the Doctrine of Justification by the Law. And that this was the yoke which was so intolerable, *Acts* 15. 10. appears by the next words, *ver.* 11. *But we trust or believe to be saved by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, even as also they.* The term [ἀλλὰ, *but*] being adversative, shews the Apostles assertion, *v.* 11. to contain an *Antithesis* to their *Thesis* or Doctrine, that is, whereas they impose this intolerable yoke of Doctrine, that without Circumcision, and keeping the Law, Disciples cannot be saved, *We believe they may be saved by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, purifying their hearts by faith, v* 9. without the observation of *Moses* Law. 2. It is not true, *that they taught onely a necessity that those who believed in Christ should be circumcised, and keep the Law*; as if they exempted others. For though there is mention onely of their *teaching the Brethren*, yet doubtless they held a like necessity of it, or rather a greater, for *Jews*. whether converted or unconverted, as for Christian *Gentiles*. 3. But were it true, *that they taught but a necessity that those who believed in Christ should be circumcised, and keep the Law*; yet the Doctrine might be an intolerable yoke both to Disciples, and to the Ancestors from whomsoever they learn'd it. Whose Doctrine soever it were, yet it was a yoke intolerable to present Disciples and the Predecessors of former Generations. 4. The antiquity of the Pharisees is variously conceived by Writers; it is conceived that Sect began three hundred years before the birth of Christ, by some higher; sure they were ancient enough to burden the Fathers, that is, the Ancestours of the modern *Jews*, when *Peter* spake those words. 5. Were it that others spake that Doctrine, and burdened the Fathers with it, yet it might be well called by me the Pharisees Doctrine, who taught it afterwards. 6. That Mr. *Bs.* willingness to cavil may appear, let *v.* 5. be read, and there it is said, *The false Teachers were of the Sect of the Pharisees.* 3. Saith Mr. *B. The Doctrine is no further a yoke than as it hath reference to Circumcision, and keeping the Law, in practice, and as it prevaileth*

vaileth to bring them to the belief and practice; therefore it is evident, that the Doctrine is not the yoke; but the judgment and practice which that Doctrine did teach them; else it would be in the power of men to yoke and burden us at their pleasure: But till we obey it we are free from the yoke; therefore the yoke lieth not in the Doctrine, but the obeying.

Answ. This Argument however faulty, yet it plainly crosseth Mr. *Bs.* purpose; for his aim is to expound the yoke, so as that it may be said, to be laid on infants, and so they be reckoned for Disciples; but if it be *that the judgment and practice which the Doctrine did teach were the yoke, if the yoke did ly in obeying*, as he here saith, then the yoke was not put or endeavoured to be put on infants, the false Teachers neither did put nor endeavoured to put any thing on the judgment or practice of infants, nor to have brought them to obeying. What was to be done to them was not to be done by false Teachers, but the Parents; there was no act to be done on the infants mindes, consciences, judgments, but on their flesh, nor were they to be active in practice, or willing in obedience, but meerly passive, and likely very unwillingly. And therefore I infer from Mr. *Bs.* own Argument, *If the Doctrine were no further a yoke, than as it hath reference to Circumcision, and keeping the Law, in practice, and as it prevaileth to bring them to the belief and practice, that the yoke is the judgment and practice, which the doctrine did teach, that it lieth in the obeying*, then it is no yoke to infants, then it is not Circumcision as acted but as taught and yielded to, then it was not to be put on infants, and consequently no infants are meant by the *Disciples*, *Acts* 15.10. But for the thing objected, as I have sayd before, the doctrine may be considered either *in se, in it self*, as it came from the Teachers, or in the event to the persons taught, being yielded to by them: It is true, the doctrine was not a yoke to the Disciples eventually, till the Disciples yielded to it, but it was in it self a yoke, and might so be called before, as the truth of Christ is *the Gospel* or *glad tidings* in it self, and may be, and is often so called, though it prove not so to all that hear it. Wherefore I have sometimes called the yoke the command, sometimes the doctrine, sometimes the necessity of observation, sometimes the opinion of the necessity, and all these in different respects are rightly made the

Yoke: in respect of God the command and necessity of observance, of the Teachers the doctrine, of the persons yoked the opinion and judgment, when it becomes such in the event, not onely *in fieri*, but *in facto esse*, yet no way barely Circumcision acted on infants, and consequently they not Disciples, *Acts* 15.10. which conceit is plainly overthrown by Mr. *Bs.* own Argument.

4. Saith Mr. *B.* [" That which this Synod did decree against, and *Peter* here spoke against, that was the yoke here meant. But it was Circumcision as needfull, and engaging to keep the Law, which this Synod decreed against, and *Peter* here spoke against: therefore this Circumcision was the yoke. The *minor* is evident in the the three verses before named, and in the whole Chapter. Who dare say that this Synod did not decree against Circumcision and keeping the Law? And the *major* is as plain; And yet the very sum and strength of all that Mr. *T.* hath to say against this Text is here, which seems apparently to me to be but a meer cavilling with the plain Scripture. "]

Answ. All this may be justly retorted. That which this Synod did decree against, and *Peter* here spake against, that was the yoke here meant: but it was not barely Circumcision as acted on infants, but Circumcision as taught, the command, doctrine, obligation, necessity of it to salvation, & opinion of that necessity urged on Disciples by teaching, which this Synod decreed against, and *Peter* here spoke against: therefore this doctrine, command, obligation, necessity, opinion of Circumcision and keeping the Law urged on persons taught was the yoke, & not barely Circumcision as acted on infants by parents, after the manner, and by virtue of *Moses* Law. The *minor* is evident in the three verses before named, and in the whole Chapter. Who dare say that this Synod did not decree against the command, doctrine, obligation, necessity, opinion of Circumcision, and and keeping the Law? And yet the very sum and strength of all Mr. *B.* hath to say against this Text is here, which seems apparently to me to be but a meer cavilling with the plain Scripture.

But he adds of me, [" He saith that the Synod decreed against Circumcision but by consequence, and not expresly; and that the thing they directly and expresly decreed against, and *Peter* spoke against, was not the yoke it self, but the putting the yoke on them, which was the act of the false Teachers in Teaching. "]

Answ.

Answ. That which the Synod decreed against, and *Peter* spake against, I say was not barely Circumcision as acted on infants, nor Circumcision acted on infants immediately, but the command, doctrine, obligation, necessity and opinion of necessity of Circumcision, and keeping the Law to salvation, and consequently the infants Circumcision, which how or in what sense they are the yoke, and what the putting on of the yoke is, hath already been often shewed.

But saith Mr. *B.* ["1. If this were granted, yet neither directly nor consequently do they decree against the circumcising of any but Disciples, and therefore infants must needs be part of those Disciples. "]

Answer. That which *Peter* spoke against was the practise of the false Teachers, *v.*10. The decree of the Synod was expresly, 1. a condemnation of the false Teachers practice, *v.*24. 2. A release to Gentile Disciples of other commands called burdens save onely some excepted, *v.*28,29. *Acts* 21.25. And it is true that these decrees are directed onely to the Disciples of the Gentiles for the freeing of their consciences. But it is false that they decree against the circumcising of none but Disciples. It is true the decree is not for the release of burdens to any but Disciples: But he that releaseth the burden that is the command of Circumcision to the Father who is a Disciple, doth withall by plain consequence free the childe from Circumcision, and yet the childe no Disciple.

2. Saith Mr. *B. But the Text expresseth actual Circumcision three times over.*

Answ. And it expresseth also keeping the Law, doth it therefore follow that the yoke, *Acts* 15.10. is the *actual* keeping the Law, and that this might be put on infants.

3. Saith he, [" It is undeniable in the 28,29. *v.* that it was matter of their practice, as directly as the false Apostles teaching, and much more which was decreed against. It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater burdens than these necessary things: that ye abstain from meats offered to Idols, *&c.* Mark 1. their practice is the thing decreed upon expresly, and not the doctrine of the false Teacher (though that is implied) they do not say we do not decree, that they preach so no more, but that you abstain, *&c.*

Answ. 1. Mr. *Bs.* speeches seem to enterfer, when he saith, *v.*28 29. *It was the matter of their practice as directly as the false Apostles teaching, and much more, which was here decreed against*, Doth he not confess that *the false Apostles teaching was directly decreed against*, though not so much? yet presently he bids, *Mark, that it is not the Doctrine of the false Teachers that is decreed upon expresly* [*though that is implied*] yet by [*directly and expresly*] he seems to mean the same. 2. What if *v.* 8, 29. decree not expresly against the Doctrine of the false Teachers, yet if it were implied it was decreed against. 3. If it were not expresly decreed upon, *v.*28, 29. Is it not enough that it was expresly decreed against, *v.*24.? 4. Though they do not say *v.*28. we decree that they preach so no more, yet when they say, *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay upon you no greater burdens than these necessary things*, this is an expres decree against the Doctrine of those false Teachers, *v.*1. *Except ye be circumcised after the manner of* Moses *ye cannot be saved, and v.*5. *that it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the Law of* Moses.

2. Saith Mr. *B.* "This is it also which is here called [the burden] in the sense, no doubt, with that which before was called the yoke, no greater burden or yoke. And can any impartial mans conscience tell him that the onely chief question here debated and determined was, whether the false Apostles should any more preach such doctrine. and not rather whether the Disciples ought to be circumcised and keep the Law of *Moses*."

Answ. If the burden and yoke be the same, then the yoke *v.*10. is not that which was put on infants. For the burden *v.*28. is called [*Command*] *v.*24. and this was opposit to the false Teachers *saying to command them to keep the Law of* Moses *v.*5. and by burdens elsewhere are meant Commands or Doctrines or Doctrinal Commands *Matth.* 23 4. *Luke* 11.46. *Revel.* 2.24. now Commands were not attempted to be put on infants who could not understand them. 2. *If the practise were the yoke*, then it was not on infants who were not urged to practise but to suffer, specially taking in what Mr. *B.* before said, *it was the judgment and practice which the Doctrine did Teach which was the yoke.* And to his questions I say, the false Teachers Doctrine and the Disci-

ples

ples practise were both in question, and both determined in the Synod, and therefore both decreed against, and so the doctrine is the yoke in respect of the yoakers, and the judgment and practise in respect of the yoaked.

4. Saith Mr. *B.* "It was the Church of *Antioch* and not the false Teachers that sent to *Jerusalem* for resolution. 5. And it was to the brethren, and not to the false Teachers that the Synod did direct their letters, and decrees: therefore it was the Disciples practise that is more directly decreed against (or at least as much) than the Doctrine of the Teachers."

Answ. Be the Conclusion granted, yet the Doctrine is decreed against, and consequently is meant by the yoke *v.*10. even according to Mr. *Bs.* argument, *That which the Synod did decree against was the yoke here meant.* But doth not Mr. *B.* in these words plainly intimate that *Disciples* are the same with *brethren, to whom the letters were directed*, which sure were not infants? It is true the Church of *Antioch*, and not the false Teachers, sent to *Jerusalem* for resolution, and that the letters were directed not to the false Teachers, but brethren called *believers*, *Acts* 21.25. yet they sent about the false Teachers Doctrine, and the decree and speech were against that Doctrine: even as the decrees or Canons of Councils are against the doctrine of Heretikes though sent to the Churches. From all which I infer that Mr. *Bs.* reasoning is frivolous, and while he oppose h it, his own arguments prove, that the Doctrine of the false Teachers is the yoke. But he hath not yet done.

6. Saith he, "If it were granted as Mr. *T.* would have it, that it is onely putting on the yoke that is here expressely decreed against, and the yoke or practise it self but onely by consequence, then he would make this Synod so weak as to leave the matter imperfect and obscure, which they were to determine expressly: and perhaps it might put him hard to it to prove that consequence: For it will not alway follow that what may not be taught may not be practised, as I could shew in several cases."

Answ. I hold the Synod to decree expressely against the yoke, understanding by it the Doctrine of the necessity of Circumcision, the obligation and opinion of its necessity, and the putting of the yoke, that is the Teaching this Doctrine to Disciples, and by consequence

sequence against the Gentiles believing Parents practice of circumcising their Infants as of duty, nor do I know how any other way Mr. *B.* can gather it from the Epistle of the Synod than as I do; sure in all the Epistle I finde not any other way to prove Gentile believers are not bound to circumcise their children, but by urging the words *v.* 24, 28. 29 in which parents are not discharged of circumcising infants expresly in so many words, But by consequence. And yet the matter is not left imperfect or obscure, but there is an expres determination against that which was the occasion of the Synod, to wit the Doctrine of the false Teachers, *v.* 24. nor is the consequence hard to infer, if the Apostles give no command to the Gentile parents to be circumcised. and to keep the Law, then parents are not tied to circumcise their infants, there being no necessity or duty to them who have no command or burden put on them. Mr. *B.* misttakes in conceivng I framed the consequence thus: What the false Apostles might not teach, the parents might not practice. And therefore though he could shew in many more cases than he can, that it will not alway follow that what may not be taught may not be practiced, the consequence as I frame it may be clear, & the determination of the Synod expres and perfect.

But he adds: 7. *And me thinks we may be allowed to prove baptism of infants by consequence: if this Synod assembled of purpose about Circumcision and the Law did yet leave them nothing but consequence against it.*

Answ. I never said, that the Synod left nothing but consequence against Circumcision and the Law; nor did I disallow at any time the proving of infants baptism by consequence, but have often declared the contrary, though Mr. *M.* most unbrotherly charged me with it, *pag.* 3. of his *Defence*, but absolved me of it, *pag.* 205. as I shew in my *Apology*, *sect.* 11. and in my *Præcursor*, *sect.* 8. But having so long expected some proof by consequence for infant-baptism, and finding upon trial in so many Authors as have occurred nothing worth the name of a proof, I conclude there is no such thing, but that Pædobaptists, and none more than Mr. *B.* do onely gull the world, and which is more to be detested, the godly, and of those, many that are teachers of others, with flourishes and shews, instead of proof, in so much as some who are of able parts magnifie his book about infants baptism as excellent,

whether

whether it be out of rashness, or for advantage sake to themselves, finde it upon strictest examination to be but a meer cheat.

But Mr. *B.* hath one string more to his Bowe. 5. *Further*, saith he, *that it was Circumcision it self as needfull, and as engaging to* Moses *Law, which is here meant, is plain in Gal.* 5.1,2,3. *No doubt either those that mis-taught the* Galatians *were the same with those or their companions teaching the same Doctrine, and therefore* Paul *there decideth the same cause; and mark what he cals the yoke, Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I* Paul *say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testifie again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to the whole Law. Is not he wilfull that yet will say, the yoke is onely the Doctrine of the false Teachers, and not Circumcision as engaging to keep the Law.*

Answ. 1. Mr. *B.* before *p.*17. said, *that it is evident the doctrine is not the yoke*; here when he saith, *Is not he wilfull that yet will say that the yoke is onely the doctrine of the false Teachers?* He doth plainly intimate that he excepts not against the holding the yoke to be the Doctrine, but the holding it to be onely the Doctrine of the false Teachers, which is me thinks to contradict himself, and to overthrow what he contends for, to wit, the yoke is that which was put on infants: but the Doctrine was not put on infants, and therefore if the Doctrine were in part the yoke, and this not put on infants, then the yoke was not put on infants, then it is not absurd for me to expound the yoke of the Doctrine of the false Teachers, and his Arguments against that Exposition are answered by his own concession. 2. If it be true, that either *those that mis-taught the* Galatians *were the same with these false Teachers, Acts* 15.1. *or their companions teaching the same Doctrine*, then it is most false which Mr. *B.* teacheth, *pag.*16. *It was true, and good doctrine before Christ, which these false Apostles taught*, viz. *that except they were circumcised, and kept the Law, they could not be saved; I mean as to the* Jews *it was true.* Now the Doctrine of those that mis-taught the *Galatians*, was justification by the Law, as appears by the Apostles opposition, *Gal.*2.16,21. & 3.5 11,18,21. & 4.21. & 5.4. and this was

the same with the Doctrine of the false Teachers, as appears from *Acts* 15.1,9,10,11. and Mr. *B.* confesseth it to be the same. But that Doctrine the Apostle denies to have been true and good before Christ to the *Jews*, *Gal.* 3. & 4. and elsewhere, and therefore Mr. *B.* contradicts the Apostle, and his speech overthrows the Gospel, and avows keeping of the Law necessary to justification and salvation, to have been true and good Doctrine to the *Jews* afore Christ. 3. He is not wilfull but considerate, that by the yoke of bondage, *Gal.* 5.1. understands not Circumcision as acted on infants, that is the bare passive reception of Circumcision, of which onely infants are capable, no nor perhaps (for that is disputed) all willing receiving of Circumcision as the *Habassine* Christians do, but the willing subjecting to Circumcision according to the command of *Moses*, and the Doctrine of the Teachers that urged it as necessary for justification and salvation. For herein, 1. they have many of the best sort of Protestant Writers on their side. 2. They have these Reasons for them, 1. Because the exhortation, *Gal.* 5.1. is inferred from his determination in the precedent Chapter, from *v.* 21. to the end, to wit, that *the Covenant of the Law did beget to bondage*, and that *they were children of the free woman*, and therefore the yoke of bondage is not simply Circumcision as acted, but as Mr. *Dickson* expresseth it, *the yoke of the Covenant of Works and legal Ceremonies.* 2. Because [*if ye be circumcised*, *v.* 2.] is expounded rightly, if ye be willingly circumcised, upon the opinion, and according to the Doctrine of the false Teachers to seek justification thereby, as the reasons of the Apostle, *v.* 3,4 do evidently shew. 3. Otherwise *Timothy* might be said *to be entanged with the yoke of bondage* when he was circumcised, *Acts* 16.3. which being so, this Argument (as all the rest of Mr. *Bs.* Arguments) is against him. For *if the false Teachers were the same, and the yoke the same, Acts* 15. 10. *Gal.* 5.1. *and the yoke, Gal.* 5.1. be not Circumcision as acted on infants, but the Covenant of Works, and Circumcision as taught and yielded to by the circumcised under the notion of necessity for justification, and obligation thereby to keep the whole Law, then the yoke was not that which is put on infants, nor any infants meant by *Disciples*, *Acts* 15.10.

Vide Dr. *Field* of the Church, *l.* 3 *c.* 1.

SECT

SECT. XIII.

The Arguments are vindicated, which are brought to prove infants not meant by Disciples, Acts 15.10.

BUt Mr. *B.* proceeds, *Well, but Mr. T. hath one argument for his conceit, and but one that I have heard, and that is like the conceit it self. If* (saith he) *putting on the yoke be onely by teaching, then the yoke it self is onely the Doctrine, and consequently it was to be put on none but those that could be taught. Answ.* 1. *I deny both the Consequences, and he will never prove them. For,* 1. *by* [*putting*] *he confesseth is meant* [*an endeavour to put*] *therefore it must be more than bare Doctrine. And if by Doctrine they perswade the People of the necessity of practice in so doing, they put on them both the mis-belief and the practice.*

Answ. Mr. *B.* it seems either did not reade, or not heed, or forgot what was in *Examen. pag.* 135. when he saith, *he had heard but of one Argument for my conceit*, though it be his meer ignorance that makes him call it my conceit, as if it were my peculiar conceit; whereas his own conceit is scarce any thing older than himself, and mine agreeable to the Exposition of the best and elder Interpreters. And however when Mr. *B.* wrote this he might know of no more Arguments against his conceit, yet there are more in my *Antidote, sect.* 6. to which with this here I shall review his Answers. My Argument in form is this, They onely are meant by Disciples, *Acts* 15 10. who were to be the subjects passive or recipient of the act of the false Teachers whether effected or attempted, that is of that which they would have done to them. But no infants were to be the subjects passive or recipient of the act of the false Teachers, whether effected or attempted, that is of that which they would have done to them. *Ergo.* The *major* is plain to common understanding, according to all Rules of Logick and Grammar. So we argue, they must be meant by *all men*, *John* 12.32. when Christ saith, *I will draw all men to me*, who were the subjects recipient of the act of *drawing*. Every particular man is not the subject of Christs drawing, therefore [*all men*] doth not note

every particular man. Innumerable such Arguments are among Writers Ecclesiastical and Civil, nor is there any thing more plain to common understanding The *minor* is proved thus: the onely act of the false Teachers by which the yoke was to be put on Disciples was teaching, or that which they would have done to them was onely teaching. But of this act no infant was the passive subject: *Ergo.* The former is confessed by himself in calling it *perswading*, and if it were not, the Text proves it, *v.* 1. 5, 24 The *minor* is manifest, they were neither capable of it, nor were the false Teachers so sensless as to endeavour it. But let's view Mr. *Bs.* Answer. *He denies this consequence, if the putting on the yoke be onely by teaching, then the yoke it self is onely the Doctrine.* But this is not my consequence, but this, if their act of putting on the yoke were onely Teaching then the *terminus*, at least immediate, must be Doctrine in respect of the agent, and in respect of the patient learning, as if the act of the Sun be Teaching, the immediate *terminus* is heat, although other effects follow, as dryness or the like; so if the false Teachers did put the yoke on the Disciples by Teaching they did put Doctrine on them, and if they received it they learned that Doctrine, although other effects followed, as disquietnes of minde, *&c.* which may be comprehended under the metaphor of a yoke. By Teaching parents, an infant is not cut or circumcised, no not though the parents receive the Doctrine, he may have no childe to circumcise, or no strength, or the like: no though it come to pass that the childe be circumcised, yet this is not done by the false Teacher, but by the parent. If then their act was onely teaching, then the product result or *terminus* must be Doctrine, though there were other consequents to follow. But *Mr.* B. *denies also this consequence, that if the yoke were onely doctrine, it was put on none but those that could be taught.* Whereto I reply, he may as well deny the Snow to be white, as deny it: Can any put Doctrine but on Persons that can be taught? What is this but to hold that a Person may have Doctrine put on him, that cannot be taught, which is a meer contradiction, all one as to say, He may be taught that cannot be taught. But he will forsooth give us some Reason of his denial as wise as the rest. *For,* 1. *by* [*putting*] *he confesseth is meant* [*an endeavour to put*] *therefore it must be more than the bare doctrine.* *Answ.* 1. I confess not

by

by [*putting*] *is meant* [*an endeavour to put*] though I confeſs that *Peter* accuſeth them onely of their endeavour to put the yoke. 2. If I had confeſſed it, yet Mr. *Bs.* Reaſon is fooliſh, for it would rather follow, that it is leſs than bare Doctrine, the endeavour to put being leſs than putting. Yet it is not true that I ſaid, *The yoke notes bare Doctrine*, without any other effect, but that the yoke notes doctrine, command, opinion of obligation, and neceſſity, and perhaps diſquietneſs, trouble, care, fear conſequent. However they that put the yoke by teaching did put doctrine on whom they put the yoke, the putting the yoke being nothing but teaching. That which follows, *And if by doctrine they prevail to perſwade the people of the neceſſity of practice in ſo doing, they put on them the both the miſ-belief and miſ-practice*, is as little to purpoſe. For, 1. to put on them the misbelief is to put on them the doctrine, for doctrine is put on by being learned or believed.

2. They that do prevail do put on the miſpractice it may be in the event, but not barely by their putting on their doctrine, for it may be they may both teach, and that effectually, ſo as that the perſon do learn or miſ-believe, and yet not miſ-practice through many intervenient impediments, yea though he do miſ-practice, yet the miſ-practice is not the *terminus* of his teaching, nor is he the miſ-practicer, it is not his act logically or phyſically, though it be his morally, that is, the fault of it be imputed to him, as ariſing from the Doctrine he taught. However if it be by perſwading and by producing miſ-belief and miſ-practice, they onely are the ſubjects of it who miſ-believe and miſ practice, which being not verified of infants, they are not meant by Diſciples, on whom the yoke is put.

But Mr. *B.* gives a Reaſon of his denial of the latter conſequence, and it is this, 2. *The latter conſequence is as falſe; For he that perſwadeth a parent to circumciſe himſelf, and his childe, doth as properly put that burden of Circumciſion on the childe as on the parent. Though he teach onely the parent, yet by teaching the parent he puts the burden on both.*

Anſw. 1. If the putting the yoke be Teaching or perſwading, ſure he onely is the ſubject of his putting the yoke, who is the ſubject of his Teaching, (as if we ſay the killing there was wounding by the ſword, it folows he was not there ſaid to be

killed who was not wounded by the sword) though it may be true also that another agent by another act may put the burden on one not taught. 2. But were Mr. *Bs.* speech true, yet it is nothing to his wilful denial of the later consequence, for the consequence is thus, if the yoke were onely Doctrine it was put on none but those that could be taught, which may be undeniable, though it be granted, that *he that Teacheth onely the parents, yet puts the burden both on parent and child.* 3. Yea Mr. *B.* doth grant it by supposing that he *Teacheth onely the parent*, that Doctrine is put onely on the parent. For what is it to put Doctrine on any but to Teach him? And therefore if the yoke were onely Doctrine, sure it was put on none but such as could be taught, unless we imagine that Doctrine can be put on those that cannot be taught, which is all one in my apprehension as to say they may be taught who cannot be taught. And therefore if there be any silly wranglings in the dispute between us, sure Mr. *B.* doth wrangle here either as a silly man or as a most perverse man in denying this consequence, and in his whole arguings about this Text, when confessing *the yoke to be not onely the Doctrine but the judgment and practise also of Circumcision, and that the false Teachers would put it onely by Teaching*, yet doth imagine he can perswade his reader to be so silly as to conceive that they did any thing to infants or that infants are any of those *Disciples* mentioned *Acts* 15.10.

And here I shall inforce the arguments of my *Antidote sect.* 6. The first is *ad hominem*. He counts it a heinous offence that I take the word [holy 1 *Cor.* 7.14.] in a different sense than it is used six hundred times in the Scripture, and yet he takes the word [*Disciple*] used three hundred times in the New Testament, and of those about one hundred in *Lukes* writings for one that is a Disciple by owning a Teacher and his Doctrine, in another sense or rather nonsense acception for one that is *a Disciple in title, incompleat, without actual learning for present*, that is for a meer relative without a foundation, and brings no place in any Author for this sense but this, and therefore I may more justly use his conjuring speech p. 83. *requiring men that are not of desperat resolutions and prostituted consciences to consider faithfully how they can answer the Lord Christ* for perverting so solemn an institution as

that

that is *Matth.* 28.19. by their baby ſprinkling, when the very words of Chriſt, practiſe of the Apoſtles, conſtant uſe of the word [Diſciples] throughout the New Teſtament, common conſent of Interpreters ſhews Chriſt appointed Diſciples onely to be baptized ordinarily, who were made ſuch by preaching the Goſpel, upon pretence that infants are called [*Diſciples. Acts* 15.10] in a ſenſe different from what *Luke* uſeth it elſewhere even in the precedent and following chapters, and that ſenſe or rather nonſenſe ſelf-contradicting acception deviſed of late by Mr. *B.* without any ancient Author I know, or any reaſon from the Text. That which Mr. *B.* replies is as frivolous. 1. He ſaith *infants are called Diſciples Acts.* 11.26. *They are there part of Chriſtians and Diſciples*; but this is falſe theres not a word in the Text that ſoundes to this ſenſe, that infants are any part of the Chriſtians or Diſciples there mentioned, yea there is that which is plainly to the contrary *v.*29. *Then the Diſciples, every man according to his ability, determined to ſend relief to the brethren.* If every one of the Diſciples determined to ſend, and no infants determined to ſend relief, then no infants are part of the Diſciples. 2 Saith he, *the caſe is not alike, In* 1.*Cor.*7.14. *I argued about the meaning of the word* [*holy*] *here we are agreed about the ſenſe, that it ſignifieth one ſo related to Chriſt as their maſter, the difference is about the application of this term.* But this is falſe that I agree with him about the ſignification and ſenſe of the word [*Diſciple of Chriſt*] *as it notes a relation to Chriſt as Teacher*, yea I utterly deny it notes ſuch a relation as Mr. *B.* fancies *in title without actual learning or owning Chriſt as Teacher*, in which ſenſe it is no where taken in Scripture or any Ancient Author I know. 3. Saith he, *However I am certain, if we have not the name elſewhere, yet we have the deſcription and names of the ſame ſignification, they are Church members, Gods people, his ſervants, and therefore Diſciples. Anſw.* 1. This doth not at all avoyd his owne charge of proſtituted conſciences, *&c.* in another caſe, he charged theſe things on me for uſing the word [*holy*] in a different ſenſe from what elſewhere it is uſed, though I brought a term of the ſame ſignification *Mal.* 2.15. and cogent reaſon out of the Text for my interpretation, and therefore by his own Law to me, he is to be charged as he chargeth me for doing the ſame, though it were true

he

he had the description and names of the same signification. 2. It is not proved, no nor can be proved, the terms [*Churchmembers, Gods people, Gods servants*] to be of the same signification with [*Disciples of Christ*] 3. There is no: so much as one Text in the New Testament, which alone is written in Greek by the Holy Pen-men, and therefore the fittest if not the onely way to shew the meaning of a New Testament term, brought to prove infants under the New Testament to be caled *Churchmembers, Gods people, Gods servants.*

4. The consequence shall be examined in that which follows.

Besides I argued from the Text, *the putting the yoke on the necks of the Disciples* is the same with that which is mentioned *v.1. they taught the brethren*, and *v.5. they said it was needfull to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the Law of* Moses, *and v.24. certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying ye must be circumcised and keep the Law.* Now is any man so sensless as to think they did these things to infants? Again the Text *v.1.23.* calls *the Disciples v.10. brethren*, saith *v.9. their hearts were purified by faith* upon the hearing of the word, which none but those that are resolved to outface a plain truth would aver to be meant of infants, therefore neither the term *Disciples, v.10.* sith what is said of the *brethren* is meant of the *Disciples v.10.* To this all the reply I finde in Mr. *B.* is this *pag 252. And your bringing some passages of the chapter not applicable to infants doth not prove that therefore the rest is not, no more than several passages in* Deut.29. *applicable onely to the aged, will prove little ones were not taken in to be Gods people.*

Answ. It is true, the bringing some passages of the chapter not applicable to infants doth not prove that therefore the rest is not: if I had made such an Argument I would give him leave to use his Rhetorick *of silly insipid arguing.* But my arguing is this, The same thing which is expressed, *v.10. by putting the yoke on the necks of the Disciples*, is expressed *v.1. by teaching the brethren, v.5. by saying to them it was needfull to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the Law of* Moses, *v 24. by troubling with words, subverting their souls, saying, ye must be circumcised*

cumcised and keep the Law, and the same persons which are expressed by *Disciples*, *v.*10. are termed *v.*1. *Brethren*, are said *v.*9. *to have their hearts purified by faith*, *v.*19. *those of the Gentiles that were turned to God*, *v.*23. *Brethren of the Gentiles*; But these things were not done to infants, nor infants comprehended under these persons, in these places, which express the same thing, and the same person, which is apparent by the narration, *Peter* reprehends the same thing in the same persons, *v.*10. which is related *v.*1,5,23,24. the occasion of his speech was the same fact, the drift of his speech is to condemn the same fact, the determination of the Council is against the same practice, the same persons are in all these places spoken of, and this is proved by Mr. *Bs.* first Argument, who brings *v.*1,5,24. to prove Circumcision to be the yoke, *v.*10. which Argument supposeth the same persons and things meant, *v.*10. which are meant, *v.*1,5,24. But not one of the things said there is applicable to infants. How then can any man imagine that the same act being meant in all the places, it should be meant of the act of Circumcision, *v.*10. and not *v.*1,5,24. and the same persons meant, they should be infants meant, *v.*10. and not *v.*1,5,24? Is not this to make the same act and the same persons not the same, which is a contradiction? I know not how men conceive of my intellectuals: But I am still possessed of this to be so good proof, that I should as soon doubt of other common notions as of this, and as soon believe that the Moon is made of green Cheese, as believe Mr. *B.* affirming that *Peter* meant infants by *Disciples*, *Acts* 15.10.

I added further, if the putting on the yoke had been Circumcision, it had been to be done not on their necks but elsewhere, the yoke was put not on their flesh, but on their consciences, *their souls are said to be subverted*, *their mindes troubled*, *v.*24. not their flesh pained by the putting on the yoke, it was done *by words*, *v.*24. not by a knife or such like instrument. Again, the *yoke v.*10. was such *as neither the present* Jews *nor their fathers were able to bear*: but Circumcision put on infants was tolerable. I argued also that Christs doctrine is called his *yoke*, *Matth.*11.29. I alleged the testimonies of *Piscat.* on *Acts* 15.10. *Grot. Annot.* in *Acts* 15.10. calling it the *Law* and *Doctrine*, that *the yoke of bondage*, *Gal.*5.1. is the Doctrine or *Covenant of the Law*, *which genders*

to bondage, *Gal.* 4. 21, 24. That Circumcision is not the yoke without subjection of minde or opinion to it, which are not verified of infants. *These things* he saith *are answered already*, but where I know not: if he mean in his Argument before, he may see his Cannon turned against himself.

I said, all the colour Mr. *B.* hath from this Text to prove infants disciples, is by conceiving the yoke to note barely and precisely the cutting off a little skin. To this he answers, *I must say it is but one of your fictions. Did you ever hear me talk of such a thing? Cutting that skin is not Circumcision, as the word is used for a Sacrament. The end, signification, and engagement go into the definition of Circumcision. And if from hence you would infer, that it is onely the aged that are capable of signification and engagement, you may strait conclude that no infant was ever circumcised.*

I reply, it is no fiction of mine, but a truth, whether Mr. *B.* talked or thought of it or no, that all the colour, that is shew of reason Mr. *B.* hath from this Text to prove infants Disciples, is in taking the yoke for the cutting off a little skin. For his proof is from what was done or endeavored to be done to infants; but that was onely the cutting the little skin. Mr. *B.* would have the yoke to be actual Circumcision, or Circumcision as acted, and that was nothing but the cutting off the litle skin. It is true, Circumcision in the users is more than the cutting off the little skin, there is the end, signification, and intended engagement, but as infants receive it, as it is acted on infants, the yoke can be no more than the loss of the skin and the soreness following, they neither are taught, nor discern the end, signification or engagment, and Circumcision as it includes these is as I say in my *Antidote* Circumcision not as acted on infants, but taught persons of years; nor was it my objection that Circumcision as a Sacrament was onely the cutting off a little skin, but as it was acted on infants, and the imagined yoke endeavored to be put on infants *Acts* 15. 10. which sure *Peter* never blamed them for, and therefore it is not the yoke there meant. Mr. *B.* talk of Circumcision as a Sacrament, and what is the definition of it as a Sacrament, as it leades to a dispute about the notion of a word not found in Scripture, so being besides the present business, I shall let it pass.

Lastly

Lastly I added, that if it were granted that the term [*Disciples Acts* 15.10] noted infants, then onely male infants, for they onely were to be circumcised, therefore female infants should not be thence proved Disciples, nor to be baptized. To this he answers, *That is as much as I needed, when my position was that some infants are Disciples and to be baptized.* I reply, It is not as much as he needed, unless he understood his position onely of some male infants. 2. Saith he, *I should hence prove, that if males are Disciples, then certainly females, both being Church-members till Christ, though but one circumcised.* I reply, 1. It is more than he can prove that those who were Church-members in the Jewish Church are Disciples of Christ in the New Testament to be baptized. 2. If he could prove it, yet not from *Acts* 15.10. it being certain no more can be proved thence to be Disciples, than are there called Disciples, which Mr. *B.* himself will not say of female infants. I conclude still, that in this arguing of Mr. *B.* I finde nothing but froward, and, I had almost said, impudent wrangling against a plain truth, that the Disciples *Acts* 15.10. were onely the brethren converted, and the yoke the Doctrine the false Teachers would have put upon them, and the reader, of whosoever education or tutelage, if he be not otherwise blinded, may perceive with his own eys the slightiness of Mr. *Bs.* arguings, and how superficially he hath handled this business. I go on to review the next, which is no better.

SECT. XIV.

Infants discipleship is not proved by Mr. B. *from* Lev. 25 41,42. *which speaks of the* Israelites *being Gods servants.*

MY *second Argument, saith Mr.* B. *to prove that some infants are Disciples, is this, If no infants are Disciples, then it is either because they are not capable, or else because God will not shew them such a mercy; But neither of these can be the cause; Therefore that no infants are Disciples is false Doctrine. Mr.* T. *to this gave this Answer*

[*that the reason why they are not Disciples is because they have not learned.*]

Answ. It is true, in the dispute at *Bewdley* finding Mr. *B's.* vein of disputing to run upon a captious way of endeavouring to bring me to such absurdities in appearance as would stir up passions in hearers against me as lessening Gods mercy to their infants, and then aggravating these imagined absurdities, turning to the people with his wonted exclamations, and other Rhetorick (whereby he hath befooled not onely those parts, but a great number of shallow heads throughout the Land) which I found to be his course in his first argument in *ch.6.* now printed to prove his Ordinance of visible Church-membership of infants unrepealed, with which he began, when he should have first proved such an Ordinance and its continuing in force out of Scripture, it being an indirect way, though popular and taking, to prove a thing done by God, because we conceive it fit to be done, and having been tired with answering three or four hours his long hypothetical Syllogisms, and those sometimes brought to prove an hypothetical proposition, contrary to the use of schools, not allowing me to ask a question for clearing his termes, neither allowing me time to consider of his reasonings, nor at first liberty of repeating, I did thus answer to this argument, hoping though in vain to reduce him to a proof of infants of Discipleship from the notation or use of the word, which is the onely genuine and clear way of proving infants to be Disciples, ordinarily to be baptized, according to the institution *Matth.*28.19.

But, *alas*, saith Mr. *B. that such an answer should satisfy such a man*! I reply, Alas, that such an answer should not satisfy such a man! *Is this any third cause* saith Mr. *B.*

Answ. What need any man assigne any cause at all why infants are not Disciples, but because the term [Disciple] agrees not to them? If Mr. *B.* should prove in like manner infants to be believers, what need the respondent shew any other cause than this, that they have not faith? so even sith Mr. *B.* himself acknowledgeth the term *Disciple* pag. 92. *to have its denomination from the act of learning*, it is a sufficient, yea the most direct and proper way to shew infants not Disciples, because they have not the act of learning, which Mr. *B.* should have overthrown if he would have proved

proved, as he ſhould, infants to be Diſciples. But then he might have been hindered in his vagaries and popular diſcourſes, which with his Rhetorical exclamations were that he moſt minded to uſe, and been brought to diſcover his nonſenſe acception of the word [*Diſciple.*] But ſaith he, *or is it not evidently reducible to one of the former? For if their unlearnedneſs hinder them from being Diſciples, either it muſt be becauſe it maketh them or ſheweth them uncapable, or becauſe God will not ſhew the unlearned ſo great mercy.*

Anſw. It is neither becauſe unlearnedneſs maketh or ſheweth them uncapable, nor becauſe God will not ſhew them that mercy: But becauſe what ever their capacity be, or Gods intent toward them, they have not yet that which alone denominates Diſciples. If his disjunction were good he ſhould prove that capacity of a title, or Gods intention of ſhewing mercy, without actual learning or profeſſing Chriſt, is enough to denominate a perſon a Diſciple of Chriſt, which is ſo manifeſtly contrary to all the uſe of the word in the new Teſtament, and to expoſitors of *Matth.* 28. 29. that I am now bold to ſay, that it is no better than height of impudence after ſo evident proof to maintain ſo groſs an abſurdity. But I am neceſſitated to follow Mr. *B.* in his vagaries.

1. "If infants, ſaith Mr. *B.* are capable of being Gods ſervants, then they are capable of being Diſciples. For as they ſignify here the ſame thing and denote the ſame ſort of perſons, ſo there is the ſame capacity requiſite to both: or if you will make a difference, there is more required to a ſervant than to a Diſciple. But infants are capable of being Gods ſervants: this is plain; For the Lord God himſelf doth call them his ſervants, *Levit.* 25. 41. 42. they are commanded in the year of Jubile to let their brother that was ſold to them, and his children, depart; and the reaſon is added [for they are my ſervants] that infants are here included among [his children] cannot be denied or doubted of (Mr. *T.* began to deny it, but he quickly recalled it) Is not here then direction enough to help us to judg of the minde of God, whether infants are his ſervants and Diſciples or no? Doth not God call them his ſervants himſelf? what more ſhould a man expect to warrant him to do ſo? men call for plain Scripture, and when they have it they will not receive it; ſo hard is it to inform a fore-

stalled mindе. It may be some may say, They were then capable of being Gods servants, but they are not so now. But this were a wretched answer. For their capacity was the same then and now: Infants then were like infants now.

Answ. It is certain that the term [*servants of God*] is not always equipollent to [*a Disciple of Christ.*] For *Jer.*43.10. *Nebuchadnezzar* is called *Gods servant*, and *the heavens*, *Psal.*119.91. But then when it is taken in the sense the Apostle useth it, *Rom.* 6.16. *His servants ye are to whom ye obey*, and therefore unless he means by [*servants of God*] men voluntarily obeying the Gospel, yea and visibly appearing so to do, I shall deny his consequence, and his dictates, that either *Acts*15.10. or *Matth.*28.19. *a Disciple* and *a servant of God* in his sense *signify the same thing, or denote the same sort of persons.* And if *more be required to a servant than a Disciple*, it follows that a person may be a Disciple and yet not a servant of God, and so the terms are not reciprocal, and his consequence so much the more infirm. As for his *minor* it is denied, understanding it of capacity of infants while infants in an ordinary way, and of being *Gods servants* in the sense used *Rom.*6 16. in which alone it is equipollent to a Disciple. As for the Text *Levit.*25.41,42. though it be plain Scripture, yet there is nothing plain or obscure in it for Mr. *Bs.* purpose, to prove that the infants of believers of the *Gentiles* now are *Gods servants* in a sense equipollent to *a Disciple*, *Matth.*28.19. For. 1. the passage is meant onely of *Hebrews*, as *Exod.*21.2. is expressed, and the Text it self shews it. 1. From *v.*55. where it is said, *unto me the children of Israel are servants, they are my servants whom I brought out of the Land of Egypt*, in which are two discriminating notes differencing them from others, 1. That *they were the children of Israel* descended from *Iacob* by natural generation, 2. that they *were brought out of the Land of Egypt* by God. 2. *v.*44.45. do explain it, where *God allows them to take Bond-slaves of the heathen that were round about them, and of the children of the strangers that did sojourn among them*, which is the description of Proselytes of the Gate, that is, such as acknowledged the God of *Israel*, but did not submit to Circumcision, and the observation of *Moses* Law, of which

*Vide Selden de jure nat. &c. l.*6. c.8.

which sort was *Cornelius*, *Acts* 10.2. Such an ones children were not *Gods servants* in the sense there meant. Yea, *Ainsworth* in his *Annot.* on *v.*42. citeth *Maimony resolving that an* Israelites *children begotten on a* Canaanitish *bond-woman are but* Canaanites *in every respect*, not *Gods servants* in the sense there meant. 2. What is said there is said not onely of Infants but also of Parents, yea though they were idolaters, as those that worshipped the golden Calf, or joyned themselves to *Baal Peor*, or *who hardened their hearts, and could not enter into* Canaan *for unbelief*, *Heb.* 3.18,19. even the worst of them *with whom God was not well pleased*, which were not true of servants of God in a sense equipollent *to a Disciple of Christ*, *Matth.*28.19. 3. *Diodati* expresseth in his *Annot.* on *Lev.*25.42. in what sense they are called *Gods servants*, to wit, *in as much as none could get Sovereign Dominion over them to prejudice his*, therefore they are there called Gods servants in this respect onely, *in that they were to be disposed of not as men would, but as he would*, who had right to them by his purchase, in bringing them out of *Egypt*. So that they are called *Servants of God*, in that place, not out of any either voluntary obedience to his Precepts, or peculiar right to visible Church-membership, but *in respect of Gods sovereignty over them to dispose of* them as *Hebrews*, which was not belonging to believers or their children, or other Nations not joyned to the policy of the *Hebrews*. And therefore I still say, Mr. *B.* doth but trifle as a man that superficially looks over a Text, when he talks so vainly as he doth of *direction enough to help us to judg of Gods minde, whether Infants are his Servants and Disciples or no.* Nor is it tru which he saith, that *the capacity is the same then and now.* For though *infants then were like infants now*, yet the judicial Laws of *Moses*, and the peculiar condition of the *Hebrews* is not now as then.

But he goes on. *May I not make this a third Argument of it self? If God call Infants his Servants, though they can do him no service, then we may call them so too: for we may speak as God doth: but God doth call them so; therefore we may.*

Answ. The Conclusion is granted: he may call *Hebrew* infants *Gods servants* in the sense meant, *Lev.*25.41. But if he cal the children of Gentile-believers *Servants of God* in a sense equipollent to a *Disciple*, *Matth.*28.19. He must bring better warrant

than

than that Text, or else I shall deny it, slighting his vain censure of *a forestalled minde*, and conceiving rather it verified of himself. *As the Man thinketh, so the Bell tinketh.*

Again, saith Mr. *B.* *If God call Infants his Servants, though they are uncapable at present of doing him service, then we may call them Disciples, though at present they are uncapable of learning. But God doth so call them; therefore we may, &c.*

Answ. If God call infants his servants according to the Apostles description of a servant, *Rom.*6.16. then I confess infants may be called Christs Disciples, but not if onely according to the sense of *Lev.*25.41.

Mr. *B.* goes on. *Hath he a good wit now or a bad minde, that can raise a dust for the darkning of so express and plain a Text? and yet still call for Scripture proof? I will deal faithfully in telling you Mr. T. his answer to this, and that upon deliberation, in his Sermon after the Dispute.* 1. *He distinguisheth of Servants of God* de jure & de facto. 2. *Between Servants actively and passively; and saith, that here the term Servant is meant passively and not actively, that is, such as God useth: and that they are called Servants here in no other sense than the Heavens and the Earth are, Psalm* 119.89,90. *They are thy Servants; Are they therefore Disciples?* (saith he) *what ridiculous arguing is this? So Mr. T. O what cause have we all to look to the tenderness of our consciences in time, before engagement in a sinfull cause hath benummed them, and made the Word of God to be of no force to us? I know shallow brains are uncapable to discern the weakness of the silliest Answer; they go that way as their affection doth byas them: their approbation of an Argument or Answer is no credit to it. But let any man of a tolerable understanding, and conscience not seared, but weigh seriously this Answer, and I dare warrant he will think it a bad cause that must be underprapt by such palpable abuse of Scripture.*

Answ. I loath to take notice of such base insinuations, far unworthy of a christian brother or an ingenuous scholar, but that thereby Mr. *B.* hath more prevailed to hinder the entertainment of the truth I maintain, than by any arguments he hath brought. And were it not that the Law of Charity forbids me to put the worst construction on things, I see so much as might move me to

retort

retort upon himself his insinuations against me, as if I had a bad minde, and a seared conscience, and a bad cause, and that I darken so expres and plain a Text, and so palpably abuse Scripture because of my answer about this Text: I will not deny him to have a good wit, nor impute to him a shallow brain, I wish his judgment were as good as his fancy, & that with his quickness of apprehension he had more consideratenes in his determinations, and especially about the meaning of Scripture; if it were so, the Church of God might have much more benefit by his laboures than it hath, nor would his polemick writings especially, have so many crudities in them as there are. As for this present busines, I think that intemperate zeal to the cause he thinks good hath so transported him that he shews much want both of ingenuity of spirit, and clearnes of understanding, which he hath in other writings, and that however he doth often pretend love to me, yet his gall doth so overflow when ever he speakes of me, that he can neither give aright interpretation of what I do, nor of what I say. But to the matter. I had sayd in my *Sermon*, and in my *Antidot sect.*4. that what is sayd *Levit.*25.41. is nothing to our children, it being spoken peculiarly of *Hebrew* children. To this in his *reply pag.*182. 248. he tells me. 1. *The* Iewes *infants were infants, and our dispute you know was of the* species.

Answ. The *Jews* infants were infants its true, and so were the *Canaanites* infants, yet not servants of God, as *Levit.*25.41. is meant. 2. The dispute was not as it was first managed between me and Mr. *M.* nor as it was by Mr. *Bs* first argument brought to an issue, of the *species*, whether any infants indefinitely or any ones infants whatsoever were to be called Disciples of Christ and to be baptized, but whether the infants of believers, of whom his meaning is in his first argument, however he make his *position*, that *some infants are to be baptized.* 3. whatever his *position* were, yet his wordes in his *Epistle to the people of* Kederminster were *that God saith our children are Gods servants*, which is palpably false, he saying it of the *Hebrews* children as such; and not of ours.

2. saith he, *I have proved that our privileges are greater than theirs (and you deny it not) and that this was not perculiar to them.*

Answ. if it be granted that our privileges are greater than theirs, yet it is but in some respects, and therefore there is no good argument, if it be confessed God shews more mercy to our children therefore he gives them every such privilege as the *Jews* had. God shews mercy to ministers of the Gospel more than to the Priests of the *Jews*, yet it follows not, our children must have such privileges of continuance in office, inheritance *&c.* as they had. That what is sayd *Levit.*25.41. was peculiar to the *Hebrews*, is so clearly proved, that it hath a shew of impudence to deny it. 3. saith he, *it proves that there is nothing in the age to make them uncapable, or else the* Jews *infants would have been uncapable.*

Answ. It proves that there is nothing in the age to make them uncapable of being Gods servants in the sense of *Levit.*25.41. But it proves not that they are capable of being Gods servants ordinarily as the title is used, *Rom.*6.16. and is equipollent to a *Disciple*, *Matth.*28.19.

But saith he, *How have the believing* Jews *lost this privilege or Proselytes of the Gentiles?*

Answ. 1. This privilege was belonging to the unbelieving *Jews* while it continued, as well as the believing. 2. If it be lost (as I think it is) it is lost by the dissolving the judicial Laws of *Moses*, and the national policy the *Jews* had.

But saith he, *where you talk of servants in this sense and that sense, they were so servants as to be visible Church-members, and that is all that I contest for. They were reckoned among* Moses *Disciples, and so are ours to be among Christs Disciples or Christians (as* Moses *Disciples also in some sort were Christs Disciples.)*

Answ. The sense in which the *Jews* children were called *Gods servants* is not all one with to be *visible Church-members*, nor Moses *Diciples*, as is proved above where the genuine sense is shewed. But to the distinctions I used in my *Sermon* and *Antidote*, I deny not that I used both distinctions, and they are usual in schools. The former is used by the Author of the *New annot.* on *Deut.*22.24. the later is common, in the differencing of active and passive scandal, Conversion taken actively and passively, Mr. *B.* himself, *p.*81. distinguisheth of being *sanctified actively and passively.*

But

But he thinks the *application to be a palpable abuse of Scripture. For,* 1. *He (meaning me) saith they were servants of God* de jure, *but not* de facto, *in right, but not in deed. But a servant is a relation, that is the form of it,* servus est Domini servus. And *have they only a right to this relation? who then or what hindreth them from possessing the relation which they have right to? Is it not God that giveth them right to this relation? And is not that to give them the relation it self? I would he would tell us what more he giveth them that have the relation it self* de facto, (*for I suppose he dare not interpret it of a future right.*)

Answ. I said in my *Sermon* as Mr. *B.* hath printed it *pag.* 181. that the meaning is not that infants are actually servants, but in right, to me, he doth not speak what they did, but of Gods right and interest he had in them: which is so plain a truth that I supposed he could not have found any matter of exception. But Mr. *B.* is so quarelsome with me that he will either finde or make a Knot in a Bulrush. 1. He renders *de facto in deed,* as if I had said, they had relation of right, but not in deed, that is not in possession: whereas my meaning was plainly expresst, they were not actually servants in respect of what they did, or in respect of the act or fact of service. 2. he misunderstands it as if I spake of *their being servants of right,* that they had the right of being Gods servants so as to claim it as a privilege on their part, whereas I meant it and expressed it in respect of Gods right and interest in them, though I deny not the other to follow. To his questions I answer. They have a right and possession of that relation, and it is given them by God with the relation, and to those that have the relation in fact, or as I spake actually in respect of what they did. God gives this more to them that are his servants by reason of his right in them, that they have actual obedience to him, according to that of the Apostle, *Rom.* 6. 16. *His servants ye are to whom ye obey.*

2. Saith Mr. *B. whether they are servants actively or passively is nothing to the being or form of the relation; they are servants of God still. And it seems by this answer, that if God had called infants Disciples never so oft Mr.* T. *would have put God off with this distinction, and said, they are Disciples passively, but not actively. For* 3. *What reason can he give why they*

may not be called Disciples in a passive sense as well as servants? 4. Doth not God bid his Apostles baptize those that were Disciples without distinguishing? or doth he bid them baptize active Disciples, but not passive ones? Where is that distinction in the command?

Answ. Mr. *B.* is so inured to his spitefull language, that my giving him an answer to his objection and clearing the words *Lev.* 25.41. is termed by him *putting off God with a distinction*, as if I answered God, and not Mr. *B.* But to the matter. 1. Though servants actively and passively may be both called servants, as a slave bought with money, but sick and weak, who never did service actually, may be called his Lords servant, because at his dispose, yet not univocally, as they speak in Logick, in comparison of him that doth actually service, because he is a servant but in one respect, whereas he that is a servant not onely by being at his Lords dispose for his Lord to assign what he will for him, because of his propriety in him, but also doth service actively for his Lord, is in a double respect a servant, of which the later is that which is principal, and from which the denomination is primarily and principally taken, as the relation of a son is principally from generation, though analogically in some respect an adopted son have that title. 2. But were it supposed the term did univocally agree to both, yet the question being whether Infants be Disciples, and the argument being brought from the title of Gods servants to prove them Disciples, the term [*Servants of God*] passively taken for one that doth not voluntarily any service to God, but onely is at Gods dispose, is not as much as [*a Disciple of Christ*] which signifies one *that hath learned Christ*, and professeth himself to follow his teaching: And so it is a clear answer, that infants are not proved to be Christs Disciples by being proved to be passively Gods servants, except they be also proved to be actively such, and that in obeying the Gospel, and professing that obedience. What ever seems to Mr. *B.* (whose imaginations of me are still to the worst) If I had found God call once Infants Disciples in the sense, *Matth.* 28.19. I should quickly have yielded there is no need of such a distinction of active or passive Disciple, sith I finde the title given to none but such as are actual learners, and that is a reason why Infants may not be called Disciples in a passive sense as well as Gods servants.

For

For use is the rule of understanding words, and Christ bids us baptize onely Disciples that are actual learners, and profess Christ their Master, as appears both by Christs words, *Mark* 16.16. in which he expresseth that by [*he that believeth*] which he did *Matth.*28.19. by [*a Disciple*] and by the practice of the Apostles, who best understood Christs precept, and by the constant use of the word [*Disciple*] in the *New Testament*, as is proved above. Nor needs there be any such distinction of active and passive Disciple in the command, because the word [*Disciple*] is not used passively, though [*Servant of God*] be.

5. Saith Mr. *B. But I shall be bold to take it for one of Mr.*T. *his fictions, and a meer falshood, that Infants are here called Servants passively onely, till he have done somewhat to prove it; to which end he hath not spoken one word, as thinking it seems that he spake to men that will take his word. Why may they not be called Servants from the meer interest of Dominion that God hath to them? and authority over them? Are Infants the Kings Subjects or Servants in a passive sense onely? Is it not foundation enough for the relation of a servant, if God will own them so, and number them with his family of meer grace, though he should make no use of them at all? or if there must be more: may they not be called so, as being destinated to his service for the future? And so they may have the relation before the service; which is common with those men that buy children with their parents for their future service. So Eccl.*2.7. *reade it.*

Answ. How egregiously doth Mr. *B.* trifle, who expects I should prove, who was but the Respondent, and that also which is apparent to common sense, that infants are not servants of God actively in obeying his precepts, or as I sayd in my *Sermon*, in freely and voluntarily giving service to God and doing what he bids, who neither know nor hear Gods precepts, and looks I should prove what he agrees with me in! For when I said infants are servants from Gods right and interest in them, though they do no service, Mr. *B.* as if I said no such thing puts many impertinent questions to me, as if he would by them know my minde in that which I had plainly though more briefly expressed, to wit that the *Jews* infants were Gods servants. 1. Of right, because God had a right, propriety or perculiar interest in them,

he had purchased them otherwise than he had done other people. 2. Passively, so as that their bodies and liberties were at his disposé, not allowing men to dispose of them, as he did to dispose of others. As for the question *may they not be so called as destinated to his service for the future?* I conceive not; destination to his service for the future doth not either there or any where else that I know, give denomination to a servant as actually such: nor doth I think any thing in the Text lead us to such a reason of the denomination, but to that which I have set down. And to his question, *Are infants the Kings Subjects or servants in a passive sense onely?* I answer, yes, while they are infants, and should question his intellectuals that should deny it; and when he cals it *my fiction and meer falshood, that infants are here called servants passively only*, it seems prejudice against me makes him count that a fiction and falshood in my mouth, which is current enough when it comes from his own pen. But Mr. *B.* is not yet reconciled to me, theres more anger yet behinde. For thus he speaks.

6. *But the grossest is yet behinde, (as the worst errour is still at last, and the further a man goes out of his way the further he goes amiss) would any man think that such a man as* Mr. *T. can possibly believe that infants are called Goas servants in no other sense than the Heavens and Earth are?*

Answ. May I not take up the Poets words, *Tantæne animis cœlestibus iræ?* Is Mr. *B.* so waspish as to be still humming and buzzing about my ears, and flinging me with his mis-representations. Tis true, to shew that the term [*servant of God*] is not equipollent to [*a Disciple of Christ*] I instanced in *Psal.* 119.91. where *the Heaven and the earth* are called *Gods servants* in a passive sense, but my words (as he himself printed them) are not, infants are called Gods servants in no other sense than the Heavens and earth are: yea I mentioned *Nebuchadnezzar* called *Gods servant Jerem.* 43.10. after the allegation of *Psal.* 119.91. And yet if I had said so I know no errour in it, much less gross erour, or grossest of all. But Mr. *B.* asks *placet.* Well! room for Mr. *B. Let me a little reason this case*, saith he, 1. *Are the Heavens onely passive servants of God? Is that good Philosophy?* *Answ.* Sith Mr. *B.* is either in his reasoning or posing vein, I shall enforce my self with what patience I can to reade his chiding Lecture,

ſture, and to anſwer his queſtions, though he would not anſwer mine at the Diſpute, when he ſhould. To his firſt and ſecond I anſwer affirmatively. It is not good Philoſophy to ſay, the Heavens onely ſuffer, and act nothing: but it is very good Philoſophy, and Divinity too, that the Heavens are onely paſſive ſervants of God, when they do Gods will, they do it not with conſent of will, as when *the ſtormy windes fulfill Gods word, Pſal.* 148.8. they do act, but not actively obey God. Herod *and* Pontius Pilate *did what Gods counſel determined, Acts* 4.27,28. yet were not active ſervants of God, but paſſive, the doing of Gods will was beſides their intentions. So *Nebuchadnezzar, Jer.* 43.10. *Sennacherib, Iſai* 10.5,6,7. *Joſephs* brethren, *Shimei, Abſolom, &c.* are ſervants of God in this ſenſe. And in this ſenſe *the Heavens are Gods ſervants*, as Mr. *B.* might have perceived by the joyning *the earth* with them, which moves not, or rather in this paſſive ſenſe, becauſe they are at Gods diſpoſing.

2. Saith he, *What if the Earth and Inſ nts were both c lled Gods Servants onely in a paſſive ſenſe, becauſe God maketh uſe of them? Is it therefore in the ſame ſenſe? Anſw.* Yes. Mr. *B. Is it the ſame uſe that God maketh of both? Anſw.* No, and yet it is the ſame ſenſe. Again, Mr. *B. What if Chriſt were called Gods ſervant for his ſuffering? Shall we ſay it were in no other ſenſe than the Earth is ſo called? when the uſe and ſufferings are ſo unlike?*

Anſw. No, for if Chriſt were called Gods ſervant for his ſuffering, I would call him an active ſervant of God, not a paſſive. For though he in his ſuffering were paſſive, and Divines call it paſſive obedience, yet he did not obey paſſively, that is, againſt his will, or without conſent of will, as the Earth doth, but actively, out of his free and voluntary intention, and conſent of will. Be the uſe and ſuffering never ſo unlike, thoſe perſons or things may be in the ſame ſenſe paſſive ſervan s of God, whoſe ſufferings c ruſe accompliſheth Gods will without their intention, and they active ſervants in the ſame ſenſe whoſe uſe or ſufferings are with intention and conſent to accompliſh the will of God, though their uſe or ſufferings are much unlike. But he hath not yet done poſing or chiding me.

«What if I prove, *ſaith he*, (as me thinks with Mr. *T.* I might eaſily do) that the Heavens are Gods ſervants actively, and Chriſt alſo is called his ſervant actively? Doth it follow

that

that they are servants in the same sense, when the action is so unlike?"

Answ. Yes, for I never took the identity of sense to presuppose necessarily likeness in the actions. The same sense is when words signifie a like meaning, whatever likeness or unlikeness there be in the actions of the subjects to which the Predicate is attributed. And I pity Mr. *Bs.* oscitancy that doth not observe such obvious things, but troubles others with such frivolous questions. But yet there are more of these demands to be answered.

3. Saith Mr. *B. Hath not God prevented all these Cavils by joyning Parents and Children together in the same title? He saith of Parents and Children both together, they are my servants: where it is evident that both therefore have the same kinde of relation. And will he say that the Parents are onely passive servants?*

Answ. Yes, in that place, according to the explication before given; and I conceive that God hath prevented all Mr. *Bs.* Cavils against this exposition, even in that he joyns Parents and Children, (who can be no other ways servants of God) together, in the same title; besides other passages of the Text do shew it, as I have alleged above.

4. Saith Mr. *B. Or if all this be not enough, yet look further, where God himself tels you the reason why he cals them his servants, (who knows better than Mr.* T.*) They are my servants which I brought out of* Egypt, *&c. Gods interest and merciful choice of them, and separation to himself, is the reason. When God cals us his servants, it oftner signifieth the honor and priviledges of that relation, which in mercy he cals us to, than any service we do him therein. Are the Heavens Gods servants, because he brought them out of* Egypt, *and separated them to himself as a peculiar People?*

Answ. Mr. *B.* is a strange man, most shamefully dealing with me, who suggests to the world of me as if I took no notice of that in the Text, which in my *Sermon* as it is printed by himself, *pag.* 181. was observed in the first place with advice to my hearers to mark it, and urged it to that end that I might shew this was peculiar to the *Hebrew* children, and therefore impertinently brought by Mr. *B.* to prove *our infants Gods servants* as

there

there it is meant much leſs as [*Gods ſervants*] is a term equipollent to [*a Diſciple Matth.* 28.19.] all which he ſeems not to take notice of, but in ſtead thereof after a dictate or two without proof, he puts to me this frivolous queſtion, *Are the Heavens Gods ſervants becauſe he brought them out of Egypt, and ſeparated them to himſelf as a peculiar people?* To which I anſwer no, but what then? cannot therefore the Heavens be ſaid to be Gods ſervants paſſively, that is, at Gods diſpoſe, becauſe they were not brought out of *Egypt* as the infants, *Levit.* 25.41.? The reaſon is given there in reſpect of the ſubject, why they were Gods ſervants when other people were not, not on the part of the predicate, as if none were ſervants but they that were brought out of *Egypt*. *Nebuchadnezzar* is called *Gods ſervant*, *Jer.* 43.10. for going into *Egypt* there executing Gods will on the *Egyptians*; though he had no intention of doing any thing for God.

5. Saith Mr. *B.* "yet if all this be not enough, he that will ſee may be convinced from this. The *Jews* and their infants are called Gods ſervants in a ſenſe peculiar as choſen and ſeparated from all other: the *Gentiles* at age were not ſo Gods ſervants as the *Jews* infants were. If God call theſe infants his ſervants in no other ſenſe than the Heavens and the earth, then it ſeems in the year of Jubilee men muſt releaſe the earth from its ſervice to them: But Mr. *T.* knows that even the Gentile ſervants that were actively ſo were not to be releaſed in the year of Jubilee: and therefore the *Jews* and their infants are called Gods ſervants in another ſenſe than the Heavens or the heathens either; even as the choſen ſeparated people of God and members of his family. or elſe how could it be a reaſon for releaſing them in the year of Jubilee any more than for releaſing any other? But no Scripture can be ſo plain, but a man that hath a minde ſo diſpoſed may finde ſome words of contradiction.

Anſw. It is true, and Mr. *Bs.* cavils about this Text apparently prove it. But this with all the reſt is not enough to convince me that the infants of the *Jews* are called *Gods ſervants* actively, as the term [*Gods ſervant*] is equipollent to [*a Diſciple Matth.* 28.19.] though I would ſee it, yet I cannot, no not by Mr. *Bs.* ſpectacles, even by this laſt reaſon. I confeſs that *the Jews infants were Gods ſervants in a peculiar manner, other than the*

Gentiles at years, yea though godly, as Cornelius, Acts 10.2. that God for this reason required their release from bondage at the Jubilee, and yet why it should follow, that if the Earth be called *Gods servant* passively, as the *Jews* infants, it must be released by men from service at the year of Jubilee, I see not. If it were formed into an Argument, it would rest on this or the like Proposition, They to whom the same thing is predicated, in the same sense must have all other things predicated on them alike: which is so absurd a thing, that me thinks Mr. *B.* should disclaim it, and yet his reason turns on that hinge. To shew its absurdity, Magistrates are called *Gods*, *Jehovah* is called *God* in one sense in respect of rule, else the term [*God*] should signifie nothing common to both. Doth it therefore follow that what is said of Magistrates must be said of *Jehovah*, that *he must dy like men*, or else the term [*God*] cannot predicate on both in the same sense in which [*God*] is taken for one that rules? This and such like mistakes of Mr. *B.* even then when he runs with full curreer shew his heedlesness, and overlines in handling controversies, which require a man of more insight in the meaning of the Scripture, and more circumspect in observing the consequents on his sayings and reasonings than I finde him. But I follow him, not doubting to overtake him in long running, *κιχάνει τοὶ βραδὺς ὠκὺν*.

SECT. XV.

That Infants are not proved to be Christs Disciples, from being Subjects to Christ, Christians, belonging to Christ, Luke 9. 47,48. *Matth.* 18.5. *Mark* 9.41.

THe sum of the next Argument is, *Infants are capable of being Subjects of Christs kingdom, therefore of being his Disciples. The reason of the Consequence is, that Christs Church is as properly called his Kingdom as his School, all Subjects of Christ in his visible Kingdom are Christians, all Christians Disciples, according to Acts* 11.26. *Infants are capable of being Subjects in any Kingdom on Earth, nothing can be shewed to*

preve

prove them uncapable, they were actually Subjects of Christs Kingdom before his coming in the flesh.

To all which I answer, Its enough to deny the consequence sith infants may be subjects which imports onely somthing passive, whereas [*Disciple*] imports action, which agrees not to infants. But I distinguish, subjects of Christs Kingdom may be so called from active or passive subjection, visibly or invisibly, by extraordinary or ordinary operation. I deny infants to be subjects of Christs Kingdom actively, visibly, by ordinary operation through Preaching the word in which sense alone the term [subject of Christs Kingdom] is equipollent to [a Disciple *Matth.* 28.19.] and in which sense alone the consequence is true. Though in common speech arising from the fond conceit as if baby-sprinkling made them Christians, infants are called Christians, yet in Scripture none are called Christians till they believe. *Christiani non nascuntur sed fiunt.* Our Infants are children of Christians, But not themselves Christians till they beleive in Christ. *Acts* 11.26. is so far from proving infants called Christians, or Disciples, that both *v.* 26. *&* 29. prove the contrary, as was shewed above. Though infants be reckoned as parts of human Kingdoms, yet it follows not they are parts of Christs visible Kingdom or Church. For then natural fools, yea the most ungodly professed unbelievers, must be subjects of Christs visible Kingdom or Church, because such are subjects of human kingdoms. I have seen *Ephes.* 5.24. and see nothing there for Mr. *Bs.* purpose, but against him, there being no subjection there meant but what is willing, which infants have not, except by extraordinary operation unknown. Infants whether of believers or unbelievers are capable of being Christs subjects passively, or actively by extraordinary secret invisible, and unknown operation, but not actively, visibly by ordinary means for want of the use of reason. This consequence will never be proved by Mr. *B. Infants were members of the* Jewish *Church, therefore visible Church members of the Christian Church.* To this argument, *Infants were Disciples in the* Jewish *Church,* Ergo, *God will shew the like mercy now,* I answer by denying his antecedent, which he would prove from *John* 9.28. *we are* Moses *Disciples in opposition to Jesus Disciples,* But *infants were* Moses *his Disciples.* This proposition I

deny, and Mr. *B.* hath brought nothing to prove it. The Text mentions none as *Moſes Diſciples* but perſons of years, and therefore theres no need of further anſwer to his argument.

3. "My third argument ſaith Mr. *B.* to prove ſome infants are Diſciples, is this from Chriſts own words. If Chriſt would have ſome children received as Diſciples, then they are Diſciples; But Chriſt would have ſome ſuch received as Diſciples; Therefore ſome ſuch are Diſciples. All the queſtion is of the antecedent and that is plain in *Luke* 9.47,48. compared which *Matth.* 18. 5. and *Mark* 9.41. He that receiveth this childe in my name receiveth me. Here obſerve. 1. It was the childe himſelf that Chriſt would have received. 2. He would have him received [in his name] now that can mean no leſs than as a Diſciple: when they are baptized it is into his Name: And that which in *Luke* is called [receiving in Chriſts name] is expreſſed in *Mark* [one that belongeth to Chriſt] and in *Matthew* [in the name of a Diſciple] though ſome of theſe places ſpeak of infants, ſome of others: yet compared, they plainly tell you this; that to receive [in Chriſts Name] and [as belonging to Chriſt] and [as a Diſciple of Chriſt] in Chriſts language is all one, for they plainly expreſs the ſame thing intended in all. So that Chriſt hath encouraged me to receive children [in his Name] *Luke* 9.47. And he expoundeth it to me, that this is to receive them [as belonging] to him, and as [Diſciples] I know ſome frivolous anſwers are made to this: but they are not worth the ſtanding on. Mr. *Blakes* Argument hence remaineth as good as unanſwered."

Anſw. What Mr. *Blake* alleged in his *Birth privilege*, *p.*21: about theſe Texts was anſwered in my *Examen*, *pag.*134. and what he replied in his *Anſwer* to my *Letter*, *cap.*11. *ſect.*5. was refelled in my *Poſtſcript*, *pag.*145,146. all which I have reviewed with what Mr. *Blake* refers to in his *Repulſe* of Mr. *Blackwood*, *pag.*16,17,18,19,20. and do not finde wherein my anſwer in my *Poſtſcript* is deficient, and therefore ſee no reaſon to be moved by Mr. *Bs.* vain talk that *Mr.* Blakes *Argument hence remains as good as unanſwered*, and do conceive it more abundantly anſwered than ſuch a far-fetch'd argument deſerved. Yet Mr. *B.* brings it again into the field, and Mr. *Blake Vindic. Fœderis*, *pag.*414. ſays, *he will forbear to make any rejoynder to the Reply of my*

Apo-

Apology, pag.145. because Mr. B. hath here done it for him. Now what saith Mr. *B.* He saith, *I know some frrivolous answers are made to this; but they are not worth the standing on.*

To which I reply, if the Answers be more frivolous than the Argument they are not indeed worth standing on. But let us see what kinde of Argument it is. 1. Mr. *B.* should have concluded that *Some Infants are Disciples*, and he concludes that *Some Children are Disciples*, or else he means by [*some such*] in the *minor* and conclusion others than by [*some Children*] in the *major*, now *some Infants* and *some Children* are not all one. 2. The phrase in the middle term [*received as Disciples*] may be understood two ways, 1. thus, that Christ would have them received as being Disciples, and in this sense I grant the Consequence, but deny the *minor*, understood of some infants. 2. That he would have them received with such tenderness and love as is given to Disciples, though they be not Disciples. And in this sense I might grant the *minor*, and deny the Consequence of the *major*, though I think the *minor* is not true in that sense.

And to Mr. *Bs.* proof of this, I say, 1. the word παιδιον, *Luke* 9.47. doth not note an infant always. For *Jairus* his Daughter though *twelve years old*, is called παιδιον, *a little childe*, *Mark* 5.41.42. And yet that age might be a patern of humility, seldom are children of that age ambitious, though they be impatient. And that *the little childe Matth.* 18.2. was not an infant but a person of some years, is made probable, in that Christ is said *to call him, and to set him, or make him stand in the midst of them.* 2. *Beza* saith, *Perhaps it should be read* τοιοῦτο, *such a little childe.* So the *Syriack* Interpreter reades, and it is very probable by comparing it with *Matth.* 18.5. where the words of Christ are related, and there it is παιδιον τοιοῦτον ἕν, *one such little childe*, and *Mark* 9.37. ἓν τῶν τοιούτων παιδίων, *one of such children.* 3. But if the reading be allowed as the Copies now have it, yet it is not unusual that [οὗτος, *this*] is all one with [τοιοῦτος, *such*] as on the other side τοιοῦτος is 2 *Cor.* 2.6. all one with τοσοῦτος. So in the same Chapter οὗτον, *Luke* 9.26. is not meant of one particular person, but of one so qualified, and in like manner 2 *Tim.* 3.5.

παιδαριον, *Matth.* 11.16. (which is less than παιδιον) notes a little childe that could call to his fellows.

ἀπ' τέτες ἀποστάτε, *from these turn away*, that is, as our Translators well render it, *from such turn away*, and *v.6.* ἐκ τέτων, is rendered [*of this sort*] There are more of the like, 2 *Thess.* 3.14. 2 *John* 7. 1 *John* 2.22. *Luke* 8.14,15,21, *&c.* So *Grotius in Luc.* 9.48. τῦτο, *id est*, τοιῦτο, *Ut apud Matthæum, quomodo & hic Syrus interpretatur.* And this may be confirmed by reason thus, If τῦτο τὸ παιδίον, *Luke* 9.48. must be expounded *of this little childe*, then the speech of Christ is to be understood onely of that one individual little childe and no other, for in that sense it is a Pronoun demonstrative, and so notes a demonstrative individual, as Logicians speak, and so it shall note not onely *the childe himself*, as Mr. *B.* observes, but even that particular little childe then present, and it would onely import a privilege appropriate to that little childe, and agreeing to no other, whereas the sense is manifest from the words there, and other places, *Matth.* 10.40. *Luke* 10.16. *John* 13.20. to be this, whosoever shall receive any one that comes in my Name, though he be as mean and as inconsiderable as this little childe, receiveth me; and therefore it is added presently, *For he that is least among you all, the same shall be great*, which shews that by [*this*] or [*such a little childe*] he meant the Apostles, whosoever receiveth any of you, though as mean as this little childe, or such a little childe, receiveth me. 4. There are sundry things in the Text, and in parallel places, which do evince, that *the receiving the little childe*, neither is nor can be meant of a little childe in respect of age, much less an infant.

As, 1. that it is supposed that the little childe here meant may *be received in Christs name*, but that agrees not with the meaning of the speech as there is meant to understand it of a little childe in age. For *receiving in Christs name* presupposeth *coming in Christs name*, as *John* 5.43. 2 *John* 10. *&c.* that is either professing Christs name or Preaching or acting in Christs name. And that this is presupposed here, *Luke* 9.48. appears partly by the phrase *receiveth him that sent him*, which intimateth this to be the force of the speech, he that receiveth one such little childe sent by me receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me, and partly from the very next *v.*49. where *John* is said *to answer and say* taking occasion, as it seems by the relation from Christs words, *Master we saw one casting out Devils in*

thy

thy name, which words intimate that he underſtood, *receiving in Chriſts name* to be meant of one acting or ſpeaking in Chriſts name, and thus is the phraſe [*in my name, in the name of the Lord*] often uſed *Matth.*7 22. & 21.9. & 23.39 & 24.5. which thing is more fully confirmed by Mr. *Bs.* parallel place. *Mark* 9.37,41. It is plain that *Mark* ſets down Chriſts words upon the ſame occaſion of their contention for preheminence which *Luke* doth, and the ſame words *v.*37. and there expreſſeth it, *whoſoever ſhall receive one of ſuch little ones in my name*, which cannot be meant of that little one then ſet before them, but of his Apoſtles and others who ſhould be as mean as ſuch a little one, and *v.*39. expounds [*in my name*] of acting in my name, and *v.*41. *whoſoever ſhall give you a cup of cold water in my name becauſe ye are Chriſts*, that is, ye are ſent by Chriſt, or act for Chriſt, which ſhews *v.*37. to be meant of the Apoſtles not little children in age, but ſuch as did act for Chriſt though mean as little children. The ſame may be proved from *Matth.* 10.40,41,42. 2. Again, *the receiving of the little childe* proves it is not meant of a little childe in age. For what is the receiving? It is, 1. by hearing *Luke* 10.16. 2. By entertaining upon travayl, as *Luke* 9.52,53. *they did not receive him by making ready for him*, and *Mark* 9.41. *by giving a cup of cold water*, which was no ſmall kindneſs to a travailer in thoſe dry and hot Countreys. But what kindneſs had this been to a little childe in age as an infant, that travayls not? On the contrary, *not receiving* is expreſſed *Matth.*10.14. *Mark* 6.11. *by not entertaining them into their houſe nor hearing their words.* ſo the *New Annot.* on *Matth.*10.42. [*he that receiveth you*] *Luke* 10.16. *John* 13.20. *that heareth your Doctrine willingly, and entertaineth you*, which receiving agrees not to infants, nor any other receiving mentioned in the Goſpels that hath ſuch a bleſſing aſſured to it as here. 3. The reward annexed, to wit, *the receiving of Chriſt* ſhews *the receiving of a little one in Chriſts name*, to be another thing than the receiving of a little infant in Chriſts name, that is, after Mr. *Bs.* ſilly conceit, the receiving into the viſible Church by baptizing it. For then the greateſt bleſſing, that is, of receiving Chriſt and his Father ſhould be annexed to ſo poor a thing as may be done by every poor Presbyter, or Curate, how ill mannerd ſoever

he

he be; the baptizing, that is, as now its used and defended, the sprinkling of a little holy water on an infant. 4. It appears that a little infant is not meant *Luke* 9.48. from the description of the little childe there meant. For Mr. B. himself compares that speech in *Luke* with the like, *Matth.* 18.5. Now *such a little childe Matth.* 18.5. is expressed *v.*6. *one of these little ones which believe in me*, (not as Mr. *Cobbet* in his *Just Vindication*, *pag.* 117. fondly conceives without any other Author that ever I heard of besides himself, *one of those little ones, who are the little ones of them that believe in me.* For then it should be either τῶν πιστευόντων, or τέκνων, or some such supply, and it would be ridiculous to imagine *the scandalizing* to be of infants, the penalty of which is heavier *than to have a milstone tied about the neck, and to be cast into the Sea*, that little infants are *those not to be despised, whose Angels behold the face of Christs Father*, v. 10. *The little ones Matth.* 18.6. are called *Christs brethren*, *Matth.* 25.40. answering to *them that believe*) *and v.*3. *one that becomes as a little childe*, *v.*4. *one that humbles himself as this little childe*, which it is meer dotage to expound of little infants. Again Mr. *B.* referrs to *Matth.* 10.41. and there the little childe received is *a Prophet*, and *a righteous man.* Hereto I add the expressions of many writers. *Piscator* (to whom Mr. *Blake* refers) *Analys. Luc.* 9.48. *innuit amorem suum erga demissos animo in exemplo pueruli præsentis. Schol. in Matth.* 18.5. *propter nomen meum, propterea quod in me credit, Beza annot. in Matth.* 18.5. *puerulum talem* παιδίον τοιοῦτο, *id est, quempiam ita se demittentem ut puerum referat: nec enim proprie de pueris agit. Parens in Matth.* 18.5. *dicit, qui susceperit unum ex parvulis talibus, hoc est, unum ex vobis pueri instar humiliatum. Diodati* on *Matth.* 18.5. [*one such*] "namely, a true Christian that shall have layd aside all worldly pride, whereby he is become abject in the sight of the world. *New Annot. in Matth.* 10.42. [one of these little ones] who newly made profession of religion: on *Matth* 18.5. one like such a childe in the qualities before mentioned. " Mr. *B.* himself confesseth that *some of these places speak of infants some of others*: yet saith he, *compared they plainly tell you this; That to receive* [*in Christs name*] *and* [*as belonging to Christ*] *and* [*as a Disciple of Christ*] *in Christs language is all*

one;

one; for they plainly expreſs the ſame thing intended in all. From whence I infer, that *if the ſame thing be intended in all, and all expreſs the ſame thing*, then is no other thing intended or expreſſed, *Luke* 9.48. than what is expreſſed and intended *Matth.*18.5. *Mark* 9.41. *Matth.* 10.42. and then, it is certain that *Luke* 9.48. is not meant of a little infant in age, nor the receiving ſuch as agrees to ſuch an infant, ſith it is certain that *Matth.* 18.5. *Marke* 9 41. *Matth.*10.42. are not underſtood of either of theſe, and it follows upon Mr. *Bs.* confeſſion *that ſome of theſe Texts ſpeak not of infants*, that none of them ſpeak of infants, *ſith they all expreſs and intend the ſame thing*; and thus Mr. *Bs.* own obſervation refutes himſelf. But ſaith he, *when they are baptized it is into his name.*

Anſw. Mr. *B.* it ſeems would have this the ſenſe: *whoſoever receiveth to Baptiſm in my name one little childe receiveth me* to Baptiſm, which ſhould imply it to be a gratefull office to receive him to Baptiſm, and *the offending Matth.*18.6. and *deſpiſing v.*10. ſhould be not admitting to Baptiſm, and when it is ſayd [*whoſoever*] *ſhall receive one ſuch little one*, it would imply it to be a gratefull work for any perſon though no Miniſter to receive to Baptiſm, and an ungrateful work for any to refuſe to baptize. I grant that in the places named *to be ſuch a little one, Matth.*18. 5. *to belong to Chriſt, Mark* 9.41. *to be a Diſciple of Chriſt, Matth.*10 42. note the ſame ſort of perſons, yet I deny that propoſition, which is the hinge of Mr. *Bs.* proof, [every one that belongs to Chriſt is a Diſciple of Chriſt] For the holy Angels, thoſe yet uncalled whom his Father hath given him, *John* 17.10. belong to Chriſt, and yet are not to be called Diſciples of Chriſt. And therefore I infer, that Mr. *B.* hath no encouragement from Chriſts expoſition of theſe Texts to account infants Diſciples, and what he collects in his own fancy without the Text is frivolous and ſelf contradicting, ſo little worth the ſtanding on, that for my part I think this ſheet of his Book, what ever be ſaid of the reſt, worth no more than a ſheet that is made *thuris piperiſque cucullus*, yet he cannot forbear but muſt add more of this frivolous ſtuff.

In anſwer to this objection, *Infants cannot learn, and therefore cannot be Diſciples*, he adds thus much more. 1. *They*

can partake of the protection and provision of their Master (as the children of those that the Israelites *bought) and enjoy the privileges of the family and school, and be under his charge and dominion, and that is enough to make them capable of being Disciples.*

Answ. What privileges of Christs family and school, infants enjoy, I know not, what ever they be what ever protection, provision, rule, care is for them, yet this is not enough to make them Disciples, as Christ meant, *Mat.* 28.19. till they have learnt, or profess learning of this Lesson, that Jesus is the Christ; all that is said here of Children may be said of slaves bought with money, they are all then with him Disciples of Christ, though professed infidels.

2. *They are,* saith he, *devoted to learning, if they live: however they are consecrated to him as their Master, who can teach them hereafter, and that is yet more.*

Answ. I may add, they may cry, as *Cyprian,* and his sixty six *Bishops* alleged for their Baptism, and suck, and smile, and play with the mother, and that is more than this, but neither the one nor the other any thing to the denomination of a Disciple of Christ.

3. Saith he, *I wonder you should be more rigorous with Christ in this case than you are with men. Is it not common to call the whole nation of the* Turks *both old and young by the name of* Mahometans, *or Disciples of* Mahomet?

Answ. What a pretty passage is this to set out a man as rigorous with Christ, who expounds his words *Matth.* 28.19. according to his constant language in all the Evangelists, because he allows not infants to be called Disciples, as if Christ forsooth did plead for infants discipleship, and I were so stiff, as that I would not yield to him. But he thinks *I will allow* Mahometans *children to be called* Mahomets *disciples, for it is the common use, and why not then we and our children by the name of Christians and Disciples of Christ.* *Answ.* I confess I think the common use now is to call the *Turks* young and old *Mahometans,* and in Chorographical relations, *English, French, &c.* are called Christian Nations, old and young, termed Christians: but neither do I finde the common use to be to call infants either *Mahomets* or Christs Disciples, nor if I did, should this sway me at all to allow

low infants discipleship according to *Matth.*28.19. till Scripture use of the term [Disciple] applicable to that sense can be shewed.

But Mr. *B.* hath more of this childish arguing. *And when a man hired a Philosopher to teach him and all his children, were they not all then Disciples of that Philosopher? They are entered under him as their Master for future teaching, are at present in the relation of Disciples.*

Answ. It is no such strange thing to hear of a Physician taking a stipend to cure a man and all his children, but to hear of a Philosopher hired to teach a man, and all his children, even his infant children, and counting them Disciples, and entering them under him as their master, is so strange to me that it seems to me somewhat like a tale of a man of *Gotham*. Yet if there were any such thing acted by wise men in sober sadness, it is nothing to prove infants Disciples in Christs or his Apostles language. But the prettiest part of this Comedy or poppet play of Mr. *B.* is yet behinde.

4. Saith he. "And truly I wonder also that it should go so currant that infants are not capable of learning, the mother is a Preacher to the infant, partly by her action and gesture and partly by voice. "*Answ.* And why not by smiles, and kisses and whipping? But what then? *They can dishearten and take off from vices and teach them obedience.* *Answ.* Tis true they can still them from crying: but how they can take them off from vices and teach them obedience to Gods Command I am yet to learn, it may be nurses may better inform me than Mr. *B. Me thinks* saith he, *we should not make an infant less docible than some brutes.* What doth Mr. *B.* mean by this? Doth he think they that deny infants to be Disciples allow brutes to be Disciples? A parret I think will sooner learn some words of Christs than an infant, yet I think neither learn any thing of the Doctrine of Christ till they understand it. But *I am referred to nurses, who he* saith, *will tell me more in this than he can,* It may be so; yet sure nothing to shew that any have made their infants learn the Doctrine of Christ. He adds. *And what if they cannot at first learn to know Christ? even with men of years that is not the first Lesson: if they may be taught any of the duty of a rational*

creature it is somewhat. *Answ.* If they do not learn to know Christ they learn not that which should make them Disciples of Christ. It is somewhat indeed that they can learn to kiss the mother, stroke her breasts, *&c.* but whats this to make them Disciples of Christ? *And if they can learn nothing of the parents either by action or voyce; yet Christ hath other ways of teaching than by men even by the immediate working of his Spirit.*

Answ. 'Tis true, and he may make infants Disciples, nor do I deny it to be done invisibly, but it would be a greater wonder than yet Mr. *B.* hath had for all his wonderments, a very prodigy that any of them should become a visible Disciple. 'Tis true *they may learn something of God very young and are to be bred up in the nurture of the Lord.* But that in their infancy at two or three dayes old they are learners of the things of God, of the admonition of the Lord from mothers and nurses is a fiction like *Galilæus* his New World in the Moon, or *Copernicus* his Circumgyration of the earth.

Mr. *B.* tels us *he might argue further, All that are saved are Christs Disciples, some infants are saved, Ergo.* And I might answer him, that they may be saved, and yet no visible Disciples according to the meaning of Christ *Matth.* 28. 19. But sith he hath put this off to another time I shall take a little breathing from Mr. *B.* and set him aside a little while till I have heard what his seniors say further for their baby-baptism.

SECT. XVI.

Dr. Featley *and Mr.* Stephens *arguings from John* 3. 5. *for Infant-baptism are answered, and Baptism shewed not be a cause of Regeneration, and Mr.* Cranfords *words considered.*

THere are some other Texts brought to prove an institution of infant-baptism out of the New Testament which I shall take in though the Assembly and the chiefest I have to do with in this controversie do omit them. The Ancients were wont to allege *Joh.* 3. 5. to prove infants are to be baptized after Christs appointment, or rather the reasonableness and necessity of the Churches appointment. *Augustine* in his writings often joyns *Rom.* 5. 12, and *John* 3. 5.

as

as the reason of infant baptism *Lumb. Sent.4. Dist.3.* allegeth some as making the institution of baptism to be *John* 3.5. The Papists commonly allege *John* 3.5. for the necessity of infant-baptism, *Becan. Manual.l.4.c.2. Mandatum habemus, Joan.*3.5. They are refuted by the Protestants, as *Chamier tom.4.l.5.de bapt. c.9.* yet *Vossius thes. Th. de pædobapt. thes.*7. brings it, to which being in Latin I have answered in Latin in my *Refutation of Dr. Savage his supposition*, though contrary to my expectation not yet printed, Dr. *Featley* in his *Dipper dipt*, p.10.43. makes it one of his prime arguments for infant-baptism, p.10. he thus argues. *If none can enter into the Kingdom of God but those that are born of Water and the Spirit; that is, those that are baptized with Water and regenerated by the Spirit, then there is a necessity of baptizing children, or else they cannot enter into the Kingdom of God, (that is ordinarily) for we must not tie God to outward means. But the former is true.* Ergo, *the latter.* And *pag.*43. *none ought to exclude the children of the faithfull out of the Kingdom of Heaven. But by denying them baptism (as much as in us lieth) we exclude them out of the Kingdom of Heaven. For as Christ affirmed to* Nicodemus, *and confirmed it with a double oath or most vehement asseveration, Amen, Amen; or verily, verily (I say unto thee) except a man be born of Water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven,* Ergo, *we ought not to deny them baptism.*

Answ. This arguing is the same in effect notwithstanding the Doctors mincing it (which is but a little) with that which the Papists bring for their horrid tenet of Exclusion out of the Kingdom of Heaven of infants dying unbaptized. For he holds that there is a necessity of baptizing children or else they cannot enter into the Kingdom of God ordinarily. In which assertion he denies any infants enterance into the kingdom of God ordinarily without water-baptism. And no more is said as I conceive by the more moderate Papists, such as *Biel, Cajetan, Gerson*, cited by *Perkins in his preparative to the demonstration of the probleme.* But no marvail the Doctor; who was addicted to the Common Prayer Book, concurred thus far with the Papists: For in it the Doctrine of *Augustin*, and others is retained, of asserting the necessity of infant-baptism because of original sin and Christs words, *Ioh.*3.5.

as appears by the Preface appointed to be used before the solemnity of Baptism. But Protestant Divines do generally refute this opinion, as *e.g. Chamier Panstr. Cath. tom. 4. l. 5. de Bapt. c. 8. &c.* teaching that infants of believers are ordinarily holy, and admitted into the Kingdom of Heaven, though dying unbaptized? But to answer his Arguments, 1. It's known that *Calvin, Piscator*, and many more do take [water] metaphorically, and the conjunction [*&*, *and*] to be exegetical not coupling differing things, but expounding what is meant by [*water*] as if he had said, *that water which is the Spirit*, as when it is said *Mat. 3. 11. He shall baptize with you the Holy Ghost and with fire*, that is, with the Holy Ghost, which is as fire. And this they conceive as necessary, that the speech of Christ may be verified. For simply understood it is false, sith the Thief on the Cross, sundry Martyrs and others have entered into the Kingdom of Heaven unbaptized. And this Exposition *Chamier Panstrat. Cath. tom. 4. lib. 5. cap. 9.* hath taken upon him to maintain against the opposites to it, and if true the objection of Dr. *Featley* fals, which rests on this, that there a necessity of water-baptism is imposed on all that shall enter into the Kingdom of God. Nevertheless I confess my self unsatisfied in this Exposition. 1: Because I do not think that *Matth. 3. 11.* by [*fire*] is meant the Holy Ghost as being like fire in his operation on every sanctified person: but that the words are an express prophesie of what Christ also foretold, *Acts 1. 5.* and was accomplished at Pentecost, *Acts 2. 3. when the Holy Ghost filled them, and fiery cloven tongues sate upon each of them.* 2. Because if it were parallel to that place, and [*water*] were used metaphorically, (as is said by them) and exegetically added [*water*] should be after, and [*spirit*] before, as *Matth. 3. 11.* [*spirit*] is first, and [*fire*] after, and after the usual manner of speaking, it should run thus, except a man be born of the spirit and water, if it were to be expounded of the spirit which is as water. Dr. *Homes anim. adv.* on my *Exercit: pag. 30.* allegeth *Bullinger*, saying, *Omnes penè de baptismo, Ioh. 3. 5. interpretantur*, to which he adjoyns *Bullingers*, and his own consent.. For these reasons I am much inclined to expound it of the Element of Water. Yet, 2. am very apt to conceive, that forasmuch as Mr. *Selden de jure nat. & Gent. juxta discipl. Heb. lib. 2. cap. 4.* tels us that when the *Iews* did initiate Proselytes by

baptizing

baptizing them with water, they called it Regenerating, and that Christ, when he taunts *Nicodemus* with dulneſs in being a Maſter in *Iſrael*, and yet not knowing of Regeneration, but by imagining a natural New-birth, when Regeneration was frequent in baptizing Proſelytes among the *Iews*, inſomuch that by it they taught a perſon loſt his natural relations of kinred as he ſhews, *lib.* 5. *c.*18. and hath theſe words in the place above cited, [*tametſi de eâ quæ ſpiritu ſit non ſolùm aquâ loqueretur Chriſtus*] our Saviour meant baptiſm of water, not according to his Apoſtles practice, but the *Iews*, and that the ſenſe is this, Except a man be born of water, and of the ſpirit, that is, Except a man be not onely born again by water, as ye Phariſees regenerate, when ye make Proſelytes, but alſo by the ſpirit, as I do beget again he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God, although he may enter into the Commonwealth or policy of *Iſrael:* which ſenſe nevertheleſs doth not aſſert a neceſſity of their water-regeneration, but onely of Chriſts ſpiritual regeneration, and the inſufficiency of the other by it ſelf, which is ſo much the more probable, becauſe I finde καὶ uſed for ἀλλὰ, that is, *and* for *but*, *Matth.*11.19. & 12.39. *Acts* 10.28. and καὶ ἐν ὀλίγῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ, *Acts* 26.29. ſeems to anſwer to [not onely but alſo] yet becauſe I finde not a place every way parallel, I onely propound it to be examined. But 3. it being granted that it is meant of Chriſts water-baptiſm, yet Papiſts themſelves make not ſuch a neceſſity of it as is without limitation and exception, and therefore they put in ſome one, ſome another reſtriction, which *Chamier* in the place alleged reduceth to four: 1. *Unleſs the perſon be baptized either with the baptiſm of water, or ſome other thing inſtead of it, as the baptiſm of blood and ſpirit.* 2. *If they may be baptized, and they deſpiſe it.* 3. *If they be not baptized with that Regeneration which is by water, though it may be otherwiſe alſo.* 4. *If they be neither baptized in deed nor deſire.* Why may not then this limitation be added, *Except a man be born again of water*, that is, except ſuch a perſon of whom baptiſm is required, according to my inſtitution, be born of water, when he may have it, and its cleared to him to be his duty, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. And indeed this and ſuch like ſpeeches *Mark* 16.16. *John* 3.18,36, *&c.* that require faith as well as baptiſm, are to be underſtood of perſons to whom the Go-

ſpel

ſpel is preached, and do or may hear it, and ſpeak not of infants, whom w efinde not that God enters into the Kingdom of Heaven any other way than by his inviſible election and operation of his Spirit. And it is obſervable, that whereas *Iohn* 3.5. our Saviour joyns *water and ſpirit* as means of Regeneration, yet *v.6.* he names onely the ſpirit, omitting water; whence may be gathered, that water is not of ſuch univerſal unreſtrained neceſſity, that in no caſe a perſon is not born again without it, nor admiſſible into the Kingdom of God, yet ſuch as is neceſſary ordinarily to thoſe to whom the Goſpel is preached, and their duty made known. Whence in anſwer to the Doctors argument I ſay, that his ſpeeches are to be thus limited at leaſt, *none can enter into the Kingdom of God ordinarily without baptiſm*, to wit, of thoſe to whom the Goſpel is preached, their duty made known, and Baptiſm may be had; and to his later Argument I anſwer, by denying that children are excluded out of the Kingdom of Heaven by denying them Baptiſm, ſith thoſe unbaptized perſons onely are excluded who are appointed to be baptized, to whom the Goſpel is preached, the duty of Baptiſm made known, and they may have it adminiſtred to them, which cannot be ſaid of infants.

Mr. *Nathaniel Stephens* in his Book intituled, *A Precept for the Baptiſm of Infants out of the New Teſtament*, having premiſed ſome thing about the Text, *Iohn* 3.5. *pag.* 18.19,20,21,22. about *the neceſſity of baptiſm of water, and the efficacy of it*, in which many things are meerly dictated, and very ſlightly handled, he would infer *pag.*23,*&c.* a Precept for infant-baptiſm from *Iohn* 3.5. becauſe *infants are guilty of original ſin, where the diſeaſe is there is need of the remedy, when Chriſt doth preſs a neceſſity of waſhing both by water and the ſpirit, he doth not this ſo immediately in reference to actual ſin, as in reference to birth-ſin, and to the natural pollution in which infants are born.* The ſame is the plea of Mr. *Thomas Fuller* in his *Infants Advocate*, *c.*13.

Anſw. That either baptiſm of water or Circumciſion are made the remedy of original ſin is more than I finde in Scripture, though it go as currant among many of former and later times. It is true our Lord Chriſt ſaith, *Except a man be born of Water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God, John* 3.5.

3.5. and he assigns this as a reason thereof, *v.6. That which is born of the flesh is flesh*, but that either thereby he intended to make baptism as the remedy of sin, or of original sin rather than actual is more than appears, For though our Lord Christ *v.5.* make regeneration to be by Water and Spirit yet I conceive regeneration is by the Spirit onely as the cause, by baptism of water onely as the sign, whereby the person baptized testifies that he is born again by the Spirit. Now a remedy is a cause and not a sign onely: no man calls that which is onely a sign of cure a remedy, but that which doth operate for healing. That baptism of water is not the cause of regeneration appears. 1. Because *v.6.* our Saviour giving the reason of the necessity of regeneration and the effect of regeneration, leaves out [*water*] and mentions onely [*the Spirit*] 2. Because the person baptized is supposed to be born again, to be a repenting and believing person afore he is baptized: But if baptism were the cause it should be before regeneration, (for the cause is before the effect) and so men should be baptized afore they are believers, or repenting persons, which is absurd, and contrary to the Scripture, *Mark* 16.16. *Acts* 2.38. *&c.* and contrary to the order of Christ that persons should be made Disciples afore they were baptized *Matth.* 28 19. 3. Because it is altogether inexplicable how the use of water can be a cause either principal or instrumental to work a new birth or inward change on the soul; If it be sayd, that it is by virtue of Gods promise, it is meet that promise should be shewed, that at, by or upon the use of baptism, God hath promised to regenerate persons. That it is a sign of regeneration will not be I suppose denyed; for it is made the sign of repentance (which is all one with regeneration) and therefore called *the baptism of repentance Acts* 19.4. because as *Beza* on *v.*3. baptism was *symbolum resipiscentiæ, the token of repentance.* And so in like manner it was the sign of faith, and therefore the Apostle *Gal.*3.27. saith, *That as many as were baptized into Christ had put on Christ*, that is, had by the sign of baptism testified their putting on Christ by faith. And in this sense it is termed *the washing of regeneration* (if baptism be meant by it) *Tit.*3.5. because by that washing the person baptized testifies his regeneration. And *Rom.*6.4. *We are buried with him by baptism into death*, that is, we by being under water

testifie our dying to sin conformably to Christs death and burial. And in this sense *Paul* is bid *Acts* 22.16. *to wash away his sins*, that is, by baptism to testifie his purging from his sins. And so Christ is said *to sanctifie and cleanse his Church with washing of water*, *Ephes.*5.26. that is, as *Beza Annot. in locum*, *as representing what he entirely doth effect within.* Mr. *Iames Cranford* in his *Epistle* to Mr. *Thomas Bedford* printed at the end of the *Friendly Accommodation* between Mr. *Bedford* and Mr. *Baxter*, saith, that *he conceives the ground of Anabaptism to have been the erroneous Doctrine* de nudis signis, *in which he is more confirmed by what I answered once to an Argument drawn by him from Ephes.*5. *from the efficacy of baptism to inforce the baptizing of infants, that if that Tenent could be clearly proved, I would no longer oppose that practice.* Concerning which I say, I remember not all that passed from me in the Dispute he mentions, I did think that which I put down in my *Exercit. sect.*11. had been his Argument. But this I still say, that could it be clearly proved that Christ ever appointed baptism of water taken severedly from the preaching of the Word to be the cause of Regeneration, or that God had assured that by outward baptism with water he would confer regenerating grace to an infant, I should not oppose the practice of Pædobaptism. What Mr. *Bedford* hath produced for the efficacy of baptism, hath been answered by Mr. *Baxter* in his *Appendix* to his *Plain Scripture*, *&c.* Nor doth it appear to me that Mr. *B.* is of his minde, notwithstanding what Letters have past between them now printed, and the syncretism yielded to in the printing of the *Friendly Accommodation*, and leaving out the *Appendix*. Dr. *Burges* his Treatise of *Baptismal Regeneration*, hath been freely censured by many. Dr. *Ieremiah Taylour* in his *Discourse of baptism* hath like an Orator rather than a Disputant pleaded for infant-baptism from the efficacy of baptism, more from speeches of the Fathers than from the Scripture. Sure I am, baptism was appointed by Christ, and used in the examples of the Scripture, as a testimony of Repentance, of faith in Christ, no cause of either. And therefore I deny *baptism to be the remedy of original sin, or the cause of Regeneration, or that Christ intended to assign the use to baptism to heal original sin, or to testifie the freedom from it without actual.* These things have been delivered by

Augustine,

Auguſtine, and taught by the *Romaniſts* and *Lutherans*, but by many other Proteſtants diſclaimed and refuted; and therefore Mr. *Stephens*, Mr. *Cranford*, Mr. *Bedford*, *&c.* in uſing this Argument do but ſymbolize with the Papiſts, and revive what many Proteſtants of beſt note have exploded.

SECT. XVII.

The 31. *Chapter of Mr.* Bs. Plain Scripture Proof, &c. *is anſwered, and Mark* 10.13,14,15,16. *is ſhewed to make nothing for infants viſible Church-memberſhip and baptiſm, and his deſcription of viſible Church-memberſhip is conſidered, and his Argument from Deut.* 29. *ſhewed to be inſufficient.*

THere are yet ſome other Texts which are brought by Pædobaptiſts out of the New Teſtament, for an inſtitution and practice of infant-baptiſm. Mr. *B. Plain Scripture Proof of infant-baptiſm, part.* 1. *cap.* 31. brings *Mark* 9. 36,37. to prove that, *Chriſt hath expreſly aſſured us that he hath not repealed the privilege of infants viſible Church-memberſhip*, and upon it fals to his Rhetorick, and tels us *of his boldneſs in adventuring on this rule.* All which I judg frivolous; nor needs it any further anſwer, there being no new Argument, and what he before ſpake of that Scripture is anſwered before *Sect.* 15. where it is ſhewed that *Mark* 9.37. by [*little childe*] is not meant one that is ſo in reſpect of age, but in reſpect of quality, and that *the receiving* is not meant of baptiſm, but entertainment in receiving the Doctrine brought, and ſhewing kindneſs to their perſons.

But he adds, "And it is not once but oft that he hath thus manifeſted his will: in the very next Chapter he doth it more fully yet, *Mark* 10.14,15,16. And they brought young children to him that he ſhould touch them; and his Diſciples rebuked thoſe that brought them: but when Jeſus ſaw it, he was much diſpleaſed, and ſaid to them, Suffer ye little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of ſuch is the Kingdom of God. Verily I ſay unto you, whoſoever ſhall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little childe he ſhall not enter therein: and he took them up in his arms,

put his hands on them, and blessed them. And is not here enough to satisfie us yet, that he doth not cast all infants in the world out of his visible Kingdom or Church? but that it is his will they should be admitted? Will any say that it was not infants in the former Text and this that Christ speaks of? Did he take any but infants into his arms? Was it not plainly them that he did bid them receive (in the former Chapter) and was it not them that he would not have to be kept from him? And was it not them that he bid should be suffered to come (that is to be brought) and was it not them that he blessed?

Answ. Mr. *M.* in his *Sermon* had alleged this Tex to prove, that *the infants of believers even while they are infants do receive the inward grace as well as grown men.* I answered, 1. It is doubtfull whether those little children *Mark* 10.14. were infants. 2. Whether it be said of them, *Is the Kingdom of Heaven.* 3. Whether they were believers infants. 4. Whether the Kingdom of Heaven be said to be of them in their present estate or their future. 5. The reason why *of them is the Kingdom of Heaven* may be referred to Christs blessing, not to their Parents faith. 6. That Christs action in this was proper to him, as the great Prophet, and extraordinary, and therefore not fit to make a constant rule for an ordinance, and if it be to that use it is more apposite to establish confirmation than baptism, sith Christ did neither baptize, nor appoint them to be baptized, though he said *of them is the Kingdom of Heaven.* In all likelihood, if infant-baptism had been according to Christs minde he would have taken this occasion to appoint it, which he not doing, it is very probable that he would not have it done.

To all which Mr. *M.* in his *Defence pag.* 221, 222. replied onely this, *that they were dictates and brought in to little purpose*, whereas there is nothing sayd by me without reason and some proof, and yet I being a respondent it was more than my business necessitated me to produce so much, a denial being sufficient for the respondent. And whereas he saith I *grant enough to serve his turn, that the Kingdom of Heaven did belong to those infants and concludes that their infants in their infantile age are capable of inward grace, and some of them actually partakers of it, and this is enough for him, and that more than this cannot be said of grown*

men

men who are visible professors. To it I say, Though I should grant that the Kingdom of Heaven did belong to these infants, yet it serves not his turn to prove thence that the infants of believers are visible Church-members, and that believers infants have right to baptism, except it be proved that their parents were believers, that the Kingdom of Heaven for that reason did belong to them, and in this thing was intended by Christ, the establishing a settled rule for infants interest in the Church and baptism. Capacity of inward grace is not denied to infants, no not to *Turks* infants: whether any of them be partakers actually of inward grace is not determined: nor is it true *that no more can be sayd of grown men*: for the making of visible profession may be said of grown men, which cannot be said of infants.

But Mr. *B.* is eager for infant-baptism as concludible hence, lets see what he saies. First he begins with his Rhetorick, which commonly supplies the want of proof. Then he heaps up seven or eight interrogations, and takes all for granted which he demands. But to them I say.

To the first, 1. I except against his expression which insinuates as if by denying that infants are visible Church-members they were cast out of Christs visible Church, whereas it is one thing not to reckon them in and another to cast them out, which is but once used in Scripture 3 *Iohn* 10. and this phrase serves onely to provoke passion. 2. It is so far from being true *that there is enough in those Texts to satisfy that Christ would have infants admitted into his visible Church*, that it is rather true on the contrary that there is enough against it. To his other questions, I answer. 1. By denying that they were infants he would have received *Mark* 9.37. 2. whether they were infants he took in his arms, whom he would not to be kept from him, but suffered to come to him, and whom he blessed, it is uncertain. *Piscator, Estius, &c.* conceive they were young ones that could come of themselves being called. But be it granted they were infants, lets see what Mr. *B.* gathers thence.

Hence, saith he, *I argue thus.* 1. *If Christ would have us receive infants in his name, then we must receive them as belonging to him and his Church. But he would have us to receive them in his name; therefore &c.* 2. *If he that receiveth an*

infant in his name receiveth himself, then some infants are to be received in his name; and those that refuse them sin: But the former is true, therefore the later.

Answ. 1. Both the conclusions might be granted and yet Mr. *Bs.* cause not gained, the former, because infants may belong to Christ and his Church, to wit, the invisible, and yet it not be proved thence they are visible Church-members; the later, because they may be received in Christs name as by harbouring, feeding them, and yet not be admitted to baptism. 2. The *minor* in both Syllogismes is false: For the Text *Mark* 9.37. speaks not of infants in age to be received, but of believers that are humble, and low in condition as infants, particularly of his Apostles.

3. Saith Mr. *B. if Christ was much displeased with those that kept particular infants from visible access to him, then (though they could not keep them from his visible grace) I think he will be much more displeased with those that keep all the infants in the world from visible access to him in his Church now (though they cannot keep them from the invisible Church:) But the former is true: Therefore the later.*

Answ. The conclusion is granted. For what visible access to Christ in his Church now can be but by profession of faith I know not. If Mr. *B.* know of any that keep infants from professing faith let him threaten them, and spare not. But that which he tels us that we keep infants from visible access to Christ, because we baptize them not for want of profession of faith, is but a squib that may affright women and children, when intelligent persons laugh at it.

4. Saith he, "If Christ command us to suffer them to come, and not to forbid them, then those sin against his express Command that will not suffer them to come but do forbid them, (for it is a standing Command and speaks of infants, and not of these individuals onely; and there is now no other visible admittance to Christ but by admitting into his Church and to be his Disciples) But *&c.* therefore *&c.*

Answ. The conclusion is granted without any detriment to our cause: we forbid not any to come to Christ. There's no coming to Christ now as those little children came, that is, to come to his person for blessing, cure, or teaching by himself in the flesh. There's

no

no coming to Christ now but by hearing his word, and believing in him, as *John* 6.35. is expressed. If any forbid infants to do so let him bear the blame. But we forbid infants to be baptized till they come to Christ, that is, till they believe, and we are sure we have the Scripture for us, *Matth.* 28.19. *Mark* 16.16. *Acts* 8.37. *Ephes.* 5.4. *Gal.* 3.26,27. A thing so known that all that heretofore baptized infants did take this as unquestionable, that believers onely are to be baptized, and therefore to justifie infant-baptism they run into wilde fancies, as that they believe in the Church, in their Parents, in their sureties, in their being baptized. But Mr. *Bs.* hold is in his *Parenthesis*, against which I except, 1. that his speech of [*admitting into his Church, and to be his Disciples*] supposeth that a person is first admitted into Christs Church, and then to be his Disciple, whereas no man is rightly admitted into Christs Church, who is not first a Disciple. 2. That he saith, *This Luke* 18.16. *is a standing Commandment.* But this we must take on Mr. *Bs.* word, theres nothing in the Text, or in Mr. *Bs.* writing to prove it. Nor is it likely. For if so, me thinks the Apostles and the Writers of the New Testament should not have been so negligent as neither to observe this command after this time, nor to have recorded any act done by the Apostles according to that command. 3. *That Christs speech is of the* species *of infants, and not of these individuals onely.* 1. Is said without proof, yea it is more probable that ἄφετε τὰ παιδία, is as much as, *Suffer these little children to come to me*, and that because, as Pædobaptists urge, τοιούτων, *of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*, (which is the reason of Christs injunction) is meant of those infants. 2. Were it granted not to be meant of those individuals onely, yet this is all that can be thence proved, that if after that time other infants were brought to Christ in that manner to be touched by him, they should be suffered. It may be granted, that *there is now no other visible admittance to Christ but by admitting into his Church.* But this is enough to prove that there is now no such visible admittance to Christ as those *Mark* 10.14. had, who were admitted to Christs person to be touched by him, and not into his visible Church by baptism.

5. Saith Mr. *B. If of such be the Kingdom of God, then of such is the visible Church: but the former is true. Therefore, &c.* *Answ.*

Answ. The consequence is denied. Of infants in the mothers womb, as *Jacob*, *John Baptist*, *&c.* is the Kingdom of God, and yet the visible Church is not of such.

But saith Mr. *B.* "Here they have two cavils against the plain sense of the Text, 1. By [such] is meant [such for docibleness and humility] To which I answer, 1. Then it seems they are so docible and humble, that the Kingdom belongs to them. For if it belong to others, because they are such as them, then it must needs belong to others also.

Answ. Mr. *Bs.* censure of the Answers I gave as cavils is as the rest of this his Dispute rash and inconsiderate. For the very words *Mark* 10.15. do directly lead to that sense I give, and the words of Christ *Matth.*18.3,4. plainly expound wherein they that enter into the Kingdom of God must be like children. But to the matter of his Answer, 1. The conclusion is granted, nor was it ever denyed by me, that of some infants is the Kingdom of God, and particularly of those whom Christ blessed, but yet not because of their docibleness and humility, but because of Christs blessing. Nor do I allow Mr. *Bs.* consequence, that *if the Kingdom did belong to others, because they are such as them, then it must needs belong to them also.* For the Kingdom of Heaven did belong to others, because they are such as them in the properities common to them with other children: But the Kingdom of Heaven did belong to them as blessed by Christ, not in respect of docibleness and humility. It may be it will be said, that then little children have those properties for which of them may be the Kingdom of God. I answer, it doth not follow: but this onely follows that there is such teachableness and humility in little children in other respects, which other men imitating and expressing in spiritual things, and so becoming such as they are by analogy and resemblance, in that respect belong to the Kingdom of God.

2. Saith Mr. *B.* "Doth Christ say, To such as them in this or that respect onely, and not to them, (or saith he) not in general, To such? even to such as he took in his arms and blessed? He would not have taken up, and blessed any, for a meer Emblem of such as were blessed; he would not have taken up and blessed a Lamb or a Dove as Emblems of humility and innocency. If Christ say, [of such] is the Kingdom, I am bound to take Scripture

in

in the most extensive sense, till there be a plain reason to necessitate me to restrain it. And therefore must understand it [to such] both of that age, or any other age. Who dare think that the word [to such] is not rather inclusive as to them than exclusive? If I love humble poor men, and my servants keep them from my house because they are poor, and if I chide them for it, and say, Suffer such to come to me, and forbid them not, for my delight is in such: who would so interpret this speech as to think I would exclude them, while I command their admittance? And that I meant other humble ones, and not these? "

Answ. Doth Mr. *B.* say, To such in general in respect of age onely belongs the Kingdom of God. If he do say so (as his words seem to import) then it follows, that to every infant, whether of believers or unbelievers, elect or reprobate, belongs the Kingdom of God: If not, then he must say as I say, if he will speak truth, that 1. To those infants belonged the Kingdom in this respect onely as they were blessed by Christ, or elect. 2. If it be applied to other infants, it can be applied to no others but such as are blessed by Christ, or elect. 3. And for other persons, that under the term [of such] are meant also persons of age like them in humility and teachableness is so manifest from *v.*15. *Matth.*18.3.4.5. that it is nothing but cavilling in Mr. *B.* thus to carp at my plain and clear exposition of the words agreeable to the most approved expositors, as *Beza Annot. ad Matth.*19.14. *talium* τοιούτων] *id est, horum & similium ut supra* 18. *Piscat: sch: in Matth.* 19.14. *talium*] τῶν τοιούτων, *quales scilicet sunt isti pueruli, nempe credentes in me & demissè de se sentientes. confer. supra, c.* 18. 2. *& seq.* that I omit others. Neither do I, nor need I say, that Christ took them, or blessed the little ones for a meer Emblem of such as were blessed, or that he might, by like reason with mine, have taken up and blessed a Lamb or a Dove as Emblems of humility. And though Mr. *Bs.* rule may be questioned, *whether a man be bound to take Scripture in the most extensive sense till there be a plain reason to necessitate him to restrain it*, yet I gainsay it not, to understand [*to such*] *both of that age or any other*, and I allow that Christ meant *those, and other humble ones*, and that the term [*of such*] is both *inclusive*, including more than those particular little ones; and *exclusive*, of those that are not elect or

blessed by Christ. And though I maintain by firm Arguments in my *Postscript* to Mr. *Blake*, *sect.* 20. that by *the Kingdom of Heaven*, as in *Matth.* 19.14. or *of God*, as *Mark* 10.14. *Luke* 18.16. is meant the Kingdom of Glory, (which Mr. *B.* denies not) yet were it allowed Mr. *B.* that it is meant of the visible Church, it is not true of all infants of believers, that of them is the visible Church, for infants in the womb, as *Jacob*, are of the Kingdom of God, that is the invisible Church, yet not of the visible, much less of the *species* of infants, as Mr. *B.* speaks. For then every individual infant should be of the visible Church, though the Parents be unbelievers, which Mr. *B.* me thinks should gainsay: and therefore there is plain reason necessitating to restrain the speech of Christ, as I do.

3. Saith Mr. *B. When Mr.* T. *maketh their docibleness the thing intended by Christ, he forgot that he judged them uncapable of being Disciples. Why may not those be Disciples who are not onely docible, but exemplary for their teachableness.*

Answ. Mr. *T.* tels Mr. *B.* he did not forget, but thinks Mr. *B.* did not heed. The docibleness allowed to infants was in things natural, such as are to know the Nurse, imitate gestures, to be stilled from crying when rebuked, *&c.* but not in things spiritual, to know Christ to be the Son of God, the *Messiah*, *&c.* which are necessary to denominate them Disciples of Christ. Yet such teachableness, and humility onely negative, in not ambitiously affecting preheminence are sufficient for Christ to propound them as examples or similitudes rather, to direct his Disciples to imitate in another kinde.

« Their second Objection, saith Mr. *B.* is that by [the Kingdom of God] is meant the Kingdom of Heaven. And I think so too: but then if the Kingdom of Heaven belong to such, much more a standing as members in the visible Church: For what is it to be a member of the Church visible, but to be one that in seeming or appearance, or to the judgment of man, doth belong to the invisible Church or the Kingdom of Heaven? For the Church is but one, and the difference respective as I shewed before: therefore both visible and invisible, both military and triumphant are called in Scripture [*the Kingdom of Heaven* or *of God*] If a man be known (or any sort of men) to belong to the Church invisible,

then

then they visibly belong to it; and then they are visible members of the Church: so that this proof is more full for infants Church-membership, than if it had been said, they may be visible Church-members. For it saith much more of them which includeth that."

Answ. Mr. *B.* thinks it seems with me that by the Kingdom of God is meant the Kingdom of Heaven, that is, of Glory, or the invisible Church; which if true, then of no infants but elect is the Kingdom of God, for no other are of the invisible Church, or enter into the Kingdom of Glory. And if so, not the the very *species* of infants but particular persons, and of these not all perhaps but a few of the infants of believers, perhaps more of the infants of unbelievers are of the Kingdom of God. But however he thinks it will follow *à majori*, that *if of infants is the Kingdom of God, that is the invisible Church or Kingdom of Glory, then much more they have a standing in the visible Church.* To which I say, 1. If this Argument were good, it could onely prove those infants to be of the visible Church who are elect. 2. It can prove it onely of those *who in seeming or appearance, or to the judgment of men do belong to the invisible Church, or be known to belong to the invisible Church.* But no infants in particular are known to belong to the invisible Church, nor is there any note whereby any infant in particular may be discerned to be of the invisible Church, which may make it seem or appear to the judgment of man, *Ergo*, there is no infant, no not according to Mr. *Bs.* own description, hath a standing in the visible Church. The *minor* of this Argument I expect should be denied, but it will concern them that do deny it, to shew us out of Scripture, where God hath given us any sign, though but probable, to judg such an infant to be of the invisible Church of the elect, such a one not. If any say Gods covenant and the Parents faith. I reply, God hath plainly declared *Rom.* 9. 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 18. that he hath not made any promise to the natural seed of *Abraham*, that he will be their God in respect of saving grace, much less to the natural seed of every or any believer of this time, but that notwithstanding any covenant he hath made, he takes the seed of unbelievers to be his children, and leaves the seed of believers to be hardened: and this appeared plainly in *Jacob* and *Esau* of the same Parents believers, born together, yet one lo-

ved, the other hated, and the Gentiles called, when the *Jews* were rejected. We say truly the book of life is a secret which belongs to God, who hath hidden it, yea hath so ordered it by the strange variations of his calling, that *his judgments should be unsearchable, and his paths past finding out*, *Rom.* 11.33. And therefore no man hath warrant from Gods Word to frame any judgment concerning this or that infant to be of the invisible Church. But because Mr. *B.* says somewhat to prove his consequence, let us consider what he brings. That which he sayth is, 1. *The Church is but one, and the difference respective.* 2. *He that saith that they belong to the invisible, saith much more, even that which includeth that they are visible,* (if I understand his obscure expressions) *Church-members.* 3. *That to be a member of the Church visible, is to be one that in seeming or appearance, or to the judgment of man, doth belong to the invisible Church, or the Kingdom of Heaven.*

Answ. 1. It is true, the universal Church of the elect is but one, and the difference respective, yet the difference such, that all the invisible are not of the visible Church, nor all the visible of the invisible; nor by any good consequence can it be made good, they that are of the invisible are much more of the visible, no not when they are known to be of the invisible Church. The first is manifest by instances, the spirits of the just made perfect, elect persons yet unbegotten, yet uncalled, called, but not yet shewing it are of the invisible Church, but not of the visible: on the other side, secret hypocrites are of the visible, but not of the invisible. And the last Assertion is manifest, in that though it is more to be of the invisible Church than of the visible, yet that which denominates a person of the visible Church doth not agree always to a member of the invisible Church. But Mr. *B.* thinks the contrary to be true, and accordingly frames an explication of what it is to be a member of the Church visible, which I must not call a definition, for that is excepted against by him, *Præfat in: Morator, sect.* 11. as if in Logick any descriptions or explications of words or things were not usually called definitions, though imperfect. Let's examine it however. He tels us here what it is to be a visible Church-member, which because he doth elsewhere more fully express, I shall have an eye on the writings elsewhere, and so much

the

the rather, because in this mistake of his lieth much of the fallacy of Mr. *Bs.* second Argument. In his *Præfat. Morator, sect.* 11. He saith, when he distinguisheth the Church into visible and invisible, *He doth not divide the* genus *into the* species, *sed æquivocum in sua æquivocata:* but I think he is mistaken in this; for then a term is *equivocal*, as *Arist. Categ.* in the beginning tels us, *When the name is onely common, but not the reason of being*, or the definition according to that name; but the definition of the Church of Christ, even that which Mr. *B.* himself saith, *All Divines are agreed on plain Scripture, &c. pag.* 82. *that it is a Society of persons separated from the world to God, or called out of the world*, doth agree to the visible Church, and therefore the term [*Church of Christ*] is not an equivocal term, but a *genus*, whether univocal, or *analogum*. *And I add*, saith he, *that the reason of the appellation given to the visible body is, its seeming to be the same with the mystical; or that the name is given secondarily, borrowedly from the mystical to the visible.*

Answ. I grant that the Church invisible is *famosius* or *primarium Analogatum*, that is, the invisible Church is more truly, or in a greater degree of propriety Christs Church than the visible, yet do not think *the name of the Church is given secondarily, borrowedly, from the mystical to the visible.* For the original meaning of the word] [ἐκκλησία, translated *Church*] being [an assembly, or meeting, or congregation of people in one place] (who are an object visible) I conceive that the term [*Church* first agrees to the visible Church, and secondarily to the invisible, yea in exact speech the invisible Church now are called [*the Church*] *in order to their meeting, or* πανήγυεις, *or General assembly* at the last day, for *Heb.* 12. 23. these are joined together, πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησία, *the General assembly and Church*, or as it is termed 2 *Thess.* 2. 1. ἡμῶν ἐπισυναγωγῆς ἐπ' αὐτὸν, *our gathering together unto Christ*, at which time the visible Church and invisible will be all one visible company, μία ποίμνη, εἷς ποιμὴν *one sheepfold one Shepheard, John* 10. 16. nor do I conceive *the reason of the appellation given to the visible body is its seeming to be the same with the mystical*, but because by their words and actions discernible by sense they own Christ as their Lord without any consideration of their election or reprobation, sincerity or hypocrisy,

Christs approbation, or non-approbation of them. And that the seeming to other men to be of the invisible Church, is not the reason of the appellation of a visible Church or Church-member, I gather hence, becaus a person may seem to be of the invisible Church, yea may be known to be of the invisible Church of Gods elect, as for instance, *Jacob* and *John Baptist* in their mothers womb seemed, yea were known to be of the invisible Church of Gods elect, *Luke* 1.15. yet no: of the visible. For sure they were not visible Church-members, when they were not visible men. Yea there may be many visible men who may seem, with great probability upon signs of their conversion wrought on them, to be of the invisible Church, and not of the visible as a number of *Indians* hearing Mr. *Eliat*, or Mr. *Mayhew* preach, and shewing affection by tears, smiting of their breasts, lifting up their eys to Heaven and such like actions, have seemed, from these sensible expressions, of their own, to be elect persons, such as God intended to save, and yet I think no man will say that at that time they were visible Church-members till they afterwards made profession of faith in Christ. Mr. *B.* goeth on thus, *So that if you ask me, whether it be certain or onely probable, that infants are members of the visible Church? I say, certain. Answ.* If Mr. *B.* mean it of the sorts or as he cals it *species* of infants, it may easily appear by this *Review* that it is so far from being certain [that infants are members of the visible Church Christian] that it hath scarse a shew of probability. If he mean it of the individuals, I say that according to Mr. *Bs.* own sayings, there is no certainty that any infant is a visible Church-member. For according to him *to be a member of the Church visible is to be one that in seeming, or appearance, or to the judgment of man, doth belong to the invisible Church, or the Kingdom of Heaven,* But this belonging in seeming appearance, or to the judgment of man is uncertain, its but a judgment of probability which any man, hath of any mans belonging to the invisible Church, Mr. *B.* himself *plain Scripture &c. p.*73. sayth, *Therefore even Cardinal* Cusanus *calleth the visible Church Ecclesia conjecturalis, as receiving its members on conjectural signs.* Therefore there is no certainty of it that any particular infant is a visible Church-member. If it be sayd that the seeming is certain, though it be not certain that they belong to the invisible

Church,

Church, I reply, so it may be sayd that if *Turks* infants seem to be of the visible Church, though to a fool or frantick man, the seeming is certain. But I suppose Mr. *B.* means that it is certain and not onely probable to considerate men to whom things are not certain of which they have not certain evidence, that infants are visible Church-members. But this (understanding it of particulars) is not certain upon any good evidence that they are members of the Church invisible, and therefore it is not certain they are visible church-members sith by Mr. *Bs.* description, *to be a visible Church-member is to seem to be of the invisible Church*, and therefore as the seeming to be of the invisible Church is, so is the visibility, both uncertain and at most probable, and so all baptizing of infants is upon uncertain grounds and therefore a man cannot do it in faith he being uncertain he doth his duty: which thing is also made good elsewhere from Mr. *Bs.* concessions *Antipedobapt. part.* 1. *sect.* 35. But Mr. *B.* thinks he hath sure grounds, and therefore he added! *If you ask me, what is it that directly or immediatly constituteth them such members. I answer, their visible or audible, that is their external engagement by Covenant to Christ: This (performed by the parent for them) is it on their part; supposing Christs title to them, and the offer of himself in Covenant.*

Answ. I grant that the visible or audible that is their external engagement by Covenant to Christ doth make the persons so ingaging freely, seriously, soberly, and understandingly, visible Church-members. But that the parents performing this for the childe doth make the infants such directly and immediately, is an assertion not proved by Mr. *B.* nor is it true, nor consistent with the descriptions of the visible Church and sayings about it, which Protestants of note give, nor doth it as here and elsewhere set down by Mr. *B.* yield any sure ground to know certainly any particular infant to be a visible Church-member. That I may make good these in their order. Two things are supposed and one thing named as *directly and immediately constituting infants visible Church-members.* The things supposed are, 1. *Christs title to them.* 2. *The offer of himself in Covenant to them.* But there is nothing but ambiguity in these expressions. For 1. it is uncertain whether he mean that these are supposed when the parent doth perform the engage-

ment

ment for the childe that Christ hath a title to them, and that he doth offer himself in Covenant to them: or whether he mean that the parents engagement doth constitute the childe a visible Church member, if Christ have a title to it and offer himself in Covenant to it. If in the former sense, then it had been enough to have mentioned the parents act without that supposition; if in the later, then what ever the parents act be yet no man is certain of the childes visible Church-membership by it alone without the other two. 2. What title of Christ to them he means whether by election and gift of his Father to him, or by his Spirit, which he that hath not is *none of his*, *Rom.* 8. 9. or what other title he means I am uncertain. 3. What Covenant he means whether the absolute Covenant of grace belonging to the elect, or the conditional Covenant to all upon condition of faith, or the national Covenant made to *Abraham*, and the people of *Israel*, or what other besides I cannot tell how to determine. 4. How the Covenant is offered except by Preaching to them or by some secret work of the Spirit I cannot imagine. 5. It is somewhat uncertain whether the external engagement that may make the infant a visible Church-member must not be of a parent that is a real and sincere believer, or whether a dogmatical faith serves turn. Sure in his *plain Scrip. &c. chap.* 29. *part.* 1. He makes a real faith necessary in the parent to that sanctification without which the childe is not holy, that is a visible Church-member. 6. Whether he make the parents engagement to constitute immediately infants born or unborn also visible Church-members is uncertain. Lets see what we can gather elsewhere I cannot for present find a place where he more fully expresseth himself than in his *plain scrip. &c. pag.* 336. of the first edition, *whereas* saith he, *some stick at it that I make the condition of the infants Church-membership and justification to be wholly without him in the faith of the parent; I answer them.* 1. *That it is evident in all the Scripture that God putteth a very great difference between the children of the faithfull and other mens.* Which I grant, but withall that this is true onely of the sincerely faithfull and not onely in external profession, and yet not so as to count any a visible Church-member in the Christian Church for the parents faith. 2. Saith he, *that he maketh such promises to them, and giveth them such privileges as I have expres-*

in

in this Book. But if he mean by *the promises* those of the Covenant of grace, I say, they are made onely to elect and true believers, if other promises of temporal blessings they are not made to the children of meer seeming believers but true believers, nor do they at all reach to visible Church-membership or Justification of children. These privileges are no where promised to the children of believing Christians though sincere meerly because of their parents faith. And therefore that which he adds. 3. *That this is to them as they are the children of the people who believe,* is false, And when he saith. 4. *And that he never requireth any condition inherent in the infant, that I finde in Scripture,* yet others conceive an inherent condition required in an infant *Heb.*12.14. and elsewhere. But he adds, *And doth not this plainly tell us, that the parents faith is the condition? if the parent be a believer, the childe is entered the Covenant, the father entering it for him, and his* Deut.29. *If the parent be not a believer, the childe is left out: And what other condition can be imagined?*

Answ. If the Scripture had required no inherent condition in the infant, yet it had not followed that the parents faith is the condition of the infants Church-membership and justification. For there are other ways, to wit, their election, Christs death for them, which are avouched as sufficient to their justification without the consideration either of any inherent condition in the infant, or the parents faith. Nor is it true, *that if the parent be a believer the childe is entered the Covenant, the Father entering it for him and his, and that if the parent be not a believer, the childe is left out.* For if it be meant of the Covenant of grace it is most false, *that if the parent be a believer the childe is entered the Covenant.* *Esau* was the childe of *Isaac* a believer, *Ishmael* of *Abraham*, yet neither entered into the Covenant of grace, neither justified by the parents faith? if it were so then they were entered into the Covenant of grace and justified, and after outed, which infers falling from grace. Nor is there any such Covenant of visible Church-membership which if the parent be a believer the childe is entered in. Nor is there a word *Deut.*29. to prove it. There is nothing there set down but a narration of *Moses* his renewing the Covenant with the children of *Israel* in the Land of *Moab*, beside the Covenant which he made with them in *Horeb.* It is

true it is said *v.*10,11,12,13. *They ſtood all before the Lord, the Commanders and the men, then the litle ones, wives, ſtrangers, hewers of wood drawers of water, that they might enter into Covenant*, but that, 1. The parents peculiarly as parents did enter into Covenant for their children appears not: but rather that the entering of the Covenant was by the Rulers in behalf of the ſubject, as the league with the *Gibeonites* was by the Princes in behalf of *Iſrael*, whereto they were bound *Joſh.*9.15,19. nor is there any conſideration of a Father entering into Covenant for his childe more than of a Husbands entering into covenant for his wife, or a Maſters entering into Covenant for his ſervant, and therefore if this fact were good to prove, *if the parent be a believer the childe is entered the Covenant, the Father entering for him and his:* it is good to prove that if the Husband, or Maſter be a believer, the wife, and ſervant are entered into Covenant, the Husband and Maſter entering it for them and theirs, and ſo wives, and ſervants ſhall be viſible Church-members, as well as infants of believers, by the faith of Husbands and Maſters. 2. If the parents faith procure this privilege for the child then either becauſe it is his childe, and then it procures it for the childe while it is his childe though the childe be at years and an infidel, for then it is his childe, or elſe upon condition the childe agree to it, but then the privilege belongs not to infants, and there is an inherent condition required, to wit, the childes conſent beſides the parents faith: if it be ſaid that it procures it to the childe while an infant, but not when it comes to years how can this be true that the parents faith or covenanting ſhould immediately and directly conſtitute them viſible Church-members when infants becauſe they are their children, and the covenant is made with them and their children (as they ſay) and yet they not viſible Church-members while they are children? ſurely, the immediate cauſe continuing, the effect continues, and therefore if the parents faith with the covenant make the childe in infancy a viſible Church-member it muſt alſo make it a viſible Church-member at years though an infidel. 3. Whereas it is ſuppoſed by Mr. *B.* that the parents as believers entered the covenant *Deut.*29. it rather appears by *Moſes* his preface *v.*2,3,4. that *Moſes* did therefore draw them into this ſolemn Covenant, becauſe they were to that day unbelievers,

4. It

4. It is false, that this entering into covenant did make them Church-members. For. 1. The end of it was to prevent them from backsliding *v.*18. to Idolatry, and to prevent Gods forsaking them thereupon, *v.*13. 2. They were Church-members before both by Gods special separating of the whole nation to be his people, and the solemn Covenant at mount *Horeb*, and so were members of that Church as part of that nation. 3. If this entering into covenant made them there Church-members visible then it made their posterity also then visible Church-members, for with them also was that covenant made, *v.*14.15. and so persons should be made visible Church-members after they are born. 5. If it were true, that that covenanting made them visible, Church-members of that Church, yet it advantageth no whit to prove infants now visible members of the Christian Church, which is not national as that was, nor gathered by the chief Magistrate as that was, nor injoyned such a national Covenant as that, but consisting of particular believers of all nations, gathered by the Preaching of the Gospel and voluntary personal covenanting for themselves onely testified by their being baptized into Christ. If any ask whether a national covenant or a covenant of parents for children be now allowable? I answer, I deny not but such a national or parental covenant may be allowed, and in some cases convenient, yet I say that it makes not all the subjects and children Church-members, nor bindes them without their consent any farther than the matter of the covenant it self bindes. As for that which Mr. *B.* saith, *if the parent be not a believer the childe is left out*, it is false, if we understand it in respect of Church-membership of children at years they may be in the Church visible though their parents were unbelievers and left out of the Church though believers; if of justification, it is false both of infants and children of years. And it is utterly untrue that in the Christian Church children are made visible Church-members by parents faith, or left out because of their unbelief. For, 1. There is no word of Scripture that saith so. The three Texs *Acts* 2.39. *Rom.* 11.16 17. *&c.* 1 *Cor.*7.14 are fully discussed already in the first part of this *review*, and what Mr. *Blake* hath replied shall be examined (God willing) in that which follows. 2. No one passage of the New Testament doth shew that any infant was

reckoned for a visible Church-member of the Christian Church in the New Testament, but many shew they were not. 3. If the infant children of the faithfull had been accounted in the Apostles times visible members of the Christian Church there had been some thing done by the Apostles and other holy men to have preserved their right, but no practise of baptism on them, nor any other act can be produced that the Apostles or other holy men did to preserve such a right, *Ergo*. 4. The Covenant of the Gospel is with particular persons made believers out of all nations, their gathering by Preaching the Gospel to them, which evidently shew that God intended to take in persons into the Christian Church upon their own faith, and not in a national way as he did the Church of the *Jews*. 5. The Texts (besides the three forenamed) brought by the *Assembly Confess. of faith, ch.* 25. *art.* 2. to wit, *Ezek.* 16.20,21. *Gen.* 3.15. *Gen.* 17.7. and the Texts brought by Mr. *B.* (not here examined) to wit, *Matth.* 23.37,38, 39. *Revel.* 11.15. *Heb.* 8.6. & 7.22. *Rom.* 4.11. *Exod* 20.6. *Josh.* 7.25,26. *Deut* 13.12,13,14. *Psal.* 37.26. *Num.* 31.17. *Dan.* 6.24. *Deut.* 20.16,17. *Deut.* 28.4,18,32,41. *Mal.* 2.15. are so palpably impertinent to prove the visible Church-membership of infants now, that I am in a demur with my self, whether it be fit for me to bestow any more pains in shewing the impertinency of them. 6. The speeches of Protestants of note do make the persons own profession that sign whereby they are judged, and from whence they are termed of the visible Church. *Synops. Profess. Leydens. Disp.* 40. *sect.* 32. *Ecclesia visibilis appellatur, non tam quia homines ipsi visibiles sunt, sed quia ipsorum ordo, professio & communio sensibus exponuntur.* Dr. *Prideaux Lect.* 9. *sect.* 3. *visibilis dicitur Ecclesia ratione communionis sensibilis membrorum inter se.* Mr. *Marshall* himself in the *Sermon at the Spittle, April* 1652. stiled by Mr. *B. that late excellent, honest solid Sermon for unity, pag.* 25. hath these words. *Secondly, that part of the Church which is upon the earth in regard that the very life and being of it and of all the members of it ly in internal grace, which cannot be seen, in that respect the Church of Christ is called an invisible Church: but now as the same Church and members doth make a profession of their faith and obedience sensibly to the eys and ears of others in that respect it is called a*

visible

visible Church; but the visible is not one Church and the invisible another Church, but meerly the same Church under several denominations, the one from their constituting graces, the other from the external profession of them.

There was lately a printed sheet brought to my hands intituled, The profession of the Church, *&c.* which is owned by Mr. *Richard Baxter in his Christian concord*, in the *Preface* of which are these words. *And because Ministers cannot well know who are members of the Churches, and who not, and so must be ignorant of the extent of their charges and duties without an expression of their peoples consent.* Hence I argue, 1. If *Ministers cannot know who are members of the Churches and who not without an expression of their peoples consent*, then they cannot know infants to be members of the Churches, who expresse no consent. 2. Then the parents faith upon which they were baptized without their own consent expressed doth not make them visible Church-members, for if it did they might know them by their memory and registers that they were Church-members. 3. Then they are not rightly baptized by him without their consent. 4. Then it is not true which Mr. *B.* writeth *plain Scripture &c. pag.* 280. *And do you not see it fulfilled before your eys? Are not* Bewdley, Kederminster (meaning all the people elder and yonger) *&c. and* England (till of late) *as fully Christs Disciples and so Church-members, as the* Jews *were in Covenant with God and so Church-members?* which if true Mr. *B.* may know who at *Kederminster* are Church-members without their expressed consent, even all the inhabitants, and that his charge is extended to all. 5. Then the gift of visible Church-membership is repealed sith in the Common wealth of *Israel* all the posterity of *Israel* were Church-members. 6. By his new course of distinguishing the professing and subscribing parioshiners of *Kederminster* as Church-members from the rest as not his Church-members, he gathers a Church out of a Church and separates some Disciples from others, and doth himself make a like division in his Church (though not in so justifiable a way as he chargeth so fiercely on me and others. Which I conceive to be little less than a retractation of his own tenet about infants visibe Church-membership, and clearing of his opposites. Lastly, by Mr. *Bs.* determi-

nations there is no certain way to know a particular infant to be a visible Church-member. For in his determinations there is no resolution, nor according to his grounds do I think can be given a certain resolution whether the parent be such a one to whom the Covenant is, whether he have that faith which may intitle his childe to visible Church-membership, whether the immediate parents engagement be necessary or a remote parents engagement be sufficient, whether the engagement must be open in the face of the Congregation, or it be sufficient that it be done privately, when it must be, at Baptism, or at some other time, whether it need not be as oft as he hath children to be admitted visible Church-members, whether the baptizer may account him a visible Church-member, whose parents are dead, absent, unable to come, or to express their engagement and so baptize him, which with many other doubts would retard the course of Ministers and people in their profane infant sprinkling, if they did not with a blinde obedience rest on Mr. *Bs.* unproved dictates, but searched after the truth considerately and impartially. But I pass on.

6. Saith Mr. *B. hence I further argue thus: If Christ were much displeased with his Disciples for keeping infants from him, then he took it as a part of their revealed duty that they should not forbid them: But the former is true, therefore the later. Whence I further argue: if it were the Disciples known or revealed duty not to forbid them to come to Christ, then they must needs take it also for a revealed truth that infants* in specie (*and not those numerical onely*) *should not be forbidden to come,* (*for they could not know that those individuals should be admitted but by knowing that infants should be admitted*) *But &c.*

Answ. The conclusion of the former argument may be granted, and yet the sequele of the later argument denied. For they might know it either by some particular sign from Christ or some particular instinct of the Spirit, that it was their duty to permit those infants to come to Christ, and yet not permit any more.

But saith Mr. *B. Yea further. 7. If it were the Disciples revealed duty to admit infants to come to Christ for this very reason, because of such is the Kingdom of Heaven, then it was no secret but a revealed truth, that of such was the Kingdom of Heaven: But the former is true. For Christ would not be angry*

so

so much with them for not knowing that which was never revealed, or for not admitting them when they had no means to know them to have right of admittance. The consequence is evident therefore, and so it follows: that if it were then a revealed truth, that of such is the Kingdom of Heaven; then they were visible members of the Church. For that sort of men that are known to belong to Heaven (though it be not known of the individuals) do visibly belong to the Church; (as I think none dare deny.)

Answ. 1. According to their exposition who understand [of such] onely those that are like little children in affection, and disposition, and not of those particular little children then brought, much more according to their exposition who by [of such] understand these individual infants and no other, they might know those infants were to be admitted, and yet have no knowledg of an universal rule for admitting other infants at other times. 2. But be it granted that not onely of those individuals, but also of other infants is the Kingdom of Heaven, yet I deny they were visible Church-members. And for his proof, I dare deny that which he fondly thinks none dare deny, that they that are known to belong to Heaven do visibly belong to the Church. *Abraham* and *Isaak* and *Jacob* are known to belong to Heaven, yet I do not conceive do visibly belong to the Church. And the same is true of all the spirits of the Just made perfect, of elect infants unborn, *Jews* uncalled *&c.* I know none belong to the visible Church but such as sensibly have professed faith in Christ. *Amel. Med. Th. l.1. c.31. sect.24,25,26,27. Ecclesia militans visibilis visu sc. vel sensu externo. Cameron prælect. de Eccl. pag.246. Ecclesia aliquando denominatur ab iis quæ sunt externa, quæq; in sensum incurrunt. Piscat. aphor. loc.19. 10. visibilis appellatur quatenus certas habet notas in oculos hominum incurrentes.* Mr. *B.* himself *Præfatin. Morator, sect.11. By* [*visible*] *I mean that which is discernible by the understanding, mediante sensu.* Therefore that sort of men that are known to belong to Heaven do not visibly belong to the Church, unless they are known so by some sensible expression, yea of their own, which is not true of infants, much less of the sort of them, or any sort of being, no sort of beings being visible, but onely singulars.

Mr.

Mr. *B.* goes on thus, 8. *But the chief evidence in the Text lieth here; if because that of such is the Kingdom; therefore it was the Disciples sin to keep them back; then it must needs be the very species of infants that Christ means, are of the Kingdom, (and not onely the aged humble) but therefore it was the Disciples sin to keep them back, (and their duty to admit them, or else Christ would not have been much displeased with them) because that of such is the Kingdom; therefore it must needs be infants themselves that are of the Kingdom. The reason of the consequence lieth here; It would be no sin in the Disciples to keep away from Christ those that were but meer Emblems of the saved. For else it would have been the Disciples sin to have forbidden all the Sheep or Doves in the country to have been brought to Christ to lay hands on. This is plain and convincing to me.*

Answ. The conclusion is granted, that it was the infants, if they were infants that were brought to Christ themselves, and not onely the aged humble resembled by them, that are of the Kingdom. Mr. *B.* needed not to have cast away so much pains in proving it against me, who do in my *Postscrip. sect.* 20. say, I stick not to that Exposition of not including those infants. But I think Mr. *B.* would prove, that not onely Christ said of those infants, but of the very *species* of infants is the Kingdom of God. Which speech of his hath in it sundry absurdities. 1. He seems to make infants a distinct *species* from the aged; whereas in Logick [*homo, mankinde*] is *species ima, the lowest kinde* in the Predicament of substance; and it is a Rule in that Art, that *Sex* and Age *non variant speciem, do not vary the kinde.* 2. When he saith, *the very species are of the Kingdom*, sith he grants, that by the Kingdom is meant the invisible Church, his words seem to aver, that all infants are of the invisible Church. For the very *species* comprehends all the individuals, and then he must hold all infants are elect, (for onely the elect are of the invisible Church) and if after they be reprobate then election is revocable, and the elect may not be saved. But if he mean it onely of some of that sort, and particularly all the infants of believers, neither is that true, sith the contrary is manifest in *Esau*. But if he mean no more than this, that of some elect infants, yea and of others than those particular infants is the Kingdom

dom of God, I should not stick to grant it, nor need Mr. *B.* thus trouble himself to prove it, though I think his consequence is not good. For it might be their sin to keep back those infants from Christ, if Christ did by any sign discover his minde to have them brought, though it were not to declare their title, or any other infants title to the Kingdom of Heaven, bu: onely to use them as Emblems. Nor is Mr. *Bs.* reason forcible, *that then it might have been their sin to have forbidden Sheep and Doves to be brought to Christ.* For it may be granted, that this might have been their sin, if Christ had in like manner declared his minde by any sign concerning such Sheep, that they should be brought to him. Mr. *Bs.* arguing runs upon this supposition, that the Apostles might know it was their duty at all times to permit infants to come to Christ from a general truth, that of all infants (at least of believers) is the Kingdom of God, (which he neither proves, nor can prove) whereas the Apostles fault might be in not heeding some particular thing he had then by some words or other sign made known of those infants then brought, or not considering Christs Office, and constant practice of doing good to all, specially to infirm and diseased persons, such as those infants might be, and as some conceive were, and accordingly brought to be cured by Christ. But Mr. *B.* is not yet come to that he would have.

9. Saith he, *Those that Christ took in his arms, laid his hands on, and blessed, were visible members of his Church, and not meer resemblances of such: but some infants Christ took in his arms, laid his hands on, and blessed: therefore some infants were members of the visible Church, (and consequently Christ hath not repealed the Church-membership of infants) and they were not meer resemblances of such. For would Christ have blessed so a Sheep or Dove? or are they blessed of Christ, and yet not so much as visible members of his Church? Sure there are none visibly blest without the visible Church. And it was not these onely; for I have proved, it was the Disciples duty to admit others to the like blessing.*

Answ. I do not say, that the infants Christ took in his arms were meer resemblances of visible Church-members, and therefore Mr. *B.* in seeking to prove it still follows a false sent, proving what is not denied. But the other part of the conclusion is denied by

me [*to wit, that some infants were members of the visible Church*] and that part of the *major*, [*those that Christ took in his arms, laid his hands on, and blessed, were visible members of his Church*] and for his proof, that [*none are visibly blest without the visible Church*] I deny it, nor doth he bring any thing to prove it but his own words, sure it is so. But I count it false. For *Jacob* visibly blessed *Pharaoh*, *Gen.*47.10. and yet *Pharaoh* was not of the visible Church. When Christ did raise *Jairus* daughter, heal the daughter of the *Syrophœnician*, I conceive they had a visible blessing, and yet were not of the visible Church. And if it were the Disciples duty to admit others to the like blessing, yet there is neither in the Text nor elsewhere a word to prove, it was their duty to admit them to the like blessing by any other than Christ himself, and his own laying hands on them. Or if it were imagined, that Christ intended this should be a Rule to the Disciples for their conferring a like blessing on infants, yet that it must be a Rule to successors, and if to successors, to all Ministers to do it, or that they must do it by baptism, and not rather as the Bishops did it in Confirmation, by laying on of hands, hath not the least shadow of proof; but rather the contrary is more likely. And accordingly *Jansenius*, & *Concilium Senonense*, as *Chamier tom.*4. *Panstr. Cath. lib.*4. *cap.*9. *sect.*3. the composers of the *Interim*, as *Osiander Epit. Hist. Eccl. Cent.*16. *lib.*2. *cap.*68. *pag.*451. relate, gathered the institution of Confirmation from thence.

But Mr. *B.* adds, *And it is yet more considerable, that all the three former Evangelists make full mention of these passages of Christ; and therefore it is evident that they were not taken for small circumstantials, but Doctrines of moment for the Churches information. They are recorded also in Matth.*18.2, 3,4, &c. *Matth.*19.13,14. *Luke* 9.47. *Luke* 18.16,17. *I desire any tender conscienced Christian, that is in doubt whether infants should be admitted members of the visible Church, and would fain know what is the pleasure of Christ in this thing, to reade over the Texts impartially, and considerately, and then bethink himself, whether it be more likely that it will please Christ better to bring or solemnly admit infants into the Church, or to shut them out; and whether these words of Christ so plain and earnest will not be a better plea at Judgment for our admitting infants,*

infants, than any that ever the Anabaptists brought will be to them for refusing them.

Answ. Mr. *B.* wanting proof fals here to his Rhetorick, which elsewhere he falsly chargeth on me as my fault, but is indeed the chief part of his Book, and prevails much with the most of Readers. But it is the property of childish persons to be affrighted with such mormo's. I grant that the passages of Christ were by the Evangelists taken not for small circumstantials, but Doctrines of moment for the Churches information: yet not teaching infants visible Church-membership and baptism. What ever Christian I be, I have read over the Texts impartially, and considerately as I think this and other writings shew, and I do declare in the presence of God that these passages do confirm me in this truth, that it is not the will of Christ that infants should be baptized, because he neither baptized, nor appointed these to be baptized, and that the words of Christ here are so impertinent that they are more likely to be a plea against infant baptizers who on such weak conjectures go against the plain institution of Christ *Matth.*28.19. *Mark* 16.15.16. and the constant use of the Apostles and first ages. And I do further declare that on my most serious studies I do resolve notwithstanding the evasions they bring, that the plea they make hence for infant baptism, and that which is alleaged of their being Disciples, visible Church-members, in the Covenant, doth as well tie them to admit them to the Lords supper as to baptism, and that in refusing to admit them to baptism we have as good a plea and better at Judgment then they have in refusing to admit them to the Lords Supper. Nor is it to me any other than a sad sign either of injudiciousness or slothfulnes in searching after the truth, or prejudice, or adhering to mens sayings out of reverence of their persons, or faction or some such like evil quality both in Ministers and people even those of tender consciences that they still retain so gross an abuse as infant baptism is upon such weak reasons as they do, and neglect yea and oppose the baptism of believers so manifestly Commanded by Christ and practised by his Apostles. But I must follow Mr. *B.*

But what saith Mr. *T. against this? why.* 1. *He saith, it was some extraordinary blessing to them that Christ intended Apol.p.*149. *Answ.* 1. *it was a discovery of their title to*

the Kingdom of Heaven. It was such an extraordinary blessing that included the ordinary. If extraordinary blessing then much more ordinary. 2 It was such as the Disciples should have known that these should be admitted to, or else Christ would not have been displeased.

Answ. It is true I give this reason why I conceive that [of such] included those infants as conceiving from the circumstances of the thing that Christ intended some extraordinary blessing to them, and declaration concerning them. And in my *Examen pag.* 147. I say, Christs action in this business is proper to him as the great Prophet of the Church and extraordinary, and therfore yeilds no ground for an ordinary rule of baptizing infants by the ordinary Ministery, no more than Christs whipping buyers out of the Temple, though related by the four Evangelists, for an ordinary practise answerable thereto. Now this is not denied by Mr. *B.* But he says, *it was such an extraordinary blessing as included the ordinary: if extraordinary blessing, then much more ordinary.* But 1. these things are said without proof. 2. Their falshood is shewed, and the rest is answered before.

He adds, "But Mr. *T.* saith, *Apol. pag.* 151. That [the reason of Christs anger was their hindring him in his design, not the knowledg they had of their present visible Title; this is but a dream.] To which I answer, 1. Mr. *T.* is as bold to speak of Christs thoughts without Book, and to search the Searcher of hearts, as if he were resolved to make Christs meaning be what he would have it. 2. What Design was it that Christ had in hand? Was it any other than the discovery of his mercy to the *species* of infants, and to those among others? and a presenting them as a Patern to his followers, and to teach his Church humility and renovation, and to leave them an assurance against Anabaptists, that it is his pleasure, that infants should not be kept from him."

Answ. 1. There was no such boldness in my speech as Mr. *B.* rashly, and like a calumniator chargeth me with, but such as must be granted true, if we conceive Christ to have acted as a rational being that propounds an end or design in his actings. 2. The last of the designs Mr. *B.* mentions, *assuring that it is his pleasure that infants should not be kept from him*; meaning by not baptizing

zing them, is his figment. His design I knew without searching Christs heart immediately by reading his facts, which shew his ends to be 1. the blessing those infants. 2. Teaching Doctrine concerning such. 3. Shewing himself thereby the great Prophet of his Church, and bestower of blessings.

3. Saith Mr. *B.* "How did the Disciples hinder Christs design? Not by hindring him immediately, but by rebuking those that brought the infants. 4. If this were no fault in them, why should Christ be displeased, and much displeased at it? And how could it be their fault to hinder people from bringing infants to Christ, if they might not know that they ought to be admitted? And could they know of Christs private intents and designs? Were there but this one consideration hence to be urged, I durst challenge Mr. *T.* to answer (as far as modesty would permit a challenge) that is, if Christ had intended onely that humility or docibleness should be commended from these infants as an Emblem to his Disciples, then it could be none of their fault to forbid bringing of them to Christ; for how could they know what use Christ would make of them? or by what Emblem he would teach them? or when he would do it? All the creatures in the world may be Emblems of some good; and must they therefore permit the bringing of all to Christ? Christ had not told them his design before hand to teach them by these Emblems; and when they knew his minde they desisted."

Answ. They might know Prophets did bless persons even little ones, they knew that *Matth.* 18. 2. Christ had before familiarly used a little childe, and so was not averse from them, they knew or might know that Christ was the great Prophet that was to come into the world, that he made it his work to do good, that he did permit all sorts of persons that came for healing or other blessings to come to him, and therefore it was their fault to hinder Christ in this design, and to hinder any that came to him for his blessing. I neither say that his design was onely to teach humility by these as an Emblem, nor that they knew or might know what use Christ would make of these infants. Mr. *Bs.* challenge is upon a mistake, as if I affirmed, that Christ would have those infants brought onely to teach humility by them, when the very words he cites are to the contrary. I am weary with answering such meer cavils of a

man, who if he were not set on wrangling, might by heeding my words answer himself.

5. Saith he, "If it had been onely for the present design, then Christ would have spoke but of those individual infants, and have said, Suffer those now to come: But it appears from the Text, 1. that it was not those individuals more than others that the Disciples were offended at, or disliked should be brought; but the *species*, or those infants because infants. 2. And that Christ doth not onely speak against their hindring those individuals, but the *species*, and lays them down a rule and command for the future as well as for the present that they should suffer little children to come to him, and not forbid them."

Answ. It is in all the Evangelists ἄφετε τὰ παιδία, which notes the children then brought, and no other, though I deny not but this fact and the reason thereof were a rule for the future as well as for the present, yet not either for the Apostles or any Successors to lay hands on them, or baptize them; but for them, if any more infants were thus brought to Christs person, that his own hands might be layd on them, that they should permit it.

6. Saith Mr. *B.* *And he doth not command this upon the reason of any private design, but because of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.*

Answ. Mr. *B.* still mistakes me, as if I had said [private design] that is a design proper to those infants onely; whereas my words were [present design] which I shew before what it was, and thereby it may be easily conceived I meant such a design as tended to shew his Office, readiness to do good, and interest that infants and such as were like them might have to the Kingdom of Heaven.

7. Saith he, "And where Mr. *T.* saith, It was not from any knowledg they had of their present visible title; I answer, Who said it was? Did Mr. *Blake*? No; but it was a thing the Disciples ought to have known, that infants are welcom to Christ, and that of such is the Kingdom, and therefore because of such is his Kingdom, they should not be kept from him? God will not be much displeased with men for being ignorant of that which they ought not to know."

Answ. Mr. *Blake* in his *Answer to my letter* had said *pag.* 90.

They

they (the infants brought to Christ) *had a present visible title such as the Apostles ought to have known*, and this he gives as the reason why Christ was so much displeased with the Disciples forbidding them to be brought. To which my words are rightly opposed. Nor is any thing put on Mr. *Blake* But his own words. If Mr. *B. will not say that Christs anger was from any knowleg the Apostles had of the infants present visible title*, then he must acknowleg the Apostles had no knowleg of the visible Church-membership of infants then, or visible title to one Church privilege which shews that in Christs Church no infants were then counted visible Church members, else these could not but know it. Nor is there any thing in the Text that shews that Christ was angry with them for not knowing this, nor did this teaching inform them in this, nor did Christ *admit them as* Mr. *Blake* saith, *to a Church privilege*, nor if it were true that the blessing were a Church privilege common to all Church-members, yet infants were as capable of baptism as of it, sith the institution of baptism is otherwise. To me it is a strong presumption that the Apostles understood not Christs words and deeds as importing Church privilege conferred on those infants which did infer a title to baptism, as Mr. *Blake* imagins, in that the Apostles did not baptize them, which is confessed by some pædobaptists, and appears both in that no such thing is enjoyned them by Christ, or related as done by them, and what was done to them is related as done by Christ himself who did not baptize *John* 4.2. and it is said *Matth.* 19.15. *when he had put his hands on them he departed thence*, and with him his Disciples, as appears by the speeches of them upon occasion of the yong mans conference with Christ, which presently followed. Now if the Apostles knew not such baptizability of infants there is no likelihood that Christs words or blessing proved such baptizability. If they did know it, and yet did them not right, no doubt Christ would have been more angry for their not baptizing them, then for rebuking those that brought them. And whereas Mr. *B. blesseth Christ for his discovery concerning infants* as he construes it, I bless God that hath shewed me the frivolousnes of Mr. *Bs.* arguings, and I say of such as are led away with such trifling reasons, as the Apostles sayd 1 *Cor* 14.38. *If any man be ignorant let him be ignorant*. As for his observation in the close

of

man, who if he were not set on wrangling, might by heeding my words answer himself.

5. Saith he, "If it had been onely for the present design, then Christ would have spoke but of those individual infants, and have said, Suffer those now to come: But it appears from the Text, 1. that it was not those individuals more than others that the Disciples were offended at, or disliked should be brought; but the *species*, or those infants because infants. 2. And that Christ doth not onely speak against their hindring those individuals, but the *species*, and lays them down a rule and command for the future as well as for the present that they should suffer little children to come to him, and not forbid them."

Answ. It is in all the Evangelists ἄφετε τὰ παιδία, which notes the children then brought, and no other, though I deny not but this fact and the reason thereof were a rule for the future as well as for the present, yet not either for the Apostles or any Successors to lay hands on them, or baptize them; but for them, if any more infants were thus brought to Christs person, that his own hands might be layd on them, that they should permit it.

6. Saith Mr. *B.* *And he doth not command this upon the reason of any private design, but because of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.*

Answ. Mr. *B.* still mistakes me, as if I had said [private design] that is a design proper to those infants onely; whereas my words were [present design] which I shew before what it was, and thereby it may be easily conceived I meant such a design as tended to shew his Office, readiness to do good, and interest that infants and such as were like them might have to the Kingdom of Heaven.

7. Saith he, "And where Mr. *T.* saith, It was not from any knowledg they had of their present visible title; I answer, Who said it was? Did Mr. *Blake*? No; but it was a thing the Disciples ought to have known, that infants are welcom to Christ, and that of such is the Kingdom, and therefore because of such is his Kingdom, they should not be kept from him? God will not be much displeased with men for being ignorant of that which they ought not to know."

Answ. Mr. *Blake* in his *Answer to my letter* had said *pag.* 90.

They

They (the infants brought to Christ) *had a present visible title such as the Apostles ought to have known*, and this he gives as the reason why Christ was so much displeased with the Disciples forbidding them to be brought. To which my words are rightly opposed. Nor is any thing put on Mr. *Blake* But his own words. If Mr. *B. will not say that Christs anger was from any knowleg the Apostles had of the infants present visible title*, then he must acknowleg the Apostles had no knowleg of the visible Church-membership of infants then, or visible title to one Church privilege which shews that in Christs Church no infants were then counted visible Church members, else these could not but know it. Nor is there any thing in the Text that shews that Christ was angry with them for not knowing this, nor did this teaching inform them in this, nor did Christ *admit them as* Mr. *Blake* saith, *to a Church privilege*, nor if it were true that the blessing were a Church privilege common to all Church-members, yet infants were as capable of baptism as of it, sith the institution of baptism is otherwise. To me it is a strong presumption that the Apostles understood not Christs words and deeds as importing Church privilege conferred on those infants which did infer a title to baptism, as Mr. *Blake* imagins, in that the Apostles did not baptize them, which is confessed by some pædobaptists, and appears both in that no such thing is enjoyned them by Christ, or related as done by them, and what was done to them is related as done by Christ himself who did not baptize *Joh.* 4.2. and it is said *Matth.* 19.15. *when he had put his hands on them he departed thence*, and with him his Disciples, as appears by the speeches of them upon occasion of the yong mans conference with Christ, which presently followed. Now if the Apostles knew not such baptizability of infants there is no likelihood that Christs words or blessing proved such baptizability. If they did know it, and yet did them not right, no doubt Christ would have been more angry for their not baptizing them, then for rebuking those that brought them. And whereas Mr. *B. blesseth Christ for his discovery concerning infants* as he construes it, I bless God that hath shewed me the frivolousnes of Mr. *Bs.* arguings, and I say of such as are led away with such trifling reasons, as the Apostles sayd 1 *Cor* 14.38. *If any man be ignorant let him be ignorant.* As for his observation in the close

of

of the chapter its like the reſt. For Chriſts *calling his Diſciples little children* and the *Apoſtles ſo calling Chriſtians* ſhews love and tenderneſs, but not that infants are viſible Church-members, no more then Chriſts calling the ſame his Lambs and ſheep, *John* 21.15,16,*&c.* ſhews that ſheep and Lambs are viſible Church-members. Thus much for anſwer of that chapter of M. *B.*

SECT. XVIII.

The 41. *Chapter of Mr.* Blakes Vindic. Fœd. *about Chriſts ſpeech of little children, Matth.*19.14. *is anſwered, and my ſayings in my* Poſtſcript *vindicated.*

MR. *Blake* ſince the publiſhing of my *Poſtſcript* to my *Apology* in reply to his *Anſwer to my letter* in his Book intituled *Vindic. fœd. c.*41,43. *ſect.*1. hath publiſhed ſomewhatthat is to be further examined. He ſaith, *They looked upon Chriſt (as it ſeems) as a great Prophet highly in favour with God, and ſuch were wont to bleſs in the name of God, and their bleſſing was highly prized, and hands were uſed to be impoſed on perſons in bleſſing,* Gen. 48.14. which I allow. He ſets down ſix poſitions, the firſt of which having confirmed, he ſpeaks thus of me. Mr. *T. brought his reaſons againſt this, to have nipt all in the bud, but thoſe he hath quit, and is brought to confeſs that he contradicted himſelf in them, and hath not a word to excuſe his falſe quotation out of Mark, concerning ſcandalizing, onely excuſing himſelf that he delivered himſelf doubtfully in them. Apol.*149.

Anſw. It is true I brought in my *Examen p.*146. *Piſcators* reaſons in his *Obſerv.*11. on *Matth.*19.14. to prove the little children *Matth.*19 13.14. *not to have been infants, but boyes who were capable of inſtruction,* which it is true I ſay in my *Apol p.*149. I did not ſtick to, nor need I ſith at firſt I ſaid *Examen pag.*145. onely, It is doubtfull whether theſe were infants or no. Nor is it truely ſaid by Mr. *Bl.* that *I excuſed my ſelf,* as if I had been in a fault. For it is true which I alleged, not onely *Piſcator* conceiving they were not infants, but *Eſtius* alſo *Annot. ad Marc.* 10.13. ſaying *it is not certain that they were infants which could*

neither

neither speak nor go. Which very doubtfulness doth weaken the argument thence for infant baptism, yet I had no reason to stick to that, there being other answers sufficient besides. Nor is it true which he saith, *that I am brought to confess I contradicted my self in the reasons brought*, and that they were my reasons, for I expressly said they were *Piscators* reasons, and therefore though *Piscator* should contradict my exposition of *Matth.*18.5. in those reasons I need not own it, much less do I confess that I contradict my self in them, as Mr. *Blake* falsely chargeth me as one that cares not what he prints so he may sully me with a black coal. Nor was any false quotation out of *Mark* used by me, I onely brought *Piscators* words *& de quali non scandalizando ibidem monet*, which if he misapplied to infants, and thereby crossed my interpretation of *Matth.*18.5,6. he opposed himself, though I think neither *Piscator* nor my self, were guilty of any self-contradiction, but Mr. *Bl.* of mistake and calumny. Mr. *Bl.* saith *he knows not that any in print hath maintained it that little children brought to Christ were diseased so as to have need of cure.* But there is now a Book in *folio* written by Mr. *Samuel Fisher* intituled *Baby baptism meer babism*, in which *p.*134: are these words, *that he should touch them, and put his hands on them and pray, no question 'twas in order to healing, for 'twas at a time when he healed many others, if you compare this passage as 'tis in Matth.*19. *with the first and second verses of the chapter: yea v.*15. *'tis plainly expressed what he did, i. e. he laid his hands upon them and departed thence; besides* Luke *says, they brought little children to him also that he should touch them: which* [*also*] *shews that others were brought too, as sick folks commonly were, because virtue went out of him, so that as many as touched him were made perfectly whole.* Nor do I think Mr. *Blakes* reasons sufficient to countervail the other: For though *the Disciples well knew that it was usual with Christ to cure those that laboured under infirmities of all ages*, yet they sometimes shewed their unwillingness to have persons trouble Christ about diseased persons as *Matth.*15.23. *Luke* 10.39. and whereas Mr. *Bl.* saith, *the Evangelist would never have concealed this reason and mentioned another.* if he mean it of the reason why the Disciples rebuked the bringers of the little children, the truth is the Evangelists men-

tion no reason at all of the Disciples rebuke, if he mean it of the reason why Christ would have them brought, such reason stands well with this, that the children were diseased, brought to Christ to be cured, and cured by Christ.

I had said, there is no certainty onely conjecture that they were the children of believers, Mr. *Bl.* sets down his third position thus, *These were infants of such parents that were in Covenant with God*, which he proves *Matth.* 19.2. & 15.24,26. *Rom.* 15. 8. *This farther appears by that which they requested for these infants: This* Mr. *T. seems to yeild; they came (saith he) to Christ upon the conceit that he was a Prophet, and so they might bring children to him to be blessed; And farther says, if this reason prove any thing, it is that the childrens parents were* Jews, *Apol. pag.* 150. *which is all that we contend for; the* Jews *as yet were in Covenant.*

Answ. 1. The reasons of Mr. *Bl.* some of them prove rather the bringers to be *Jews* than the parents. 2. The proving the parents to be *Jews* (if any do prove it) is not a proof that they were believers, for there were a great part, if not the greatest part by much of the *Jews* unbelievers, *John* 12.37,38. And what he sayes, *The* Jews *as yet were in Covenant*, if he mean it of all the *Jews*, and of the covenant of grace in Christ it is palpably false, contradictory to the Apostles determination *Rom.* 9.7,8. where it is expressly resolved that all the natural children of *Abraham* and *Israel* were not at any time children of the promise: If he mean it of any other covenant, or promise of God, or of some of the *Jews*, it would nothing avail him for his purpose, though his Proposition were granted him.

His fourth Proposition is thus expresst, "These infants themselves were in covenant, and stood in relation to Christ, bearing his name, and being of his people; and were not as Heathens in their present state without Christ, aliens from the Common-wealth of *Israel*, and strangers from the covenant of promise. This is evident by their free admission by Christ, and the reason by him given. When this was prest upon Mr. *T.* in solemn disputation, he took time to consider, and after more than two years in his *Examen*, we have an answer which shame will not suffer him to own. But in his Apology doth disclaim, yet not convinced by Mr. *M.* my self,

or

or any other it is enough with me, if the truth is confest, if the truth may have the honor, I am satisfied. "

Answ. Were I nor sufficiently acquainted with Mr. *Bls.* charges without cause, I should be jealous of my self that there is some thing done by me which might occasion this imputation. What was prest on me in the disputation in *London*, *Anno* 1643. and what time or for what reason I took time to answer after 10. years elapsed, I cannot trust in my memory to inform me. What answer I gave in my Examen which in my Apology I disclaim, and shame will not now suffer me to own, concerning this proposition of Mr. *Bl.* and its proof, it is such a riddle to me that I cannot yet tell how to understand it, except I have Mr. *Bls.* heifer to plough with. Sure I am, this kinde of crimination which Mr. *Bl.* useth, is very unsuitable to a clear and solid disputant thus by dark flirts, and quips to abuse me; But I think it best to slight his charge, presuming intelligent men will be little moved with it. As for his position, the terms being ambiguous, and especially the term [in covenant] being used (as I often complain) in such variety of senses or rather sometimes non-sense by Pædobaptists, that it seems to be used by them to elude rather than to inform, it may be either granted or denied as the terms are explained, and if this did occasion me to take time to answer it I did therein prudently, and if after two or ten years my answers be various they are so upon due considerations; For present I grant, those infants (if they were infants) mentioned *Matth.* 19.14. were in the covenant of saving grace, stood in relation to Christ as chosen in him, and in that respect bare his name as his bretheren, were of his invisible people, not as heathens in their present state without Christ being given to him, nor aliens from the Common-wealth of the *Israel* of God the invisible Church of the elect, nor strangers from the covenant of promise, that is, the covenant of promise commensurate with election of grace, and this I grant to be evident of those particular persons if not by their free admission to Christ, yet by the reason by him given, it being supposed that [τοιούτων, of such] is meant of them as well as of those that were like them in humility. But if the position be understood of being in covenant either by their own act of covenanting, or that which is called by Pædobaptists in their non-sense or proper gibberish the outward cove-

nant, or that it be meant that they stood in relation to Christ as visible members of the Christian church in their present state while they were infants, I deny it to be true, or that it is evident by their free admission by Christ, and the reason by him given.

Mr. *Bls.* fifth position is, *They were admitted upon a common right, equally belonging to all infants of covenanting parents, and not by virtue of any extraordinary privilege, peculiar to them, and not common to other. This is plain, saith he,* 1. *By the general admission which he gives to infants on this occasion; Suffer little children come to me, and* (*as Mr.* T. *more than once observes*) Extraordinarium non facit regulam communem, *here is a general Rule, all have admission, and therefore there is nothing extraordinary.* 2. *It was such a right that the Disciples of Christ ought to have understood, as plainly appears by Christs sore displeasure conceived against them, for forbidding their admission to him, and that must be a known right, and not secret.*

Answ. 1. There is not a word in the Text to prove that they were admitted upon any right to their admission as due to them, and which might be claimed for them, but they were admitted out of grace. 2. There is nothing in the Text to prove they were the children of covenanting parents, or that they were admitted out of any respect at all to their parents state, whatever it were. As for Mr. *Bls.* reasons. To the 1. I say, The words are a Command onely for those little children, ἄφετε τὰ παιδία, *Suffer the little children,* to wit them brought to come to me; nor doth it appear by any after instance of Christ or his Apostles that this was understood as a general rule, that all should have admission. 2. Were it granted that this rule of Christ did reach to others besides those then brought, yet there is nothing in the Text to prove this rule of admission to be onely of infants of covenanting parents or to these or any other by reason of right from their covenanting parents. Yea rather if any right be intimated it is the personal right of the infants, *for of such is the Kingdom of God.* 2. It is true, the Disciples of Christ ought to have understood they were to be admitted, But that this was the reason why they ought to know they were to be admitted because of their known right is imagined but not proved. And how or for what reasons they might know they were to be admitted is shewed above in answer to Mr. *B.*

Mr.

Mr. *Bl.* adds, Mr. *T.* *indeed says, They were not admitted out of any known right common to others, but a perculiar privilege as being elected, for which he quotes* Piscator; *when as he hath heard (and replies nothing) that* Piscator *syllogistically concludes the contrary.*

Answ. I said not, *they were admitted out of a peculiar privilege as being elected, nor for this did I quote Piscator*, and therefore in my animadversions in my *postscript* I made no reply to Mr. *Bl.* in this thing. My words in my *Examen pag.* 146, 147. were these. 4. Let it be granted they were the infants of believers and that it is said, of these is the Kingdom of God, it may be as *Piscator* observes referred not to their present estate, as if for the present they were in the Kingdom of God that is believers and justified; but that they were elect persons, and so in time of them should be the Kingdom of God: In which I do not at all assign the reason why the little children were to be admitted to come to Christ, nor do I quote *Piscator* for it, and therefore Mr. *Bl.* misrecites my words, but shew how it might be true that of those infants was the Kingdom of God, yet in their present estate they neither believers nor justified. Against which *Piscator* is so far from concluding syllogistically (as Mr. *Bl.* says) that disputing against the *Lutherans* affirming infants to be believers because of Christs words, *Matth.*19.14. in his Observe 11. out of that *v.* he sayth thus, *Deinde etsamsi ponatur, sermonem hic de infantibus esse: tamen non potest hinc certo concludi illos praditos esse fide. Etenim infantium potest esse regnum cœlorum, etiamsi non credant, dummodo sint electi:* which are the effect of my words. And for the rest that follows in Mr. *Bl.* *about Christs design, and the Disciples duty to know it, and their sin in being ignorant of it:* there is answer before in the answer to Mr. *B.* Nor is there a word in my writing that tends to this, that either they knew or were bound to know the election of those infants, or that Christ was angry with them for not knowing it: I have often said, it was either because they heeded not some particular intimation of his minde concerning those infants, or some general truth concerning Christs Office, and his readiness to do good to all sorts of persons, as there was opportunity offered, from which he ought not to be hindered by them. I do not *confess*, as Mr. *Bl.*

saith of me, *that elect infants might be baptized, were they known*: but that elect infants being actual believers, if they were known might be baptized, and therefore I need not fear Christs displeasure for not admitting elect infants to baptism, no not though they were known to be elect, except they were known to be believers, much less for not admitting to baptism those that are neither known to be elect nor believers; But Mr. *Bl.* hath just cause to fear the displeasure of Christ for admitting to baptism those that are neither known to be elect, nor believers, but infants of Parents who are manifestly *children of the Devil, covenant-breakers, &c.* according to his Doctrine in opposition to Mr. *Firmin Vindic. Fœd. cap.* 47. which is a higher degree of profanation of the Ordinance of Baptism, than many Pædobaptists fall into.

Mr. *Bls.* sixth Position is, "They are here admitted by our Saviour Christ to a Church-privilege. This appears *Numb.* 6. 22, 23, *&c.* to the end of the Chapter. The *Israel* of God are under the blessing, little ones are ordered to be received to this blessing, little ones therefore are of his *Israel*, *Deut.* 32. 9. These are the blessed of the Lord upon this account, *Jer.* 31. 23. children are within this number, they are the inheritage of the Lord, *Psal.* 127. 3. and consequently admitted by our Saviour Christ to this privilege of a blessing."

Answ. 1. Mr. *Bls.* Position is ambiguous, 1. It is uncertain whether he mean it of Christs laying on hands, or his prayer also, and blessing with it, which is the Church-privilege, 2. Whether he make it a privilege of the visible or invisible Church. 3. Whether he will have these to be a constant Church-privilege. 4. To whom he will have it a Church-privilege. 5. By whom it is to be done since Christs ascension, whether by Apostles onely, or Bishops, or Presbyters. All the proof he brings for blessing, as a Church-privilege, is the prayer of *Aaron* and his sons, for the whole congregation of the children of *Israel*, which how it proves Christs laying on of hands, and praying or blessing of a few little children, (when Christ was neither *Aaron* nor any of his sons) to be a Church-privilege, such as was *Aaron* and his sons blessing, which belonged to the Levitical Priesthood, I see not. Mr. *Bls.* arguing is like as if his wits went a wool-gathering. *This*, saith he, *appears Numb.* 6. 22, 23, *&c.* What is that which he saith appears?

pears? It should be his sixth Position, *They are here admitted by our Saviour Christ to a Church-privilege*: but his conclusion is, *Little ones therefore are of his Israel*; and this is proved by a syllogism that is either faulty in that there are four terms, or else it is in the second figure of all Affirmatives. If it be said that Mr. *Bl.* infers from that and the rest his Position, neither is that true: for his conclusion is this, *and consequently admitted by our Saviour Christ to this privilege of a blessing*; which though not denied by me, yet is neither his sixth Position, nor any thing in the Texts he brings proves it, which are all impertinently alleged by him, and the last especially, which he seems to understand, as if they were said to be the heritage of the Lord, as if they were the Lords peculiar possession, whereas the meaning is *Psalm* 127. 3. that children are such a blessing to parents, that they are an heritage given by the Lord; as *Ainsworth* rightly expounds it; and so an house-privilege rather than a Church-privilege is there meant, as the words following shew.

Mr. *Bl.* had said, *pag.* 91. *of his answer to my Letter, there is no direct precedent for baptism in particular, but for Church-privileges of which infants are capable*, on which I inferred, if [*but*] be adversative, (which must be granted if Mr. *Bl.* speaks sense) then Mr. *Bl.* grants that infants are capable of Church-privileges, not of baptism. To this Mr. *Bl.* replies, 1. *that I make a great triumph of his speech.* 2. *That I leave out that which would fully explain his meaning.* 3. *That his meaning is, this act of Christ is no direct precept for baptism, but of Church-priledges in general.* 4. *If I can make it good that baptism is no Church-privilege I have wrested this Argument out of his hand, and that this Text as to the Argument fails, otherwise it is of force and an undeniable consequence.*

Answ. 1. I said truly, that grant which Mr. *Bl.* words (if he understand himself) implies, overthrows all his dispute, and is a triumph (if it be to be so called) on a victory. 2. I left out nothing which being put in would have hindered the inference I make: but Mr. *Bl.* as if he were ashamed of his own words, leaves out in his explication the words [*of which infants are capable*] from whence I made my inference. 3. His own explication makes the matter worse. For, 1. if this act of Christ be a direct

precept

precept of Church-privileges in general, then it is of baptism in particular, being a Church-privilege, that which is said of the *Genus* being true (as Logicians say) of the *species*, *Quicquid prædicatur de genere prædicatur de specie*. Whence it follows Mr. *Bl.* speaks inconsistencies. 2. It follows also, that if it be a direct precept for to admit infants to Church-privileges in general, then it is to admit them to the Lords Supper, to Ordination, for these are Church-privileges. If he mean no more than this, that they are to be admitted to prayer for them, and that is the Church-privilege he means, I should grant it, and accordingly when desired I do both publish the names, days of infants birth, and pray for them. 4. What he would gather from hence, *by necessary consequence I wrest out of his hands*, I think easily, without gratifying *Socinians*, *Antibaptists*, (who if they *triumph over Antipædobaptists, and beat them down with their own weapons in the parts where Mr.* Bl. *lives*, the more shame for them, who betray by their unskilfulness so good a cause) with this, *that baptism is no Church-privilege*. His Arguments are thus formed, *cap.* 43. *sect.* 1. *They which are admitted to Church-privileges have right to baptism, the leading privilege; but infants are admitted to Church-privileges, Mark* 10. 14. *Matth.* 19. 14. *Luke* 18. 16. *Infants therefore have right to baptism.*

To which I answer, if he mean by [*Church-privileges*] any other than prayer, and the laying of hands on them by Christ; I deny the *minor*; if he meant it of them I deny the *major*. And whereas he makes *baptism the leading Church-privilege*, I grant it is so in order to the Lords Supper, yet to be among the catechized, commended to God in prayer, may be antecedent Church-privileges to baptism.

His other Argument is this, *The children of the Kingdom, that with others make up the Kingdom of God, have right to baptism; but infants are the children of the Kingdom that with others make up the Kingdom of God, Mark* 10. 14. *Matth.* 19. 14. *Luke* 18. 16. *Infants therefore have right to baptism.*

To which I answer, The phrase [*Children of the Kingdom*] I finde diversly used, (*Matth.* 8. 12. it is appropriated to the *Jews*, and it is spoken of them which *shall be cast out into utter darkness*. But *Matth.* 13. 38. it is meant of the elect, who shall be

saved.

ſaved. In the former ſenſe the *major* is manifeſtly falſe, and the *minor* can be onely true of *Jews* infants: in the later ſenſe the *major* Propoſition is true of children of the Kingdom who are viſibly ſuch by their profeſſion of faith in Chriſt; and the *minor* is falſe; if it be meant of ſuch as are inviſibly children of the Kingdom, the *major* is denied, and the *minor* is granted.

Mr. *Bl.* adds ſomewhat more about the meaning of the words of Chriſt, [*of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven*] And firſt he ſaith, *The particle* [*ſuch*] *cannot here have reference to their qualification, that thoſe that were qualified as theſe* (*in humility and meekneſs*) *had their intereſt; ſo are Sheep and Doves as well as infants, not proud nor revengefull.*

Anſw. This reaſon is not of force to prove that [*ſuch*] cannot here have reference to the qualification of meekneſs and humility. For being ſo expounded [ſuch] notes others than the infants, to wit, men that are humble and meek poſitively, as infants are negatively, and this cannot be ſayd of Doves or ſheep, yet infants may be included as *Beza* doth *Annot: in Matth.*19.14. *talium τοιούτων, id eſt, horum & ſimilium, ut ſupra.*18. which is plainly proved by our Lord Chriſts own words *Mark* 10.15. where [*of ſuch v.*14.] is [*whoſoever receiveth the Kingdom of God as a little childe v.*15.] and ſo it is meant *Matth.*18.5.as I have proved above. Nor is Mr.*Bls.* reaſoning of force, *That which the Diſciples took to be an impediment of force to hinder infants, and a juſt ground of thoſe that brought them, is that which Chriſt underſtands in this reproof of the Diſciples and admiſſion of their infants*; But *it was their want of growth, their littleneſs, which the Diſciples took to be a juſt impedinent, and which occaſioned their reproof, Ergo.* For the concluſion may be granted, yet this proves not that by [*of ſuch*] is meant in reſpect of quantity onely, not of quality, but onely that in the words before [*ſuffer little children to come to me*] quantity is meant not quality, for in thoſe words onely is *the reproof of the Diſciples, and Chriſts admiſſion of infants.* The other are a reaſon of his command, which is good if by [*ſuch*] be meant likeneſs in quality as well as agreement in quantity. And for Mr. *Bls.* paraphraſe, it is but his own conceit, *that the little children had no need of cure, or that the Diſciples* rebuke was after his model. But enough of this before.

Mr. *Bl.* excepts against me for saying, the Kingdom of Heaven is meant of the Kingdom of glory, and that on this hinge the answer to the whole argument turns. He saith, *I had six exceptions against the orthodox interpretation of this scripture in my* Examen, *being hunted out of all the rest I think to finde some shelter there.* But this is his figment, for though I of mine own accord expressed some onely as doubtfull, and let pass others for more ample conviction of the invalidity of the vain arguing, called falsely *Orthodox interpretation of this Text* by pædobaptists, yet I did not so much as relinquish one of the exceptions, much less have been hunted from them, as Mr. *Bl.* after his pedantique fashion talks. But in opposition to me he first saith, *That all hangs not on this, appears, in that our Saviour had said enough in his order for admission of these infants on which we can build our conclusion.* And then brings his argument, which being answered before there is no need of any more reply to this. Yet I add, that of the argument drawn by Mr. *Bl. pag.*91. of his *answer to my letter none that are interessed in the Church of Christ which is his Kingdom may be denied an admission to it by baptism, but infants have their interests in the Church of Christ which is his Kingdom, and therefore may not be denied admission by baptism*; the hinge did turn on this point, that by the Kingdom of Heaven is meant the visible Church, into which he would have infants admitted by baptism; and my speech is true of that Argument.

Mr. *Blake* adds, "Secondly, for his Reasons there is not force in them, 1. Saith he, The kingdom of God must be understood *Mark* 10.14. as it is *v.*15. and *Luke* 18.16. as *v.*17. and *Matth.*19.14. as it is in both those; This I prove, because our Saviour from their estate infers a likeness to them in others for the same estate, *Apol. pag.*150. This Argument howsoever it carries more colour than usually is found in Mr. *T.* his Reason, yet it is not conclusive. It may be taken more largely in Christs argumentation, and in a more restrained sense in his words of instruction and application, as in a place much parallel I shall shew, 1 *Cor.*6 1,2. There we have the Apostles reproof, *v.*1. and his Reason, *v.*2. as in the Evangelists we have Christs assertion confirming his reproof, *v.* 14. and his application, *v.*15. Now [Saint] in the Apostles reproof is taken

taken more largely than it is taken in his Reason: A visible Saint is meant in the first place, a real and glorified Saint in the second; visible Saints may judg in small matters, for real Saints in glory shall judg the world, shall judg Angels; and so it may be here, infants have their present title to the visible Kingdom; and men qualified as infants, shall onely enter the Kingdom of Glory.

Answ. I see Mr. *Bl.* so pertinacious in what he hath said in this argument, that he is *cedere nescius*, he knows not how to yeild to any thing against his dictates, though it be never so plain. He denies not *Mark* 10.15. *Luke* 18.17. must be understood of the Kingdom of glory for the reason given by me in my *Postscript* The proposition being false, being understood of the visible Church; many proud persons entering therein, as *Simon Magus*, *Diotrephes*, *&c.* But denies it to be conclusive, and therefore must deny the *major*. But he answers nothing to the proof of it, because our Saviour from their estate infers a likeness to them in others for the same estate. Whence the argument ariseth. The same estate is meant *Mark* 10.14. which is mean *v.*15. This is proved from the inference of Christ which is, as *of little children is the kingdom of God, so whosoever doth not receive the Kingdom of God as a little childe shall not enter into* [αὐτὴν, *it*] or the same estate, the relative particle plainly notes it to be the same. But the estate *Mark* 10.15. is meant of the Kingdom of glory, which is proved, because otherwise the proposition were false: nor is it denied by Mr. *Bl.* therefore the argument is most plainly concluisve. Mr. *Bls.* answer is either upon a wilfull or heedeless mistake of my argument as if it were onely from the identity of the words in both verses, whereas it was taken from the sameness of estate gathered by the force of our Saviours whether application of *v.*15. as Mr. *Bl.* terms it, or inference from what he had said *v.*14. and the relative [αὐτὴν, *it.*] I deny not that it is frequent according to the figure in Rhetorick termed *antanaclasis* to use terms sometimes in the same verse elegantly in a different sense: but it cannot be so here for the reasons given. And yet Mr. *Bls.* instance 1 *Cor.* 6.1,2. is not right. For 1 *Cor.*6.2. the term [*Saint*] doth not note *a glorified Saint*. For the sense is this, *know ye not these* now despised *Saints shall hereafter judg the world*, and so though it be true that then they shall be glorified, yet the term [*Saints*] is

attributed to them according to their present estate of debasement, in which the very *Emphasis* is put. Besides if it had been so that in the one *v.* it noted a visible Saint here, and in the other a glorified Saint hereafter, yet the same persons were meant in both verses; whereas if *Mark* 10.14. were meant the visible Church, who are a number of persons, and *v.*15. were meant an estate of glory, there would be a greater difference than in 1 *Cor.* 6.1,2. and therefore Mr. *Bl.* doth not rightly say, the one place is much parallel to the other.

Mr. *Bl.* goes on. *His second reason, that Christ directs his speech to the Disciples already in the visible Church, and therefore speaks not of the Church visible, I know not how to make up into a reason; if I understood it, I would either yeild or answer it.*

Answ. The reason is thus formed. The same is meant *Mark* 10.14. which is meant *v.*15. as is before proved. But by [*the Kingdom of God*] *v.*15. is not meant the visible Church, *Ergo*, neither *v.*14. The *minor* is thus proved. By [*the Kingdom of God*] is meant that estate into which the Apostles had not but were thereafter to enter into. For the speech is meant of them as well as others, and directed to them, *Verily I say to you*, and so where the same thing is sayd *Matth.*18.3. it is sayd to and of them, *Except ye be converted and become as little children ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of the Heavens.* But the estate the Apostles were to enter into was not the visible Church, for that they had entered into already, but the Kingdom of glory. Therefore by [*the Kingdom of God Mark* 10.14.] *is meant the Kingdom of glory.*

Mr. *Bl.* adds, *The third reason, that the speech Mark* 10.15. *Luke* 18.17. *is like Matth.*18.3,4. *but there it is meant of the Kingdom of glory*; Ergo, *so here, is answered already. If Mark* 10.15. *Luke* 18.17. *be like Matth.*18.3,4. *yet Mark* 10.14. *Luke* 18.16. *which we have in question is unlike Matth.*18. 3.4.

Answ. 1. If *Mark* 10.15. be like *Matth.*18.3,4. then also *Mark* 10.14. is in like manner understood *the Kingdom of Heaven, as Matth.*18.3,4. For it is understood of the same *Mark* 10.14,15. as is proved before. 2. Mr. *B.* conceived them

them like by putting them together in the chapter before answered, and the New *Annot.* and *Diodati*, whose Testimonies are alleged in my *Postscript. pag.*151.

Mr. *Bl.* adds, *Thirdly, were it granted him, that the Kingdom of glory must be understood both in Christs reason and application, yet he is nothing holpen. Infants have right to the Church visible militant, because they are in a capacity of entrance into the Church triumphant, Acts* 2 47. *The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved; not necessarily saved, but now (having entered Covenant with God) they were in a capacity, and therefore added as visible Church-members. Infants standing in this capacity ought to have admission likewise.*

Answ. It helps me much to answer the arguments drawn from *Matth.*19.14. for infants visible Church-membership, if by *the* [*Kingdom of Heaven*] be not meant the visible Church, For then it is not there affirmed, that infants are visible Church-members. Nor doth Mr. *Bls.* reserve regain the loss, to prove it by consequence, For his speech is not true, *Infants have right* (meaning of admission) *to the visible Church, because they are in a capacity of entrance into the Church triumphant.* Nor is it proved *Acts* 2.47. where Mr. *Bl.* perverts the meaning of the term τὺς σωζομένους, *which is in English* [*the saved*] that is either [*the saved from that crooked generation v.*40. by their effectual *calling as* 2 *Tim.* 1.9. *Tit.* 3.5.] or by an enallage of tense [*such as should be saved*] and that certainly or necessarily] as 2 *Cor.* 2.15. not as Mr. *Bl. they were in a capacity to be saved,* (for so were those that were not called) *and therefore added as visible Church-members.* Nor is Mr. *Bls.* proposition gathered thence: for neither is there any thing in the words to prove that then all were added to the Church which should be saved, much less which were in a capacity to be saved, or on the contrary that all that were added to the Church should be saved: much less that their right to be added to the Church was from this, that they should be saved; It is said, *the Lord added to the Church such as should be saved,* it is not said the Apostles added them to the Church because they were to be saved, yea *v.*41. it is said, that even of those that were to be saved, *they gladly received the word;* and then were *baptized and added.* So that if the Text be rightly looked into there is

nothing to be gathered thence of the persons right to be added to the Church, or the Ministers duty to add to the Church by baptism, persons meerly upon this consideration, that they shall be saved, but onely that it is the course of Gods providence to add to his Church such as shall be saved. I yet add that if Mr. *Bls.* proposition were granted him, *they have a right to the Church-visible militant who shall be of the Church triumphant*, yet this right cannot be claimed but by those who are elect, and therefore from these Scriptures so expounded *Matth.* 19. 14. *Acts* 2. 47. it cannot be proved that any other than elect infants are to be baptized and to be added to the Church, not the natural children of true believers, who are many of them non-elect; nor can a Minister gather thence, he ought to baptize any of them till he know they are elect, and shall be saved, and therefore they rashly and profanely baptize from hence them, that they have no knowledg of, that of them is the Kingdom of glory and that they shall be saved.

SECT. XIX.

Animadversions *on Mr.* Cobbets Just Vindic. part. 1. cap. 5. *and the arguings of Dr.* Homes, *Mr.* Bailee, *Mr.* Fuller, *Mr.* Sidenham, *from the words and actions of Christ to little ones are answered.*

HAving answered Mr. *B.* Mr. *Bl.* my two eager Antagonists I shall add animadversions on Mr. *Thomas Cobbet his Just Vindic. part.* 1. *ch.* 4. *sect.* 1. 1. He says without proof *that they that brought the infants mentioned Luke* 18. 15. *were pious minded parents.* 2. He denies [*of such is the kingdom of God*] *to be meant of the Kingdom of glory*, the contrary whereof is proved in the next section before against Mr. *Blake*. 3. He supposeth, *that these words* [*suffer little children to come to me*] *being granted to contain a rule of suffering little ones of that sort such as those are to come to him and the words* [*of such is the Kingdom of God*] *being expounded of the invisible Church it must be conceived that Christ must direct them to suffer*

members

members of the invisible Church to come to him, and then that they may be known. But this is his mistake; they that expound thus the words [suffer these little children and other little children in age if any hereafter be brought to my person to be touched, to come to me, and forbid them not as ye have don these. For however they are persons that are not fit to be my hearers; yet of these now brought and of some other infants which may be brought, and men of years like them in quality is the Kingdom of God, the invisible Church or the Kingdom of glory belongs to them] may avouch this exposition without supposing their election must come under the cognizance of men, nor need they say that onely such who were elected, were, by this rule so expounded to be permitted, to come to Christ. 4. *That Christ spake of those infants not as an extraordinary inspired Prophet* is said without proof; nor is it likely, sith such blessings were never given but by extraordinary inspiration, and Christ appoints not the admitting of little children to any, no not to his Apostles, but himself. 5. *That he delivered an ordinary rule of ordinary practise and use afterwards* is said without proof; nor is it likely, sith we reade no more of that practise by any of the Apostles, nor any rule concerning it after this one act of Christ.

Sect. 2. He denies that [of such is the Kingdom of Heaven might be spoken in reference to the future, that is that they were elect ones, and should in time be of Gods Kingdom, that is believers, or that they were such as God would bless. For Christs words are not, of such may, will or shall be the Kingdom of God, nor that they were of his Kingdom, because such as he would bless: but rather that they should not be hindered from being blessed of him, because of such is the Kingdom of God.

To which I answer: that by [*the Kingdom of Heaven Mat.* 19. 14. *and the Kingdom of God Mark* 10.14,15. *Luke* 18.16,17.] must needs be meant the Kingdom of glory is proved before, & then the sense can be no other than *of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*, that is the Kingdom of glory belongs to such, as *Mat.* 5.3,10. and as *ἐστὶ*, doth oft signifie as *Mark* 9.14, *&c.* And then it must needs be an *enallage of tense, as Mat.* 18.1. *as Piscat. on Mat.* 18.1. *est pro futurus est enallage temporis, or as Piscat. on Matth.* 5.3. *ipsis destinatum est & dabitur*, and this is all one as to say they

are

are elect, which is *Piscators* term in his *observation on Matth.* 19. 14. as I shewed above in answer to Mr. *Blake*, and thus [*of such is the kingdom of God*] refers to the present estate as elect, to their future as possessours of glory hereafter. And so to Mr. *Cobbet's* objection I answer, *Matth.* 5. 10. it is not said, theirs shall be the Kingdom of Heaven, but [*is*] and yet it must be understood of present title and future possession, so here. And for his exception at my words, that the reason may be given why these infants did belong to Gods Kingdom, because they were such as Christ would bless, is not avoided by saying, *they were blessed, because of Gods Kingdom.* For both ways the reason is good, they should not be hindered from blessing, because theirs was the Kingdom of Heaven the end of blessing, or they should not be hindered from blessing because he intended to bless them, and therefore theirs was the Kingdom of Heaven. Either way that I intended to prove *Examen pag.* 147. is evinced, that the reason why theirs was the Kingdom of Heaven is not from their parents faith (which should have been if it were meant, as Pædobaptists would, of interest in the visible Church) but Gods election or Christs blessing.

I have often said, that if Christs minde had been that infants should be baptized, he would have commanded these little ones to have been baptized for an Example. To this Mr. *Cobbet* answers, *that according to our principles they were elect, heirs of the kingdom of glory: now why should not or were not these infants at least baptized?*

Answ. Because though elect, yet were not believers or Disciples by profession.

But *You would allow*, saith he, *such to be baptized if of grown years.*

Answ. No, untill they were believers or Disciples, not barely because elect and heirs of glory.

But *You say*, saith he, *that if by extraordinary revelation you knew an infant to be sanctified, you would baptize it, because the extraordinary revelation would authorize it, and the words of* Peter, *Acts* 10. 47. *and the institution, Matth.* 28. 19. *And then it would follow,* 1. *That persons may be Disciples without being outwardly taught.* 2. *It is agreeable to the rule that persons without personal profession of faith should be baptized. Albeit*

extra-

extraordinary things done besides rule cross not ordinary rule; yet neither extraordinarily nor ordinarily is any thing to be done, which is in it self contrary to rule. 3. It was the minde of Christ they should be baptized, as that they should be instructed, though it be not expressed.

Answ. 1. It is true I grant in my *Examen*, p. 142, 158, 160. upon the grounds mentioned, that an infant regenerated, united to Christ, sanctified by the Spirit upon extraordinary revelation of this might be baptized; and the like is said by Mr. *Blackwood Apostolical Bapt.* p. 51. *And for those that have the thing signified let them make it appear to any Church of Christ, and they cannot deny their baptism.* But yet it follows not that these infants might be baptized which are mentioned *Matth.* 19. 14. For though their election be mentioned, yet not their regeneration and sanctification. Now *Prædestinatio nil ponit in prædestinato*, and therefore it makes not Disciples or believers at present, but assures it as future: but we are to baptize actual Disciples and believers, not future.

But *However*, saith he, *they may be Disciples who are are not outwardly taught.*

Answ. Who denies it? yet they must be learners of Christ in their own persons.

But then, saith he, *a person may be baptized without personal profession.*

Answ. It is granted, when God supplies the absence of it by his revelation otherwise: nor is this contrary to the Rule, sith that is, to baptise known Disciples, who are ordinarily known by their personal profession, though in this case Gods extraordinary act supplies that want. Yet Mr. *Cobbets* saying is not right, *that neither extraordinarily nor ordinarily is any thing to be done, which is in it self contrary to rule.* For *Abrahams* killing his son was in it self contrary to rule, yet upon extraordinary command it was to be done. And for the third, though it might be conceived Christs minde, that the children should be instructed, though it be not mentioned, *Luke* 18. 16, 17. because it was a duty of perpetual equity by virtue of the moral Law: yet baptising infants being a meer positive rite, that hath no reason or warrant but institution, is not to be conceived Christs minde, without some declaration,

which he neither then when he had so fit opportunity, nor at any time else expressed.

There are some more things in Mr. *Cobbet* censurable, as *that he makes the infants paterns as well of receiving the kingdom at least externally, as of the affection and disposition with which it is to be received*; whereas, 1. the words *Matth.* 18. 3, 4. do plainly make them paterns onely of humility, and such good dispositions as are in children fit to be imitated. 2. In Mr. *Cobbets* sense the words of Christ would be false, [*whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little childe externally by an initial seal or some other visible sign, as laying on hands, &c. shall not enter therein.*] For then that Popish Doctrine, or rather more rigid than Popish must be maintained, that no unbaptized Martyr or other shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven. And in like manner it is *gratis dictum*, without proof sayd [*of such like infants, like them in covenant, and Church interest in God is his kingdom,*] there being not a word in the Text that leads to this paraphrase, and the plain meaning is before expressed.

That which Mr. *Cobbet* sayth in answer to the reason of *Pistator*, *Why they were not infants because Christ called them*; I conceive is not an answer. For what he sayth, *that things ascribed to the children are rather to be understood of parents, and he instanceth in* Levi's *paying Tyths in* Abraham, *Heb.* 7. is not right. For, 1. that which is sayd of *Levi* is to be understood of *Levi*, not of *Abraham*; for it were neither good sense nor to his purpose, to say, *Abraham* payd Tyths in *Abraham*. 2. If things done by a parent and related by the Holy Ghost as mysterious passages are imputed to the children, yet it is absurd to understand in an historical narration of facts that to be meant as spoken to the parents, which was spoken to the children. Other things I let pass, which oppose not my dispute but others: and what things he speaks in answer to my Objections, and what concerns the answering the imaginary absurdities arising from our Doctrine in that chapter, I refer to another place. This is sufficient in answer to what he sayth in opposition to me about that passage *Luke* 18. 16, 17.

Dr. *Homes* in his *Animad. on my Exercit. pag.* 57, 58. argues thus, *To whom indefinitely as such, Heaven and the blessing of and*

for

for Heaven belongs, to them as such the seal of conveyance, and confirmation of Heaven and that blessing belongs. For if the Land be mine the Deeds and Seals of Conveyance are mine. But Heaven and the blessing of and for Heaven belongs indefinitely to such little children, more, whiles little children; so the Text here expresly. To them belong, or (which is all one) of such is the kingdom of Heaven, and he took them in his arms and blessed them. Therefore to little children indefinitely belongs the Seal of Conveyance or Confirmation of Heaven, and the blessing of Heaven, which in the New Testament, according to the time Christ spake, is baptism.

Answ. Neither is it true, That *baptism is the seal of conveyance of heaven, and the blessing for it*, that I finde in Scripture, but the Spirit, *Ephes.*4.30. *Ephes.* 1.13. 2 *Cor.*1.22. Nor is it true, *That heaven and the blessing of heaven belong to little children indefinitely as such*, that is as little children. For then it should belong to all little children, nor to them as children of believing parents, for it should belong to all children of believing parents, but as they are elect. And to these I grant baptism belongs when they are called, and believe, not before; as a conveyance may be made to a childe, yet he is not to have it in his hands till he come to understand it, and is fit to make use of it. So that the *major* may be denied if [*the belonging of the seal*] be meant in respect of present use or possession. And the *minor* is to be denied, if [*as such*] be meant [as little children, or children of believers] and the inference on the conclusion is denied, *the seal belongs to them*, Ergo, *baptism*. Other arguments of Dr. *Homes* are answered in my *Apology pag.*102. though briefly yet sufficiently. Nor hath Mr. *Geree* in his *Vindiciæ Vindiciarum ch.*10. brought any thing worth rejoyning in reply to my answer to his fixth argument in my *Apology pag.*101,102. It is false which he saith, *in admitting to ordinances we proceed not upon judgment of certainty but charity*, nor is a judgment of charity grounded upon hope of what a person may be, any rule to us in admitting to baptism, For if so, then hope of a profane persons amendment were enough to baptize him. Mr. *Baillie's* reasoning in his *Anabaptism pag.*149. [*since imposition of hands a seal of Christs grace and blessing, and of the Kingdom of Heaven belonged to*

infants; that therefore baptisme a seal of that same kinde, when once the Lord had solemnely at his ascension appointed it to be the ordinary seal of initiation into his Church ought not to be denied to them] is but dictates. 1. He says, *baptisme is a seal of the same kinde with Christs laying on hands*, which he saith without proof, nor is it true. For. 1. Christs laying on hands was an act extraordinary done by Christ himself as the great Prophet, but baptism was an act of ordinary ministration not done by Christ himself but *his Disciples*, *John* 4.1,2. 2. Baptism was the duty of the baptized, *Acts* 2.38. not onely the baptizers, but not so laying on hands by Christ. 3. If *baptisme be a seal of the same kinde with laying on of hands*, then laying on hands is a seal, and a Sacrament of the same kind with baptism, which is counted a point of Popery. 2. To shift off the objection, that Christ appointed not those infants to be baptized, he allegeth *that Christ did after solemnly appoint it at his ascension, and since then it ought to be done*: which intimates that infants were not to be baptized before, but after the ascension. But, 1. The appointment and practise of baptism was before, if not as solemn, and the same use and order of it, and therefore this reason is of no force why others should be baptized after, more than these before the ascension. 2. It will follow that *Jews* infants were not to be baptized till after the ascension of Christ, which overthrows his and other Pædobaptists argument about the seal and Covenant, which if of any validity, prove infant baptism as well before the ascension as after. 3. It is false, that Christ at his ascension appointed infant baptism any more than before, the commission of Christ and the Apostles practise shew the contrary. Therefore I deny his argment in the words set down as being without proof or shew of it. Mr. *Thomas Fuller* in his *Infants advocate ch.*18 hath these words St. *John addeth ch.*21.21. *And there are also many other things which Jesus did which are not written, amongst which for ought appears to the contrary, the baptizing of these infants might be one of them*; wherein he runs to the Popish plea for their unwritten traditions, and forgets that besides what I have alleged before to shew those infants were not baptized, there appears something to the contrary out of *John* 4.1,2. where it is said, that Jesus baptized not, but his Disciples,

and

and therefore the baptizing of those Infants could not be one of the things which Jesus did though not written *John* 21.21. His argument, they were capable of a blessing, therefore of baptism; hath been often denied and answered before. There came to my hands also the *Exercitation* of Mr. *Cuthbert Sidenham*, in which *ch.* 10. he terms Antipædobaptism *denying infants with scorn a little water*, and after, *this Text Matth.* 19.13,14. *if there were no more, will fly in the consciences one day of the most confident contemners of infants, and their baptism.* To which I say, it shews too much youthfull rashness unfit for *a Teacher of a Church either* to call Antipædobaptists *contemners of infants, and their baptism*, and their denying infants baptism (which they do for ought he knows out of tender conscience of not profaning Christs ordinance) an act, *of scorn*, and to speak of the *Texts flying in their consciences*, who know that he had more reason to expect the flying of this Text in his conscience, who in this (as he doth in the rest of his pamphlet) makes the objection against his urging it for infant baptism so as that he might put it off with a slight answer, For whereas Antipædobaptists object, if Christ hinted their right to baptism, why did he neither baptize them, nor appoint them to be baptized by his Apostles? Mr. *Sidenham* leaves out the later part of the objection, and answers. 1. *He baptizeth none.* 2. *He did that which was an ordinance usually, in those primitive times, administred after baptism and equal to it in dignity, and so we may argue from this to baptism either inclusively or* à majori *from the greater, he did such acts to them as are equivalent if not supereminent.* But doth Mr. *Sidenham* indeed think such petty arguings, which he knows not how to form in a Logick way, but in pathetick Rhetorick, likely to terrify our consciences so much, when he himself dares not positively assert, that the laying on of Christs hands did include and presuppose baptism, yea he acknowledgeth it to have been extraordinary; and for his way of proving *à majori*, he either is ignorant in Logick or else might understand, that an argument *à majori* is not thus; there is conferred on such a one a greater thing, therefore the less; Christs blessing therefore right to baptism; For then the argument were good, Christ blesse the infants which is the greater, therefore he gave them the Lords supper, or made them Apostles, or gave them

the gift of tongues, which are the less. But an argument *à majori* is *à magis probabili*, and so it is not more probable that Christ would have them baptized, than that he would bless them, sith they were not meet subjects of the one as of the other. There is nothing else in that chapter but what hath answer before, this is enough to abate the insolency of this Scribler.

SECT. XX.

The practice of infant-baptism is not proved Acts 16.15. *by baptizing a household against Mr.* M. *Dr.* Homes, *Mr.* Bailee, *Mr.* Cook, *Mr.* Sidenham, *Mr.* Fuller.

ANother Text to prove the practise of infant baptism is *Acts* 16.15. and the mention of baptizing households elsewhere. From whence Mr. *M.* in his (*Sermon pag.*40. (though the *Assembly* leave it out *Confess. of faith ch.*18. *art.*4.) would gather *examples of the new administration taking place just as the old, and so the practise of infant baptism by good consequence.* To which I answered in my *Examen* at large, *pag.*138. *&c.* 1. That the new administration is much different from the old, to wit, baptism from Circumcision. 2. That the practise of baptism in all the Evangelists is set down of singular persons. 3. That the practise in the *Acts* of the Apostles is differently set down, sometimes of singular persons sometimes of a City, sometimes of families. 4. Where households are said to be baptized there is no mention of an infant and the circumstances with other places do shew that *Luke* doth understand onely the believers of the house. What Mr. *M.* replied hereto doth yeild so much as shews there is no good consequence in this Argument. Households were baptized, therefore infants, sith he saith, *It may be granted that a house is sometimes taken for the grown persons in that house.* And what else he speaks that is to the point is briefly answered in my *Apology pag.*100. And in my *Postscript sect.*19. I have sufficiently answered Mr. *Blake* his arguing *from households being the precedent of baptizing*, and what he saith *vind. sed. pag* 416. is answered before in this part of the *Review sect.*6.

Dr.

Dr. *Homes* in his *Animadv.* on my *Exercit. ch.8. pag.71.* tels us *that the* Syriak *in the story Acts* 16.33. *renders it, he was baptized and all the childern of his house, and sure enough a son of eight days old is a son. And if sons of the house then some sons of the Father of the house.* But he might consider that the same *Syriak* renders *v.*32. *they spake the word with him, and with all the sons of his house,* which cannot be said of infants. Nor is it true that the Doctor saith, *that the sons of the house are the sons of the Father of the house.* For as *Tremelius* in his *note* sayth, *it is an* Hebraism, *in which the son of the house is all one with the inhabitants in the house,* servants as well as childien. As for the evasion which the Doctor and M. *Cook* in his *Face uncovered, pag.*18. have, that it is said [*all that were in his house, v.*32. *not,* of his house] so that the word might be spoken to the prisoners and others which ran in on the fame of the thing, and then *he and his were baptized, v.*33. it is. 1. Without ground and unlikely, that the prisoners should be reckoned in his house when the prison is named distinctly from his house, as *v.*30. & 34. compared shew, and he took such care about securing the prisoners *v.*28,29. and then *brought* Paul *and* Silas *out, v.*30. afore he spake to them or they to him about salvation, nor is it likely that into the house of the Jaylour could others get or would attempt it at that time of night. 2. Were it granted yet it no whit avoyds the objection, which is, that either there were no infants in the house, or else they spake the word to them, which were absurd. But saith, the Doctor, *they spake the word to the infants, because they should be the better for it, v.*31. To which I reply, this reason is most gross it being contrary to all use of writers and *Grammar* construction to say he spake the word to infants, to whom he directed not his speech at all, onely because the speech might be for their good. Besides he spake the word to all in his house as he spake to the Jaylour, it was the same speaking and Preaching to the one and the other, and therefore if infants be there meant, the Apostle is made as ridiculously to Preach to infants, as *Francis* the Frier is by the *Popish* Legend to Preach to a brute. Besides the same *Syriak* renders *v.*34. *he exulted, and all of his household in the faith of God,* and *Tremellius* hath this marginal note, *to a word sons of the house as a little before.* As for what

Dr.

Dr. *Homes* with Mr. *Cook* adds about rendering παντοι, *all over his house*, and rendering ηγαλλιάσατο, *he did skip as in a dance of a Galliar with triumph*, they are such as having no other approved interpreter for their author, nor indeed agreeing with the gravity and seriousness of the business and the Jaylors condition, are justly rejected as meer shifts to avoyd the plain evidence from that and many more places in my *Examen pag.*139,140. (which Mr. *M.* yeilded) *that under the term* [*household*] *persons of years onely are meant by Luke.* As for what Mr. *Baillee* in his *Anabaptism pag.*146. tels us, *that infants are not excepted*; I answer, that infants are plainly excepted from being meant in those speeches, if the things spoken of the household cannot be said of infants. But then, saith he, *they will be excepted from salvation if they be not comprised under the term* [*house*] *saith Luke* 19.9. *salvation is said to come to the house, and Acts* 11.14. Cornelius *and all his house should be saved by* Peters *words, and Acts* 16.31. *upon the Jaylours faith he and his house should be saved.* I answer Though infants be not in those passages comprised among the saved, yet it follows not by this interpretation that there is no other Tex. out of which we may conclude their salvation. And therefore all his inferences of wrong to infants as excluding them from salvation. because they are not included in the term [household] are but calumniatory And his other inferences shall be shewed to be vain in answering Mr. *B.* As for Mr. *William Cooks* collections from *Luke* 19.9. *Acts* 16.31. in his *Font uncovered, pag.*18.19. *They require faith of the Jaylour, that he and his family might be admitted into a saving estate. They said not that every one of his family must of necessity actually believe and profess, that so his household might be saved with him. So* (*as he did with* Zacheus) *God shews here by his servants that he would deal with the Jaylour, not standing for the present on strict terms of actual faith of all in his house, If the Governour believe, it is enough to put the whole family into a saving estate inchoatively at least in respect of admission into Covenant, neither are any to be excluded, but such as by stubborn refusal of the Gospel offered deprive themselves of that privilege,* I except against them 1. That he makes one sort of salvation to the believers, and another to his house in the same words and by the same means.

2. That

2. That he imagines a salvation inchoative that shall not be consummate. 3. That he makes a member of a family to have right to this salvation by the faith and profession of the head of the family, if they do not express their dissent or refusal of it. 4. That God at some time stands not on strict terms of actual faith of all in a house for salvation. All which are gross conceits and contrary to *Mark* 16.16. *John* 3.17,18, *&c.* In vain likewise doth Mr. *Cuthbert Sidenham* in his *Exercit. c.*11. infer from these passages of saving and baptizing houses, and instances in the old Testament of family Churches, as if *God had cast by an eternal decree this platform, baptism to be administred to families, and so to children.* And why not then to servants, and wives, and friends? Are not they of the household? And why doth not Mr. *Sidenham* take the whole nation into a Church, when the whole nation was taken in formerly in *Abrahams* posterity? Why doth he gather his Church with such choice distinguishing some from others? How doth Mr. *Sidenham* cross himself when he interprets *Luke* 19.9. *the Covenant is not made with him onely but with his house that is his seed,* where he appropriates the term [*house*] to seed, and in the next page makes the term *house a general phrase, which may sometimes comprehend more,* and will have [*all his, Acts* 16.33.] *to note no servants, which cannot be meant of servants, who are our own as goods and lands are, but not of a man: but must firstly and primarily refer to his children who are begotten of him; and it may be secondarily to his kinred.* In which his strange shiftings may be discerned, sometimes the term [*house*] must note the whole family of which servants and wives are a part, sometimes it must mean the seed, and then straightway it must be *a general word comprehending more,* and then οἰκὸς, must be meant *not servants for they are a mans own but not of a man,* and yet *kinred secondarily* must be meant, though they be not any more, no nor so much *of a man* as servants. But if we ask Mr. *Thomas Fuller* in his *Infants Advocate c.*16. he will tell us, *For the Jaylor; That children (if he had any) were comprised under the expression of all his, is sufficiently known by Satans interpretation,* Job 1.12. *of Gods Commission, Behold, all that he hath is in thy power; and Gods consenting thereunto, when permitting him by vertue thereof, to destroy all* Jobs *children;*

concerning which passage I say. 1. If [*all his*, *Acts* 16.33.] must be expounded as *Job* 1.12. *all that is his*, then must the Jaylours sheep, and oxen be baptized as well as his children, for they were comprehended under [*all that he had*] 2. Though *Jobs* children were comprehended under [*all that he had*] yet there was never an one an infant: but such as *did feast, and might curse God in their hearts.* As for Dr. *Homes* his question, *Is any Anabaptist sure there were no infants in these families?* I say, 1. It belongs to him to prove, who brings it for infant-baptism, that there were, and that they were baptized. 2. Yet we are sure from the words none were meant but persons capable of hearing, and believers under the term [*house*, *Acts* 16.32,34.] Yea, but sayth Mr. *Sidenham*, *Those in his house are a larger term, but when he speaks of the baptized he sayth all his or of him*; But how doth it appear that [*all in his house*] is larger than [*all his*] or what can he gather from it but this, that he spake to more than he baptized; but will Mr. *Sidenham* say, he baptized any to whom he spake not? Yea, that a man may see with what raw conceits these Scriblers abuse people, who reade such ind gested Pamphlets with examination. His own observation excludes infants. For if [*all that were in his house*] *be the largest term*, then it comprehends [*all his*, *v.*33.] But it notes no infant: For he spake not the word to any infant. Therefore by his own observation infants are excluded. But enough of the janglings of these wrangling Baby-sprinklers about this Text.

SECT. XXI.

That 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. *proves not the practice of infant-baptism against Mr.* Bailee, *Mr.* Cobbet, *&c.*

THere is another Text which is by Mr. *Cobbet*, Mr. *Bailee*, Dr. *Homes*, Mr. *Philips*, and others produced for the practice of infant-baptism, and it is 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. Mr. *Bailee* in his *Anabaptism*, *pag.*149. argues thus, *Infants were baptized as well as their Parents by* Moses *baptism*, Ergo, *Infants as well as their Parents ought to be baptized by Christs baptism.*

ptiſm. *The Antecedent is the Apoſtles,* 1 *Cor.* 10.1,2. *The Fathers baptized in the Cloud, and in the Sea, were the whole People as well young as old; for no doubt the infants went as well through the Cloud and the Sea as their Parents.*

Anſw. 1. The Antecedent may be denied, becauſe it is ſayd [our Fathers] not infants. But ſayth Mr. *Cobbet, This is ſpoken of the Church Fathers to* Paul *and the Gentile Church-members, and the young ones were in after ages inſtruments to convey Church-truths and bleſſings.*

Refut. 1. It is not ſayd *our Fathers* as we are a Church, none but *Abraham* that I know is termed a Father to the Church of Chriſt, he being onely named *the Father of the faithfull,* and they *his ſeed:* but either [*our Fathers*] notes ſimply the Anceſtors that went before, as it is uſual to call thoſe our forefathers who were before us in former generations, though they begat us not; or elſe if it note their fathers in reſpect of natural generation, it notes as *Grotius* in his *Annot in locum, the Fathers of us,* to wit, *Hebrews.* But it may be ſayd, that cannot be, ſith *Paul* onely was an *Hebrew,* and then it ſhould be my Fathers.

Refut. 1. It is not unuſual to ſpeak of perſons in the ſecond perſon by figure of Communication or Enallage of perſons, when the thing is not true of them but our ſelves, and when the thing is not true of us but others; as when we ſay, we have preached, it is meant of one perſon that ſpeaks, and 1 *Theſſ.* 4.17. it is ſayd, [*we which are alive, and remain*] and yet none of thoſe that wrote were ſuch, and ſo [*our Fathers*] is no more than the Fathers. 2. But there's no need of a figure: For the Epiſtle was written by *Paul* and *Soſthenes,* 1 *Cor.* 1.1. And for *Paul* there's no queſtion he was an *Hebrew,* and *Soſthenes being a Ruler of the Synagogue, Acts* 18.17. And in like manner *Criſpus, v.*8. and *Apollo, v.*24. whom he mentions 1 *Cor.* 1.14. & 4.6. were *Hebrews,* and therefore he ſaying, [*our Fathers*] might well mean our Fathers as *Hebrews.* 2. It doth appear the infants were not meant in that they are onely meant, who were in a ſtate of pleaſing or diſpleaſing God, as appears by *v.*5. but ſo were not infants. 3. They onely are ſayd to be baptized to whom the ſame thing was ſignified by the cloud, that is, ſignified by our baptiſm; but to the infants nothing was ſignified by the cloud and ſea, and paſſing

through or under them, for they were not subjects of instruction, capable to know a resemblance, *Ergo*, infants were not baptized. But sayth Mr. *Bailee*, *They went through the Sea*, Ergo, *they were baptized.*

Answ. So did the beasts also, and yet are not sayd to have been baptized, but those that did or might understand the signification of it. 4. They that are sayd *to be baptized*, *v.* 2. are all sayd *to eat and drink Manna and Water*, and that it was or might have been to them *spiritual meat or drink*, *v.* 3. 4. But this is not to be said of their infants. For as Dr. *Homes* and Mr. *Cobbet* grant, *the infants did not eat Manna cakes*, nor is it likely they did drink water, having breast milk, much less is it true that they were *spiritual meat or drink* to them, or might have been, *Ergo*, they are not meant by the Fathers baptized.

Nor is Mr. *Bailees* consequence good. For if the infants might be sayd to be baptized with *Moses* baptism, yet it follows not they are to be baptized with Christs, sith *Moses* his baptism was not formal baptism, but similitudinary after a sort, they were baptized, that is, as *Grotius Annot in locum quasi baptizati, as if they had been baptized*; but a Rule holds not from similitudinary to formal baptism. But Mr. *Bailee* would prove the consequence thus, *The Reasons which may be brought for the exclusion of infants from being baptized with their Parents by Christs baptism, militate as much against their being baptized with their Parents by* Moses *baptism. Therefore if nowithstanding they were admitted to the one baptism, they may as well be admitted to the other.*

Answ. The antecedent of this proof is false; for in that of *Moses*, the baptism is onely similitudinary in respect of a fact or event, which was no duty: but formal baptism of Christ is a duty of the person baptized, *Mark* 16.16. *Acts* 2 38. & 22.16. which cannot agree to an infant though the other should. Nor is such kinde of shadowy, typical, analogical, similitudinary baptism any more a rule about Christian baptism than *Noahs* Ark, which had the like resemblance, 1 *Pet.* 3.21. And this Reason is confirmed from the Text. For if by [*Fathers*] are meant infants, *v.* 2. and they were baptized, and this must be a rule to us now about baptism of water appointed by Christ, which was sayd of

the

het ſimilitudinary baptiſm, then ſith the ſame are meant by [*Fathers, v.*3,4.] and they are ſayd *to eat the ſame ſpiritual meat and drink*, which was *Chriſt*, which is manifeſtly meant of the Lords Supper, by the ſame reaſon which Mr. *Bailee* brings, infants muſt not be excluded from the Lords Supper. Yea, but ſaith Dr. Homes, *They did not eat all the Lords Supper.*

Refut. They did all eat the ſame ſpiritual meat, and drink the ſame ſpiritual drink, which if he deny to be meant of the Lords Supper he deſerts Proteſtants and other Divines acknowledging it, and may be refuted from the ſcope of the Apoſtle, which is, to ſhew that they had in a ſort, in reſpect of ſignification and uſe the ſame Sacraments with ours, and yet were not ſecured thereby when they ſinned. But Mr. *Cobbet* ſays, *There muſt be a* Synecdoche *in the later, not all the Fathers ſimply being meant, but ſuch as were capable of making a ſpiritual uſe thereof.*

Refut. If [*all our Fathers*] muſt be meant Synecdochically, *v.*3,4. then alſo in *v.*2. it being the ſame term in either, and the *ſenſe of them, v.*5. being meant of as many, *v.*3 4 as *v.*2. Yea, but *there's a bar put againſt infants receiving the Lords Supper*, 1 *Cor.*11.28.

Refut. There are more bars, and more expreſs put againſt infants baptiſm, *Acts* 8.37. *Matth.* 28.19. *Mark* 16.16. *Acts* 2. 38. *Epheſ.*4.5 *&c.* which it ſeems Pædobaptiſts will leap over, or break down, notwithſtanding they are ſo plainly ſet up by Chriſt and his Apoſtles to prevent their infant-baptiſm.

That which Mr. *Ainſworth* in his *Dialogue* brings out of *Pſalm* 77.17. *to prove that the* Iſraelites *were indeed formally baptized with water*, is upon miſtake, that the water there poured out was on the *Iſraelites*, whereas his own *Annotations* on the places, and the words of the *Pſalm* refer it to what was done to the *Egyptians*, *Exod.*14.24,25. And thus *Junius* and others conceive it. Yet were it granted him, there muſt be a *Synecdoche* in the term [*all the Fathers*] for the reaſons given, and otherwiſe beaſts as well as infants muſt be ſayd to be baptized.

SECT. XXII.

Mr. Blakes *Argument from Gal.*4.29. *is answered.*

MR. *Blake* had in his *Birth-privilege*, *pag.*9. argued from *Gal* 4.29. for infant-baptism, and his passages in his arguing I censured as very gross in my *Examen*, *part.*3. *sect.* 2. which he seeks to make good *Answer to my Letter*, *cap.*4. to which I reply in my *Postscript sect.* Yet he hath thought good to reinforce his allegation of that Text, and in his *Vindic. Fœd. cap.*43. *sect.*1. he argues thus. *Fourthly, They that by birth according to the flesh are in the bosom of the Church have right to baptism; but infants by birth according to the flesh are in the bosom of the Church, Gal.*4.29. *Infants therefore ought to be baptized.*

To which I answer, if he mean by [*the Church*] the Church Christian visible, and by [*being in the bosom of it*] having actual visible Church membership, I grant the *major*, and deny the *minor*, and for the Text *Gal.*4 29. alleged to prove it, am no more induced by Mr. *Bls.* arguings to believe that it makes to his purpose, than I am to think the Snow is black. For if it were to his purpose, the words ὅπω χ᾽νῦν, should have this sense, even so now infants by virtue of birth according to the flesh, as being the children of a believer by natural generation, are visible members in the Christian Church, *v. g.* of *Galatia*, which is as far from the meaning of the Apostle as East from West, if either I or those Interpreters I meet with have not lost their common sense. This I prove from the true supplement which must make up the words complete sense. This will be understood by considering, that the whole verse is a compound proposition of that sort which Logicians call comparative, as 1 *Cor.* 15.22. The terms ἀλλ᾽ ὥσπερ ὅπω χ᾽ do shew it to be a comparative proposition, and therein are two parts, the first called the *Protasis*, then *he that was born after the flesh, persecuted him that was born after the Spirit*, that is (for I think Mr. *Bl.* will not gainsay this exposition) *Ishmael* who was born after the flesh being the son of *Hagar* the bond-woman, persecuted (whether by mocking or by some crafty undermining device, (as *Heinsius* conceives) *Isaac* who was born after the Spirit, *by Divine virtue* according

cording to the promise, as *Grotius* I conceive rightly explains it. The other part is called the *Apodosis* or *rendering*, wherein that which answers to the forepart first held out is expressed, now that always notes some agreement, correspondence, parity or likeness whether in quantity, quality, action &c. But according to Mr. *Bls.* *apodosis* or reddition, there is no such answerableness, or likeness as hath the shew of a comparison of things equal or alike (as this is as the affirmative terms shew) For who would conceive any better then nonsence in such a speech as this, even as *Ishmael* persecuted *Isaac*, so the children of Christian believers are visible members in the Christian Church, it were all one as to say even as *Esau* hated *Jacob* so godly men are heirs of Heaven, or have access to God, the absurdity of which is so gross that I am amazed Mr. *Bl.* doth not see it or will not confess it, there being no likeness, or shew of answerablenes either in the compared subjects or in the compared predicates. Not in the subjects. For in the forepart the term, he that was born after the flesh, is taken in the worser part, as a term importing debasement, bondage, a curse, but in Mr. *Bls.* own expression *Vindic. fœd. ch* 40. the term [*he that is born after the flesh*] *notes in the better part a natural seed that inherits outward privilges* yea and that no small one to be *a visible Church-member by vertue of birth after the flesh.* And then in the predicates there is less answerablenes. For what answerablenes between persecuting him that was born after the Spirit who resembles the true believer, and having right to outward privileges as visible Church-membership and baptism by being born of a believer according to the flesh by natural generation, and this competent to infants? But the supplement is this. Even so now the *Jew* who is carnal seeking righteousness by observing the Law, and not through the Spirit waiting for the hope of the righteousness which is by faith, now persecuteth by words and deeds the Christian believer whether *Jew* or Gentile, who is born after the Spirit, that is who *by the Spirit doth wait for the hope of the righteousness which is by faith Gal.* 5. 5. This supplement is cleared to be genuine from the scope and *series* of the Apostles Doctrine before, and deductions after, and the constant exposition of interpreters. The Apostles Doctrine before is to dissuade the *Galatian* Christians from affecting to be under the Law, *v.* 21. as the false

teach-

teachers endeavoured to perſwade them. And to that end he teacheth them the allegory of *Hagar* and *Sarah*, and their children; *Hagar* and *Sarah* repreſent two Covenants, the one of the Law, the other of Righteouſneſs by Faith; and the Children repreſent the one the Juſticiaries that ſeek Righteouſneſs by the Works of the Law, and are tenacious of that Covenant, the other believers in Chriſt, who ſeek Righteouſneſs by Faith in him, and ſtick to the new Covenant of Grace, in which is promiſed *the Juſt ſhall live by Faith*. The former Covenant is a Covenant of Bondage, and the Children thereof are in bondage with their Mother, that is, they are not to inherit the promiſe of Righteouſneſs; but the later Covenant is free, and her Children are free-born heirs of Righteouſneſs. And though the former Covenant had many Children while the *Jewiſh* Church ſtood, the greateſt part reſting in the Law, and expecting their righteouſneſs in obſerving it, yet the new Covenant that was as barren, having none or very few that were born of it, there being but few that looked for redemption by the *Meſſiah* or the conſolation of *Iſrael*, but followed the Phariſes Doctrine, of conceiving themſelves righteous by keeping the Law, now, being made known to all Nations by preaching the Goſpel, hath many more children than the old, innumerable believers of the Gentiles as well as the *Jews*, embracing the Doctrine of the Goſpel concerning righteouſneſs by faith: and of this ſort *are we*, ſayth the Apoſtle, *v.* 28. But it happens to us as of old, as *Iſhmael* perſecuted *Iſaac*, ſo now the carnal *Jews* who are Juſticiaries perſecute us who are believers. And then follow deductions, one that it is Gods ſentence to reject Juſticiaries, as not heirs of righteouſneſs, *v.* 30. Another, the aſſerting the eſtate of believers to be a ſtate of freedom, *v* 31. and hereupon exhorts *cap.* 5. 1. that they ſhould *ſtand faſt in their liberty wherein Chriſt hath made them free, and not be again intangled with the yoke of bondage*, to wit, the Law and legal Covenant. And that the conſtant expoſition of Interpreters is for the ſenſe according to the ſupplement made by me, and not according to Mr. *Bls.* conceit, may appear by alleging ſome of their words, *Hieronym. Comment. in Epiſt. ad Galat. lib.* 2. *cap.* 4. thus paraphraſeth the words, *Sicut ergo tum major frater Iſhmael lactentem adhuc & parvulum perſequebatur Iſaac, ſibi circumciſionis prærogativam, ſibi primogenita vendi-*

cans:

cans: ita & nunc secundum carnem Israel, adversus minorem fratrem de gentibus populum Christianum, sustollitur, inflatur, erigitur. Consideremus insaniam Judaorum: qui & Dominum interfecere, & Prophetas & Apostolos persecuti sunt: & adversantur voluntati Dei: & videbimus multo majores persecutiones, quas nos, etiam historia docent, à Judaeis in Christianos quàm à gentibus concitatas. Chrysost. Ἑρμην: εἰς τὴν πρὸς Γαλ: ἔπις: καὶ πίσα αὕτη ἐλευθερία. εἶποι τὶς ἄν, ὅταν οἱ μὲν ἰουδαῖοι κατέχωσι καὶ μαστίζωσι τὺς πιστεύσαντας, οἱ δὲ δοκοῦντες ἐλευθεροὶ εἶναι διώκωνται; ταῦτα γὰρ πάντε συνέβαινε, τῶν πιστῶν διωκομένων. ἀλλὰ μηδὶ τῦτο ὑμᾶς θορυβείτω, φησὶ: καὶ γὰρ καὶ τῦτο προέλαβεν ἐν τῷ τύπῳ. ὁ γὰρ Ἰσαὰκ ἐλεύθερος ὢν ὑπὸ τῦ δούλυ Ἰσμαὴλ ἐδιώκετο. διὸ καὶ ἐπάγει λέγων. Ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τότε ὁ κατὰ σάρκα γεννηθεὶς ἐδίωκε τὸν κατὰ πνεῦμα, οὕτω καὶ νῦν: Gorran. [*Ita & nunc.*] *illi scilicet qui secundum carnem vivunt ut Judaei & haeretici persequuntur eos qui secundum spiritum scilicet Christianos & omnes bonos. Perkins com.* upon *Galat.* 4.29. These words are an answer to an objection, on this manner. *We are hated of the* Jews, *and therefore we are not the children of promise. The answer is twofold, one in this verse thus, No marvel, this is the old fashion; it was thus in* Abrahams *family. For* Ishmael (*born after the flesh*) *persecuted* Isaac (*born after the Spirit:*) *and so it is at this day. Pareus Comment. in Gen.* 21.12: *Illusio Ismaelis adversus fratrem significat, filios carnis persecutionem intentare filiis promissionis. Piscator schol. in locum. Ita & nunc carnalis Israel spiritualem persequitur. Grot.* οὕτω καὶ νῦν] *Sic & nunc Judaei illis ritibus addicti quos vultis imitari, maximo odio prosequuntur Christianos. Diodati. Annot. ad Gal.* 4.29. *But as*] *this singular privilege hath a condition joyned unto it like unto that which happened unto* Isaac *who was scorned by* Ishmael, *Gen.* 21.9. *that is to say, that all Christians are likewise persecuted by the* Jews. *Dicson. Cum enim in Abrahami familia is qui naturae vi ordinariâ tantùm genitus est, persequutus est eum, qui divinitus & spirituali ratione est genitus; Quid mirum, si idem nunc usu veniat nobis? Trapp. Com. on the place. Even so it is now*] *And so also it is now, may we say at this day. For what do Papists persecute us for else, but because we reject their justification by works?* which being determined I infer that Mr. *Bls.* arguing includes many absurdities. 1. That when it is

 sayd,

sayd, *Even so it is now*, and the term [*they that are born after the flesh*] is to be supplied, he by [*being born after the flesh*] means *Birth by natural generation of infants born of Christian Parents*, in which are many gross absurdities. 1. That he understands this sayd of infants, which must then be sayd to persecute. 2. That he takes [*being born after the flesh*] in the later part to note *natural birth*: but that is clean besides the Apostles meaning, who considers persons born after the flesh, not as born by humane members and seed, but as born by a fleshly covenant. Otherwise it should import no Allegory contrary to the Apostles speech, *v.* 24. which tels us these things are an Allegory, that is, do speak or declare some other thing than the narration according to the Grammar-sense imports, and that is, to be born according to the fleshly covenant, that is, to imbrace the Doctrine of that covenant. 3. That [*to be born after the flesh*] should import birth of *Abraham* as a believer, and so natural generation of each childe of a believer in that respect, but then [*to be born after the flesh*] would be common to *Isaac* with *Ishmael*, to him that is born after the spirit, of the free woman, by promise, with him that is born after the flesh of the bond woman; for to be born of *Abraham* or a believer agrees also to *Isaac*, to him that is born after the spirit, of the free woman, by promise; whereas to be born after the flesh is taken in a sense from which *Isaac* and we, that is, *Paul* and other Christian believers are excluded. For he infers *v.* 31. *Therefore brethren, we are not the children of the bond woman*, which is all one with this, *We are not born after the flesh*, as it is expressed, *v.* 23. whence it is apparent that [*being born after the flesh*] doth onely import the birth of the bond woman, generation by *Abraham* being not considered in this thing. 4. Mr. *Bl.* doth quite pervert the Apostles intent in taking to be born after the flesh to import *an honour, and that it implies two things*: 1. *A birth of nature, a childe by lineal descent of such a father.* 2. *Outward Prerogatives that accompany such a birth*, as his words are *Vindic. Fœd. cap.* 40. whereas the Apostle mentions birth after the flesh as a debasement, takes it in the worser part, not as importing a descent from the father, but from the mother, and that mother a bond woman, and therefore the children servants or bond slaves by reason of their being born after the flesh.

I will

I will use the words of *Cameron* in his *Conference* with *Tilenus*, *Die Dominica April* 26. 1620. *sect.* 18. *Contrà verò Ismael etsi patre libero attamen matre serva natus est, porrò partus ventrem sequitur, nascendi ergo conditione servus fuit: tales scilicet sunt, qui Deo cultum exhibent servilem Justiciarii:* where he explains the Apostles words, *Gal.* 4.

Against this Mr. *Bl.* excepts *Vindic. Fœd. cap.* 40. "1. That I make the Apostles parallel to look at the Allegory, and not at the History; when the Text makes it plain that the Apostle looks at the History, *then* and *now* are both Adverbs of time, and relate to *Ishmaels* jears in person, not to the malignity of men of the covenant of works against those of the covenant of grace: Here he is wholly silent, and answers in his *Apology* nothing at all."

Answ. I conceived in answering the second I had answered this exception. But I now answer particularly. I conceived he meant by the history those words *v.* 22. 23. and the forepart of the 29. *v.* *As then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit.* And by the parallel he meant the later part of the 29. *v.* And the allegory to be that which answers to *Ishmael*, to wit, to seek righteousness by the Law, and to *Isaac*, to wit, to seek righteousness by faith: which may be seen in *Bezas* and *Piscators Diagrams*, *where Beza* and *Piscator* make *Ishmael* συστοιχεῖν, *to answer, or to be in the same rank as the type with the Justitiaries that seek righteousness by the Law, which answers to* Hagar, *whose generation is after the flesh, that is, justification is by works, and are cast out of the family of God, excluded from the inheritance of life as* Ishmael *from* Abrahams, *and* Isaac *to answer to believers by virtue of the Covenant of the Gospel answering to* Sara, *whose birth is after the Spirit, that is, whose justification is by faith, and so are in* Abrahams *house and heirs of eternal life.* Now it is true I do make the history to be in the forepart of the 29. *v.* and the mystery or allegory in the later: not but that I acknowledg there is a history in both parts of the verse, as the Adverbs *then* and *now* shew. But it is not the same history in the later part of the verse which is in the former. For then there should be nothing allegorized, yea there would be a meer tautology, if as Mr. *Bl.* speaks, *then and now both adverbs of time relate to* Ishmaels *jears in person*, then the speech of the

Apostle is inept or rather false. For then it should be [As *Ishmael* in person then jeered *Isaac*, so now *Ishmael* in person jeers *Isaac*] which is I say still a gross absurdity. But the later part contains another history of what was done in the Apostles time, where in the terms [*born after the flesh and after the spirit*] are allgorized, and applied to other sorts of persons, and the term [*now*] relates the malignity of men of the covenant of works against those of the covenant of grace, as hath been fully proved before against Mr. *Blake*.

2. "M. *Bl.* excepted, that I shut out the literal sense both from the history and parallel, and bring in an allegorical sense in both, when the contrary is evident in the Text, for though *Ishmael* be a Type of one under the covenant of works, yet that *Ishmael* himself was a Justiciary, or that he sought righteousness that way, and persecuted *Isaac* under any such notion, as a man for Gospel-righteousness, Scripture hath no word, or so much as any colour."

Answ. This exception is the same in effect with the former, and in answering this the former was answered in my *Postscript*, *sect.* 5. and now this is answered by answering the former, yet I finde a necessity to add something by reason of Mr. *Bls.* unreasonable importunity. I take notice that *Ishmael* is confessed to be *a type of one under the covenant of works*, and whether he were himself a Justiciary is not material, though sure there is some colour for it. But this seems to be Mr. *Bls.* minde that in the parallel, *Gal.* 4. 29. there's no allegorical sense, because *Ishmael* himself was not a Justitiary: which reason rests on this conceit, that neither in the forepart nor the later part of *v.* 29. by [*he that was born after the flesh*] is meant any other than *Ishmael himself or in person*, which how it makes the Apostles speech tautological or false is shewed before.

Mr. *Bl.* goes on, "To this he answers, he shuts not out the literal sense from the History but from the parallel, and that is so far from being contrary to the Text, that it is expressly sayd, These things are ἀλληγορούμενα, an Allegory: I desire the Reader to take notice, what kinde of interpretation Mr. *T.* will put on this Text, and who will have him pass for an eminent Scripture interpreter? (when Mr. *B.* is a man in his high censure defective in it) *Then*

and

and *now* are both Adverbs of time, and we must have a literal then and a mystical now, one of them to answer the History and the other the Allegory; if my interpretation be thus gross, I desire the Reader to disclaim it; either the History must be wholly looked at in the parallel, or else the Allegory, there is that harmony between the Apostles *then* and *now* that will not admit such divorce and separation."

Answ. What I sayd of Mr. *Bs.* interpretations of Scripture in my *Præcursor*, *sect.* 3. appears by this writing to be right, and will appear more hereafter. Did he measure himself *suo modulo ac pede*, he would be more cautelous than he is in expounding Scripture, and if he did take warning by my words the Church of God would have cause to thank me for them, however he or Mr. *Bl.* take them. I am sorry that the Reader and my self are troubled about such flirtings rather than arguings, which Mr. *Bl.* here and elsewhere useth, which sure do ill become him, who should at the years he is now of rather weigh things than lightly pass over them with satyrical quips instead of arguments. He may take notice that I make no *mystical Now*, *Gal.* 4. 29. but in both parts the Adverbs of time are literal, and yet the terms [*he that is born after the flesh*, and *he that is born after the spirit*] are without any absurdity meant allegorically, as I have both sayd and demonstrated.

3. Sayth Mr. *Bl.* "I have told him, that he makes two contradistinct *species* of birth, that both cannot be incident to one man, no more than a man be a brute beast, or a brute beast a-bird; when it is plain that here is not a distribution of a *genus* into several *species*, but a distribution of a subject according to its several adjuncts, of which I give several instances."

Answ. I sayd in my *Postscript*, that I not onely make birth after the flesh and after the spirit contradistinct but also contrary. Contradistinct *species* may be incident to the same person, the same man may be long and broad, just and temperate, but not contrary, as white and black, just and unjust; [*Birth*] distributed into birth after the flesh and after the spirit must needs be a *genus*, or an equivocal term, it cannot be any subject either *quod* or *quo*, it being neither substance, quantity nor quality, but either act on or passion, action as from the mother, passion as in the person born.

Now actions though they are capable of various modifications, yet I do not think any Logicians call them subjects, or their several modifications adjuncts: but the substance whose action or passion it is, is the subject both of the action and passion, and their degrees and modifications, and these are adjuncts of that substance.

Mr. *Bl.* adds of me, "He is pleased to deny that it is a distribution of the subject according to its adjuncts, and gives in the thing in dispute for a reason. Then the same person (he says) would be born after the spirit and after the flesh."

Answ. I give in this reason I confess: but I did not think this was in dispute, but out of all dispute, the Apostle making them two sons born of two mothers, *v.* 22. two several ways, *v.* 23. born to two several estates, *v.* 24, 25, 30. the one persecuting the other, and all these diversities are in the persons which are Types, and in their Antitypes; and the Apostle thence inferreth, that the one are not the other, *v.* 31. whence it follows, that birth after the flesh and spirit are not adjuncts of the same subject, but contrary attributes of several subjects.

Mr. *Bl.* proceeds. "Presently he confesseth that *Isaac* was born after the flesh in the two senses I mention. And I am sure Mr. *T.* will not deny that *Isaac* was born after the Spirit, and then either truth is very absurd, or else Mr. *T.* hath quit me from absurdity; but then he says, It is untrue in the Apostles sense, for then he should be the childe of the bond-mayd, not by promise, a persecutor to be cast out, not to inherit. To which I answer, that my sense is the Apostles sense, and Mr. *T.* his sense far from it: For though the Apostle doth indeed allegorize the Text, as *Arias Montanus* renders it, *quæ sunt allegorizata*, yet the Apostle in the parallel looks at the letter of the history, as I have shewen, not at the Allegory, which Mr. *T.* had not a face to oppose, either he must deny now and then to be Adverbs of time, or else he must allow of my interpretation, *Ishmael* did never as a Justitiary prosecute *Isaac* under the notion of a follower of Evangelical righteousness.

Answ. I do confess *Isaac* was born after the Spirit, and that he was born after the flesh in the two senses of Mr. *Bl.* *for one born of natural parents* Abraham *was his natural father, and in the*

sense more common in Scripture for the outward prerogatives that accompany such a birth (though I do not find the phrase, *born after the flesh* in this later sense in Scripture, not *Phil.* 3.4. *Rom.* 9.3.5. 2 *Cor.*5.16. where the term [*flesh*] is used and yet I think onely in the first place importing prerogatives, no where the phrase *born after the flesh* in that sense) yet not in the Apostles sense, in which to be *born after the flesh* notes birth without consideration of the father as by a mother that was a bond-woman, and so no prerogative is intimated in it but a debasement or deminution and so *Isaac* was not born after the flesh, that is not of a bond-woman, by an usual way of generation, but of the free-woman by Divine virtue according to a promise to her when past childe-bearing in the course of nature. And this to be the Apostles sense is proved before, and Mr. *Bls.* sense proved very absurd, and his reasons for it answered.

Yet he adds of me. "After some concessions in full contradiction to himself, I deny not (saith he) but legal Justiciaries may be in the visible Church as *Ishmael* in *Abrahams* house, though the Apostle make the parallel onely in the casting out, that they might not inherit, *Apolog. pag.*114.) he saith, if Mr. *Bl.* would gather any thing hence for himself, he must prove that the Apostle makes some to be of the visible Church by virtue of being born after the flesh as their prerogative, which is as wide from the Apostles meaning, as the East is from the West, as far as the East is from the Sun-rising, he should have said, that is the thing that I have proved, and do maintain, I laid down by way of Syllogism and have an Apology instead of an answer. Mr. *T.* hath a notable faculty in begging of the question in agitation. The Apostles full scope (I confess) is another thing, but I still affirm that he occasionally expresses that from whence this is evidently deduced, namely a distinction of births literal not allegorical, which Mr. *T.* never will be able with any reason to deny, till it can be proved that *then* and *now* look at the Allegory, not at the History; I can prove from *Luke* 13.16. that the *Israelitish* women are daughters of *Abraham*, though it is plain that another thing there was Christs main intention.

Answ. Mr. *Bl.* continues to write at random. There's no shew of contradiction much less a full contradiction in my words to

my

my self. This may be true, Justitiaries may be in the visible Church, and this also, To be born after the flesh or to be a Justitiary doth not import a prerogative giving title to be of the visible Church, my speech was right, and needs not to be mended by any of Mr. *Bls.* flirts. He hath a full answer to his Syllogism before, and so he had before in the Apology, the strength of his arguing being thus expressed here, *The consequence is plain, birth of the flesh in the Church gave a Church interest*, which is denied to be proved from *Galat.* 4. 26. and was denied before. And though being an answerer I need not prove, and therefore begging the question is charged on me frivolously by Mr. *Bl.* For he only begs the question who takes for granted that which he should prove (which is Mr. *Bls.* fault who useth to dictate when he should prove) yet did I prove that the Apostles scope is not onely another thing than the asserting of a prerogative of visible Church-membership by being born after the flesh, that is, being the childe of a believer by natural generation, but that he deduceth their casting out of the Church from it, and that *the birth after the flesh* is taken in the worser part as that which bringeth bondage not Church estate or Christian liberty, nor doth *birth after the flesh* respect the descent from a believer but the bond-woman, and that this birth is in the Antitype allegorical, and yet the Adverbs *then* and *now* are Adverbs of time, and a history is related in both parts of the 29. *v.* of *Gal.* 4. Generally interpreters take the words, *even so it is now*, as meant of the *Jews*, which cannot be true literally: for they were not born after the flesh, that is, of bond-women, but of free-women, which were true *Israelites*, or *daughters* of *Abraham*, as Mr. *B.* here confesseth.

Mr. *Bl.* proceeds. *Secondly, he sayth that I say, such are in the bosom of the Church, when the Apostle sayth, they persecute the Church, and are cast out: I desire the Reader to consider, if this had any truth in it; whether it hold with greater strength for me or him? They are cast out, and therefore they were in, is my Argument: they are cast out, and therefore were never in, sayth Mr. T.* 2. *The Apostle sayth no such thing, that they are cast out;* Ishmael *was in the family when he persecuted, though afterwards he was cast out of the family; these are in the Church, though in case they continue persecution, they shall*

in

in time be cast out; now in present they have a being in it.

Answ. It is true that this was my second Exception against his gross perverting of the Apostles words, [*even so it is now*] as if the meaning were, that by virtue of being born after the flesh, some infants, to wit, those that are born of a believing parent are in the bosom of the Church, when the Apostle sayth, 1. *They persecute*, which cannot be meant of infants. 2. In that *they are born after the flesh they persecute the Church*, therefore he ascribes no privilege to them, as accruing to them, by the birth after the flesh, but a cursed practice. 3. That *they persecute the Church*, therefore while born after the flesh they were not in the bosom of the Church, that is the Church Christian visible. 4. That *they are cast out*, therefore not in the Church. To the two first of these nothing is answered, the consequence of the third is denied, he supposeth *they did persecute the Church, and yet remained in*; which is most palpably false: For this being apparently meant of the unbelieving *Jews* that sought righteousness by the Law, and acknowledged so by Interpreters, it is notoriously false, that *they were in the bosom of the Christian Church*, while they did persecute the Church; yea, *Saul* himself was not after his conversion taken in presently to communion with the Disciples at *Jerusalem*, till they knew that he ceased to be a persecutor, *Acts* 9.26. so that the words [*even so it is now*] expounded as Mr. *Bls.* words intimate [even so now by virtue of being born after the flesh, that is, by natural generation born of a believing parent, there are some even infants that are in the bosom of the Christian visible Church, as members of it, and remaining in it, do persecute the Church] are so false, and the Exposition so unsavoury, that it is a wonder to me, that neither Mr. *Bl.* nor the Prefacers to his Book take care to have it left out. That which Mr. *Bl.* answers to the fourth thing in this exception is of like stamp. 1. He sayth, *It follows not they were cast out, therefore never in.* But my Argument is this, they were by reason of their being born after the flesh cast out, therefore not for this reason in the bosom of the Church. 2. *That it follows, they are cast out, therefore they were in:* which consequence I deny, being understood of the Church Christian visible, and the particular persons who are sayd to be cast out: for they are sayd to be cast out not from what they had, but from what they might have had

my self. This may be true, Justitiaries may be in the visible Church, and this also, To be born after the flesh or to be a Justitiary doth not import a prerogative giving title to be of the visible Church, my speech was right, and needs not to be mended by any of Mr. *Bls.* flirts. He hath a full answer to his Syllogism before, and so he had before in the Apology, the strength of his arguing being thus expressed here, *The consequence is plain, birth of the flesh in the Church gave a Church interest*, which is denied to be proved from *Galat.* 4. 26. and was denied before. And though being an answerer I need not prove, and therefore begging the question is charged on me frivolously by Mr. *Bl.* For he only begs the question who takes for granted that which he should prove (which is Mr. *Bls.* fault who useth to dictate when he should prove) yet did I prove that the Apostles scope is not onely another thing than the asserting of a prerogative of visible Church-membership by being born after the flesh, that is, being the childe of a believer by natural generation, but that he deduceth their casting out of the Church from it, and that *the birth after the flesh* is taken in the worser part as that which bringeth bondage not Church estate or Christian liberty, nor doth *birth after the flesh* respect the descent from a believer but the bond-woman, and that this birth is in the Antitype allegorical, and yet the Adverbs *then* and *now* are Adverbs of time, and a history is related in both parts of the 29. *v.* of *Gal.* 4. Generally interpreters take the words, *even so it is now*, as meant of the *Jews*, which cannot be true literally: for they were not born after the flesh, that is, of bond-women, but of free-women, which were true *Israelites*, or *daughters* of *Abraham*, as Mr. *B.* here confesseth.

Mr. *Bl.* proceeds. *Secondly, he sayth that I say, such are in the bosom of the Church, when the Apostle sayth, they persecute the Church, and are cast out: I desire the Reader to consider, if this had any truth in it; whether it hold with greater strength for me or him? They are cast out, and therefore they were in, is my Argument: they are cast out, and therefore were never in, sayth Mr. T.* 2. *The Apostle sayth no such thing, that they are cast out;* Ishmael *was in the family when he persecuted, though afterwards he was cast out of the family; these are in the Church, though in case they continue persecution, they shall*

in

in fine be cast out; now in present they have a being in it.

Answ. It is true that this was my second Exception against his gross perverting of the Apostles words, [*even so it is now*] as if the meaning were, that by virtue of being born after the flesh, some infants, to wit, those that are born of a believing parent are in the bosom of the Church, when the Apostle sayth, 1. *They persecute*, which cannot be meant of infants. 2. In that *they are born after the flesh they persecute the Church*, therefore he ascribes no privilege to them, as accruing to them, by the birth after the flesh, but a cursed practice. 3. That *they persecute the Church*, therefore while born after the flesh they were not in the bosom of the Church, that is the Church Christian visible. 4. That *they are cast out*, therefore not in the Church. To the two first of these nothing is answered, the consequence of the third is denied, he supposeth *they did persecute the Church, and yet remained in*; which is most palpably false: For this being apparently meant of the unbelieving *Jews* that sought righteousness by the Law, and acknowledged so by Interpreters, it is notoriously false, that *they were in the bosom of the Christian Church*, while they did persecute the Church; yea, *Saul* himself was not after his conversion taken in presently to communion with the Disciples at *Jerusalem*, till they knew that he ceased to be a persecutor, *Acts* 9.26. so that the words [*even so it is now*] expounded as Mr. *Bls.* words intimate [even so now by virtue of being born after the flesh, that is, by natural generation born of a believing parent, there are some even infants that are in the bosom of the Christian visible Church, as members of it, and remaining in it, do persecute the Church] are so false, and the Exposition so unsavoury, that it is a wonder to me, that neither Mr. *Bl.* nor the Prefacers to his Book take care to have it left out. That which Mr. *Bl.* answers to the fourth thing in this exception is of like stamp. 1. He sayth, *It follows not they were cast out, therefore never in.* But my Argument is this, they were by reason of their being born after the flesh cast out, therefore not for this reason in the bosom of the Church. 2. *That it follows, they are cast out, therefore they were in:* which consequence I deny, being understood of the Church Christian visible, and the particular persons who are sayd to be cast out; for they are sayd to be cast out not from what they had, but from what they might have had

of others had; as *Matth.* 8. 12. it is sayd, *The children of the Kingdome shall be cast out* (of the Kingdom of Heaven, *v.* 11. in which others were, and they not) *into outer darkness*. He sayth also, *The Apostle sayth no such thing that they are cast out, but mentions a command of casting them out*. To which I replied, As if Gods *dictum* were not *factum*: if they were not cast out, why doth the Apostle allege that Text? My meaning was, Gods speech of the casting out of *Hagar* and *Ishmael* was not a bare command, but such as included a sentence and decree of God, which he took course to execute, and that the Apostle alleged the Text not to prove a duty, but to shew an event, or fact of God. For as the Apostle alleged it, the casting out is of the legal covenant, and the children of it those that desired to be under the Law, and their casting out is their rejecting from the inheritance of righteousness and being Gods people: now this could not be any mans duty but Gods act determining and accordingly accomplishing this sentence, that righteousness shall not be by the Law, nor Justitiaries this people, and therefore it is most absurd in Mr. *Bl.* to determine, that some by vertue of being born after the flesh have a right to be in the bosom of the Church Christian, when the Apostle determines they are for this reason rejected or cast out.

I had, thirdly, excepted against Mr. *Bl.* as *making those that are born after the flesh*, *Gal.* 4. 29. *Abrahams* seed, wherein he joyns with *Arminius* in calling them *Abrahams seed who sought justice in the Law*, Mr. *Bl. Vindic. Fœd. cap.* 40. sayth, *I joyn with* Arminius, *and that he follows Mr.* Bayne. For sayth he, *I interpret it of a natural seed that inherit outward privileges, and never reach the birth of the spirit, so Mr.* Baines *interprets it, the children of the flesh here, are those onely who in course of nature came from* Abraham, Baines *on Ephes.* 1. *pag.* 140. *quarto.*

Answ. It is true Mr. *Bayne* hath those words, but yet he excepteth *pag.* 139. against *Arminius* as I do for calling legal justitiaries (who are meant by [they that are born after the flesh, *Gal.* 4. 29.]) *Abrahams* seed. For there he thus speaks. *Beside that, though the sons of the flesh may signifie such, who carnally, not spiritually conceive of the Law, yet the seed of* Abraham *without any adjoyned is never so taken.* It is true that Mr. *Baines* so interprets the term [*children of the flesh*, *Rom.* 9. 8.] as Mr. *Bl.* hath

hath cited him, which place he meant by [*here*] *but not* the term [*he that is born after the flesh, Gal.4.29.*] yea *pag.*138. he saith, *For though children of the flesh in some other Scripture* (*meaning Gal.4.29.*) *doth note out Justitiaries, seeking salvation in the Law, yet here* (*Rom.9.8.*) *the literal meaning is to be taken; a childe of the flesh being such a one who descendeth from* Abraham *according to the flesh.* So that this is the thing that I except against Mr. *Bl.* for that whereas by the consent of all, that I know, interpreters besides himself [*they that are born after the flesh, Gal.4.29.* in the *apodosis* there *even so it is now*] do note legal Justitiaries who are there called the children of the bond-woman, not called *Abrahams seed* (for those he had determined before to be *those of the faith, Gal. 3.9. Christs v.29.*) not to inherit, but cast out, he on the contrary, makes them *Abrahams* seed as *Arminius* doth in his *Analysis* of *Rom.9.* And ascribes to them the inheriting of outward privileges as to be members of the visible Church in that they are born after the flesh. Whereas the term [*born after the flesh*] is taken in the worser part precisely from the birth from the bond-woman abstractively from generation by *Abraham* and importing no privilege, but a privation of privilege. As for Mr. *Baym*, though he interpret [*children of the flesh, Rom. 9. 8.*] *of those onely who in course of nature came from* Abraham, *and proves there that it notes not legal Justitiaries, because it is applyed to* Esau *who is considered as having done neither good nor evil.* Yet Mr. *Bl.* wrongs him in two things. 1. In that he saith, Mr. *Baine interprets it of a natural seed inheriting outward privileges*, whereas though Mr. *Baine* doth interpret [*children of the flesh, Rom.9.8.*] of a natural seed, yet not as inheriting thereby outward privileges. 2. That he makes his exposition of [*children of the flesh, Rom.9.8*] to be his exposition of [*those that are born after the flesh, Gal.4.29.*] whereas he expresly saith, *though children of the flesh in some other Scripture* (which can be no other than *Gal.4.29. doth note out Justitiaries, seeking salvation in the Law.* I confess *Cameron* in his *Conference* with *Tilenus* in the place before cited makes *Ishmael* not onely a Type of Justitiaries, *Gal.4.23.29.* but also *Rom.9.7,8 9.* and *Isaac* a Type of believers in both places, and *Esau* and *Jacob* Types not of Justitiaries

and believers, but of uncalled and called, non-elect and elect, and so the resemblance to be different of the two former brethren from the later; which to me seems not right: for me thinks the words οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ, have this sense, that the thing he had sayd before did not onely appear in *Ishmael* and *Isaac*, but also more fully in *Esau* and *Jacob*, which me thinks imports, that the Apostle meant to prove the same thing by *Esau* and *Jacob*, which he did by *Ishmael* and *Isaac*, and me thinks the long *Parenthesis* he imagines from *v.* 10, *to* 30. agrees not with that expression *v.* 10. *Not onely so but also*, they being connexive particles, and so not agreeable to a *Parenthesis*. But *Cameron* and all others I know, understand by [*those that are born after the flesh, Gal.* 4. 29.] legal Justitiaries. Mr. *John Cotton Grounds of baptism, &c. pag.* 158. *By such as are born after the flesh* (*Gal.* 4. 29.) *the Apostle doth not mean such as are born by ordinary course of nature: but such as are born and bred of the carnal seed of the Covenant of the Law; which as it begot by* Ishmael *carnal confidence of his own strength,* (*or else he would never have slighted and mocked the promised seed*) *so it begat in* Cain *and* Saul *and* Judas *an utter despair of grace and salvation.*

My fourth exception was, whereas the covenant of grace is made the reason of baptizing infants; to be born of *Hagar*, that is, to be in the covenant of works, should give a childe interest into the Church of Christ. To this all that Mr. *Bl.* replies is this, *If Mr.* Tombs *his Gloss* (*borrowed from* Arminius) *must stand for the sense of the place, that to be born of the flesh, is to be under the covenant of works, then it will hardly be avoided; but in case Mr.* Baines *interpretation may stand of a birth in nature, according to the flesh, then the Argument is valid.*

Answ. That Mr. *Baines* doth interpret no otherwise the term [*born after the flesh, Gal.* 4. 29.] than I do, is shewed above: yet if it were true, that he did as Mr. *Bl.* mis-allegeth him interpret [*born after the flesh, Gal.* 4. 29.] *of those onely who in course of nature came from* Abraham, yet it is false that either there or *Rom.* 9. 8. he conceived this term [*children of the flesh*] to import *a natural seed* by virtue of it *inheritiing outward privileges*, and therefore the Argument of Mr. *Bl.* is not valid, though Mr. *Baines* were granted to be rightly alleged by him. And for that he sayth, *I bor-*

row

row my Gloss from Arminius: I answer, I have shewed that I have deduced it from the Apostles own words, and have the concurrent judgment of many Divines of best note, to whom it is no disparagement, that in this *Arminius* joyns.

SECT. XXIII.

Mr. Brinsley *and Dr.* Homes *their conjecture from Hebr.* 6. 2. *to prove infant-baptism is refelled.*

THere is another Text, to wit, *Hebr.* 6. 2. from which Dr. *Homes Animad.* on my *Exercit. pag.* 58. and after *cap.* 10. would prove Infant-baptism, and with him Mr. *John Brinsley Doctrine and Practice of Paedob. pag.* 76. *&c.* which if their arguing were good, would not onely prove the practice of infant-baptism, but also that it is a principle of Christianity, and part of the foundation.

The arguing is to this effect, *If the Doctrine of laying on of hands put after the Doctrine of baptisms cannot be expounded of any other than the laying on of hands for confirming the baptized in infancy than the Doctrine of laying on of hands put after the Doctrine of baptisms presupposeth infant-baptism. But the Antecedent is true,* Ergo, *the Consequent. The Antecedent is proved by parts,* 1. *It cannot be understood of laying on of hands for healing or miraculous gifts of the Spirit. For then the knowledg of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit should be put among the Principles of Christian knowledg, which is absurd.*

To which I answered in my *Exercit. pag.* 22. that it is no absurdity to put that among the Principles of Christian knowledg, those gifts being though by extraordinary power, yet frequent in those days, and necessary to be known to confirm young Christians, that Jesus is the Christ, because the Spirit thus given was the great witness concerning Christ, that he was the Son of God, and shewed that he was gone up to the Father, else the Spirit had not descended, it was it by which the world was rebuked, and the Saints established.

To this sayth Dr. *Homes, that I by and by as good as confess*

it is a vulgar reason, because I go about to prove that imposition of hands here mentioned is for Ordination, because it was still in use, and to continue to be used.

Answ. The Doctor misallegeth my words; for I do not say positively as he cites them, but comparatively thus; for it is more likely that imposition of hands for Ordination, which was still in use, and to continue to be used, should be there meant, than laying on of hands for confirmation after baptism of infants, which hath no Rule nor Example in Scripture.

2. Saith Dr. *Homes*, *These gifts usual onely in that little time of the Apostles were not to be joyned with, and put among the first Principles of Christian Religion to be taught young ones to fit them for baptism, or to give an account of their faith after baptism.*

Answ. Those Principles *Heb.* 6. 1, 2. are not sayd to be taught to little ones in age, but in knowledg of Christian Religion, nor are they sayd to be taught to fit them for baptism, or to give account of their faith after baptism: they may be principles and a foundation, though they were taught them after baptism, and to establish themselves rather than to give account to others. Now for what reason the knowledg of these might be a part of the beginnings of the Doctrine of Christ to young Christians is given above. And there is in the Text that which may induce us to conceive the giving the spirit by laying on of hands meant, because v. 4. they that were enlightned, which many even of the Ancients understood of baptism, commonly called by the *Greeks* [inlightning] are sayd, *to have tasted of the heavenly gift and to be partakers of the Holy Ghost*, which seems to be meant in respect of these gifts, and *Paul Acts* 19. 2. propounded this as a Catechism question to certain Disciples at *Ephesus*, *Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?* But I rested not on it, because the other of laying on of hands for Ordination seemed to me more likely then.

2. Saith Mr. *Brinsley*, *It's not likely to be meant of laying on of hands for Ordination*, 1. *Because that's not fit to be taught younglings, children, novices; as milk, Heb.* 5. 12. *If this be milk, viz. the Doctrine of Church-discipline, Church-officers, Church-goverment, &c. what shall we call or count strong meat?*

To

To this was answered, that however all the Doctrine about Church-discipline might be unfit to be taught novices, yet laying on hands for Ordination being an outward rite of continued use, it might be needfull to be taught younglings in Christian profession.

To this Dr. *Homes* replies, *that no ingenuous man weighing and pondering things will think that little children should be taught, as one of the first elements of Christian faith the imposition of hands to ordain Ministers.*

To which I say, many even of later Writers, whom me thinks the Doctor should not deny to be ingenuous men do refer the laying on of hands, *Heb.*6.2. to Ordination, *Dieson* on *Heb.*6.2. *Ames Bell. Ener. tom.*3. *lib.*3. *cap.*2. *th.*8. *Cartwright Answ.* to *Rh. Annot. in locum*, *Thomas Hooker Survey part.*1. *cap.*1. *pag.*7. *Noyes the Temple measured, pag.*70. *Hudson Essence and Unity of the Church, pag.*9. and *Vindic. pag.*22. *Dr. Hammond* of the *Keys cap.*4. *sect.*28. *Chamier tom.*4. *Panstr. Cath. lib.*4. *cap.*10. *sect.*38. recites the opinions of Papists, as differing, some referring to Confirmation, some to Ordination, some to giving the Holy Ghost. The *New Annot. Diodati*, speak as uncertain, to which to refer it, *Grotius* refers it to all rites besides baptism; and the Lords Supper, in Confirmation, Ordination, curing the sick, reconciling penitents, blessing the married, and therefore whether little children were taught the Doctrine thereof or no, many ingenuous men conceive it meant, *Heb.*6.2. 2. Though it might be conceived unfit for little children in age to be taught, yet it may nevertheless be fit to be taught younglings in Christianity meant, *Heb.*5.12. It seems to me to be as fit to be taught little children as the Doctrine of Confirmation, and may be as easily learned by them as the points about the Resurrection of the Dead, and eternal Judgment.

2. Sayth Mr. *Brinsley*, *The very putting these two together* [*baptisms and laying on of hands*] *seems in* Calvins *judgment to import some relation that the one should have to the other, as in the other Principles which are by pairs.*

To this I answered, that baptism and imposition of hands might be fitly coupled, being both Ordinances for initiation, the one into the profession of Christianity, the other into sacred function.

To

To this Dr. *Homes* replies, *that imposition of hands initiates but few, and that long after they are Church-members, and that Matriage might better be coupled with baptism or imposition of hands and the Lords Supper.*

Answ. If all this were granted, yet the answer stands good, that the joyning proves not Mr. *Brinsleys* sense necessary, which is enough for my purpose to shew the insufficiency of his Argument.

But Dr. *Homes* thinks to blow away all by avouching his and Mr. *Brinsleys* interpretation, which he cals *a naked and honest explication of the Text.* And that is, *that the Doctrine of baptisms is the Doctrine which the catechized of the heathens recited afore their baptism, and the Doctrine of laying on of hands was the Doctrine which infants of believers before baptized in their infancy, after they were past childhood, rehearsed before the Church, upon which they were received into the Church by imposition of hands.*

Answ. He may well call it *a naked interpretation*, because it is brought into the world without proof, there being nothing in the Text for it, and all the shew of proof is onely the opinion of some late writers mistaken about the practise of antiquity. Yea me thinks if the Doctor with his brethren of the congregational way, as it is called, did believe this interpretation to be genuine, they should admit their infant-sprinkled members by laying on of hands, which yet I hear not that they do. But against this interpretation are these reasons. 1. In it is supposed that *the Doctrine of baptisms, and laying on of hands* is not the Doctrine concerning those rites, but the Doctrine recited when those rites were used. But the Doctrine then recited being the Doctrine of *the resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment*, and the profession of *repentance from dead works and faith towards God*, if the *Doctrine of baptisms and the laying on of hands* be the Doctrine recited by the baptized, and confirmed at the use of those rites, it will be the same with the resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment, repentance from dead works and faith towards God, and so those several principles will be confounded. 2. The Doctrine of baptisms was that which in those to whom the Apostles wrote was layd before, which is intimated in the words

*v.*1. *not laying again.* But they were *Hebrews*, therefore not, as the Doctor, Heathens that recited it at baptiſm. 3. There's no diſtinction in the Text as if ſome recited the Doctrine at baptiſm, and others who had been baptized in infancy recited it at laying on of hands, but the ſame perſons had the Doctrine of both layd in them. 4. There's not a word of reciting the Doctrine at the ſeveral rites by the taught, but the laying of the foundation of the Doctrine of thoſe rites by the Teachers. 5. *The Doctrine of baptiſms* whether by them be meant thoſe of *John* and Chriſt, or other, and of laying on of hands is more likely and more generally conceived to be concerning the uſe of baptiſm and laying on of hands. But the Doctrine of the uſe of theſe was not recited by either ſort of catechized perſons, though both ſorts were taught both doctrines. 6. The placing the words [*the Doctrine of baptiſms and laying on of hands*] in the middle between *faith and reſurrection of the dead*, is againſt the Doctors ſenſe, ſith *the Doctrine of baptiſms*, being joyned by appoſition to *faith and repentance*, the ſenſe muſt be, that *repentance and faith* were the Doctrine recited at baptiſm, not *the reſurrection of the dead*, which comes after, if the Doctors ſenſe were right. 7. This order leads us to conceive, that the writer of that Epiſtle did orderly place the elements of Chriſtianity in which Chriſtians were inſtructed, to wit, repentance and faith before baptiſm, then the baptiſm of water, and the laying on of hands for the obtaining the Spirit by prayer after baptiſm, and then the declaration of what they were to expect, the reſurrection of the dead, and eternal judgement, wherein ſentence ſhould paſs on them concerning their everlaſting ſtate. 8. The terms [*of repentance, of faith, of the doctrine, of the reſurrection, of judgement*] are all governed of [θεμέλιον, *the foundation*] as if they were poſſeſſed of it (as the Grammarians ſpeak) the word [*Doctrine*] is not joyned by appoſition to [*faith*] as if the ſenſe were [which is the Doctrine of baptiſms] which muſt be the ſenſe if the Doctors interpretation be right. 9. Thoſe interpreters which are brought as giving us that ſenſe which Dr. *Homes* and Mr. *Brinſley* allege are but late writers, and ſuch as ſpeak onely by gheſs without proving the antiquity of the uſe they mention out of ancient writers, or alleging any ancient writer expounding the Text *Heb.*6.2. as referring to that uſe, Dr.

Homes recites *p.* 59, 60. the words of *Pareus*, *Calvin*, *Bullinger*, *Marlorat*, *Hofman*, *Theophylact*, Mr. *Cotton*, of all which there is none afore the 16. Century but *Theophylact* placed by Dr. *Usher* atthe year 1070. and his words with the words of *Hofman*, and *Marlorat* do not at all speak of the use of laying hands on children of believers baptized in infancy, and *Bullingers* words apply the laying on of hands to the ordination of Pastors. So heedlesly did Dr. *Homes* write his *Animadversions* that his own authors he allegeth are not for him, or else against him. And for Mr. *Cotton* he sayth onely, *There be that conceive and that not improbable there was such an use, and that some judicious Divines have conceived that use to be the reason of reckoning the laying on of hands among the Principles, Heb.* 6. 2. *and he brings it to prove that then Elders were not without laying on of hands, for all Church-members had hands layd on them, and so might more freely lay hands on others*: which speech if true, and the inference be good, then women who were Church-members had hands layd on them, and might more freely lay hands on others. But the *New England Elders*, of whom I think Mr. *Cotton* was one, if not the very Penner of those answers, in the *Answer to the* 32. *Question pag.* 69. say, *If it were not so, then one of these would follow, either that the Officers must minister without any Ordination at all, which is against* 1 *Tim.* 4. 16. *Heb.* 6. 2. So that there it is referred to the same laying on of hands which is mentioned 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. which is indeed a very common exposition of interpreters. It is true *Calvin* and *Pareus* refer it to the use Mr. *Brinsley* mentions: yet *Chamier tom.* 4. *Panstr. Cath. lib.* 4. *cap.* 10. *sect.* 39. allegeth with *Salmeron*, *Justinian*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Aretius*, *Piscator*, concerning the initial laying on of hands upon the catechized to prepare them to receive baptism, (for which use Dr. *Hammond* in his *letter of resolut. pag.* 195. brings some places of the ancients) and *Calvin* in his *institutions l.* 4. *cap.* 19. *sect.* 4. *disallows* Hieroms *judgment, conceiving that the laying on of hands for confirmation was an Apostolical Ordinance. Beza* saith, *that the Doctrine Heb.* 6. 1, 2. *was delivered when they met either to baptize, or lay on hands on infants or adult persons*; so that he speaks as one not fully resolved. And indeed interpreters, as is shewed above, are not agreed whether to refer it to laying on

hands

hands on the baptized or the ordained, yet very few of the Protestants refer it to the laying on of hands for confirmation of them that were baptized in infancy, and the 25. *Article* of the *Church* of *England* makes *Confirmation one of those things which have grown of the corrupt following of the Apostles.*

I sayd in my *Exercit. sect.*14. that if *Hierom. tom.*2. in his *Dialogue against the Luciferians* do assert that use of imposition of hands from Scripture, yet he allegeth not *Heb.*6.2. for it, but the Examples of giving the Holy Ghost by laying on of hands in the *Acts* of the *Apostles.*

To this Dr. *Homes* replies, 1. *That however the antiquity holds good, that imposition of hands was used to be after applied to them that have been baptized.*

To which I say, This being granted, yet as I shew there and here the use of baptizing infants is not proved thereby, nor doth *Hierom* confirm Mr. *Brinsleys* Exposition.

2. Sayth Dr. *Homes*, *In that place he quotes other places than the* Acts *of the* Apostles, *and speaks to our purpose thus*, and then reciting some words of *Hierom*, adds, so *Hieronymus. Wherefore he supposeth imposition of hands may be on them that had the Spirit in baptism before:* which is not denied by me, nor do I see what that is to Dr. *Homes* his purpose to prove *that the laying on of hands Heb.*6.2. *is meant of believers infants before baptized, and then upon their own profession received into the Church by imposition of hands.* Yet *Chamier. tom.*4. *Panstr. Cath. lib.*4. *cap.*11. *sect.*41. allegeth *Hierom*, as referring the imposition of hands to the time of baptism, not some years after.

I sayd in my *Exercit. pag.*23. but if it were supposed, that this imposition of hands meant *Heb.*6.2. were on the baptized; yet this proves not the baptism of infants in the Apostles days, unless it could be proved, that it was used after the baptism of infants onely for a confirmation either of the baptism or the baptized. On the contrary, it is apparent out of *Tertullian de corona militis, cap.*3. that in the primitive times the baptized did make his confession *sub manu antistitis, the Minister laying hands on him.*

To this Dr. *Homes* says, 1. *That the learned men before quoted gave us the sum of Antiquity.* But how little to the pur-

poſe their words are, or how deſtitute of proof is ſhewed above. 2. *He cites in the Margin Tertul. de bapt. Cyprian. Ep. 3. & 70. Auguſt. Tract. 6.* on *Johns Epiſt.* But none of the paſſages he cites prove the uſe of laying on hands after the baptiſm of infants, which is many years after baptiſm, but of laying hands preſently after baptiſm. 3. *He excepts againſt my allegation out of* Tertullian, *that he there diſputes for receiving unwritten traditions, that he alludes to no Scripture authority, or to any approved Antiquity:* Which doth no whit infringe my allegation: For notwithſtanding theſe things his teſtimony is valid for the practice of what was done at baptiſm in his time, of which no doubt he was often a ſpectator.

4. Saith he, [*Sub manu*] *is a Phraſe that hath ſo many ſenſes as it is no ways certain, that here* [*Sub manu*] [*under the hand*] *ſignifies impoſition of hands. Haply it may rather ſignifie the Miniſters liſting up of his hand in prayer:* as Pacianus *hath it, We obtain, ſayth he, in Prayer pardon, and the Holy Spirit in baptiſm by the mouth and hand of the Antiſtes.*

Anſw. The moſt likely ſenſe is, *the Biſhop laying on his hand,* as being neareſt the uſe of the phraſe. Dr. *Homes* his ſenſe is not likely, 1. Becauſe that which is ſayd was done *under the hand of the Biſhop,* to wit, the proteſtation of the baptized, intimates that the Biſhop did not then lift up his hand in prayer, but hold his hand on the head of the Proteſtant. Nor is it likely he would then be praying when he ſhould attend to his confeſſion. 2. Dr. *Homes* ſhews not the phraſe to be uſed elſewhere in his ſenſe. For that which he cites out of *Pacianus* is a different expreſſion, *by the hand,* is not all one with *under the hand.* And yet *Chamier. Panſtr. Cath. tom. 4. lib. 4. cap. 11. ſect. 28.* refers *that obtaining by the hand to the impoſition of hands at baptiſm.*

I added further. And to ſave labour in reciting teſtimonies *Chamier* may be ſeen, who in his *Panſtr. Cath. tom. 4. lib. 4. cap. 11. ſect. 14. &c.* at large proves out of the Ancients, that the impoſition of hands, which was after made a diſtinct Sacrament called Confirmation, was either *a part or Appendix of baptiſm,* and cites many paſſages to ſhew, that it was when the baptized was to confeſs the faith, and renounce Satan.

Againſt this Dr. *Homes* excepts, *that* Chamier *quotes but few,*

and

and those not of credit. But though the Books some of them be not the Authors works whose names they bear, yet many of them are of credit, yea all for what they are brought, and for the purpose for which they are alleged, however Dr. *Homes scorn or score with his nails those Fathers*; if I may use his own words of my doing which is more justly to be charged on himself. Dr. *Homes grants there imposition of hands presupposeth baptism, precedent, though in men of ripe years*, but he should have added at the same solemnity joyned with it. The other testimonies are sufficient to shew the practice in the Age in which the Writers of them lived. But for Dr. *Homes* to say, *that* Chamier *doth not assert as from himself or from antiquity, that imposition of hands was to be conjoyned with baptism*, when he doth at large undertake to prove, *it was a part or appendix of baptism*, is too much boldness in the Doctor, much more to say, *But rather tels us the contrary, partly from himself, partly from the Authors he quotes, as that men were reconciled in penance by imposition of hands*, Sect. 53. which is nothing to the business. For though imposition of hands in reconciliation might be unconjoyned to baptism, yet what *Chamier* says stands good, *that imposition of hands for Confirmation was a part or appendix of baptism.* And what the Doctor adds, Sect. 54. *that though Confirmation belongs to the solemnities of baptism, yet after a while after baptism*, is a plain confession of what I allege as averred by *Chamier*, that that imposition of hands which after was made a distinct Sacrament long after baptism, did formerly belong to the solemnity of baptism: which shews how little regard the Doctor had to his own allegations. But it is not *Chamier* alone who avers that anciently baptism and laying on of hands were together; *Salmasius* also a man of very accurate study in Antiquity in his *Apparatus ad librum de Primatu Papæ, pag.* 84. speaks thus, *Discat igitur in Ægypto & in Gracia & in toto Oriente confirmationem quæ separata est à baptismo non fuisse notam. Unus idemq; Presbyter in omnibus Orientis Ecclesiis simul & semel in baptismo conferendo etiam Chrismationem cum manuum impositione ac signaculo Dominico dabat egressis è piscina sive baptisterio:* which he proves thereout of *Severus Alexandr. Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus*, and refers to more testimonies in his Treatise *De Chrismate.* And he says, *p.* 124. *Pri-*

nis temporibus in Occidente Chrismatio & manuum impositio sequebantur post baptismum, posteaquam à baptismo separata est confirmatio aliquando in sola Chrismatione constitit, pag. 182. he proves in *Tertullians*, *Cyprians*, and others times, that *Hæ tres erant baptismi hoc est unius Sacramenti partes, lotio, unctio, & impositio manuum.* Out of all which I conclude, that the laying on of hands for the confirmation of children of believers baptized in infancy, when they came to years, and professed the faith, was altogether unknown in the Eastern Churches anciently, and in the Western onely in the declining times, and therefore notwithstanding *Calvin* and *Pareus* his conceits there was no such thing meant, *Heb.* 6.2. as baptism of infants, and their receiving into the Church, many years after by laying on of hands, there being no such things known in the days of that Writer, nor some hundred of years after, and therefore Mr. *Brinsley* and Dr. *Homes* Argument from thence for infant-baptism is of no weight. I go on.

SECT. XXIV.

Dr. Hammond *his way of proving infant-baptism from the* Jews *baptizing Proselytes children is shewed to be vain.*

DR. *Henry Hammond* in his *Letter of Resolution to six Queries, in the fourth Quere, Sect.* 23. speaks thus, *But there is no need of laying much weight on this, or any the like more imperfect ways of probation,* (meaning the example of Circumcision, *Gen.*17. of baptizing a whole household, *Acts* 16.33. Christs reception of little children, *Matth.* 19.14. *Mark* 10 16.) *The whole fabrick being sufficiently supported, and built on this* Basis (*the customary baptism among the* Jews) *and that discernible to be so, if we consider it first negatively, then positively. First negatively, that Christian baptism, which is an institution of Christs, lightly changed from the* Jewish *custome of receiving of Proselytes by him appointed in his life-time, and settled a little before his Ascension hath nothing in the patern, whence it is copied out, nothing in the copy it self, as it is set down in the New Testament,*

ſtament, i. e. in the words of the inſtitution, or in his or the Apoſtles practice, which doth any way exclude the Chriſtians children from being part of that indefinite number, that ought to be baptized, or for whom baptiſm was inſtituted by Chriſt. That there is nothing exclusive of them in the patern (the Jewiſh cuſtom of baptiſm) hath been ſufficiently evidenced by the ſeveral branches of that already inſiſted on.

Anſw. I like the Doctors ingenuity in his waving the imperfect ways of proving infant baptiſm he mentions, and doubt not to ſhew his own to be no better than thoſe he relinquiſheth. The ſubſtance of his proof is this, as I conceive. *The* Jews *were wont when they admitted Proſelytes to baptize them and their children, and this is diſcernible to be the patern of Chriſtian baptiſm, and that Chriſts inſtitution was but a copy according to that patern, and therefore infants to be baptized, the Apoſtles and the firſt Churches practiſe ſhewing it to be ſo.* Concerning which I ſay, 1. It ſeems baptiſm was a cuſtome of all nations as well as the *Jews*. *Grot. Annot. in Matth.* 3.6. conceives *that for as much as ſtrangers waſhed, not circumciſed, were obliged by thoſe Laws onely which God had given to all mankinde, it is eaſie to be underſtood that baptiſm was among old inſtitutions ariſing, as I think, after the great deluge in memory of the world purged. Whence that famous ſpeech among the* Greeks, *The ſea waſheth away all the evils of men. Surely we read even in the Epiſtle of of* Peter, *that baptiſm is anſwerable to the deluge.* And *Annot. in Matth.* 28.19. *yea with profane nations it was of old uſed, that they who would be initiated were firſt waſhed all over their body, no doubt teſtifying thereby their purpoſe of innocency.* 2. By the paſſages cited by the ſame Author in *Matth* 28:19. *Juſtin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian,* and *Auguſtin* allegeth thoſe nations cuſtome for their practiſe; nor do I know that ever Dr. *Hammond* or any other hath alleged one paſſage in Scripture or any of the Fathers, that might evince that the cuſtome of baptizing or baptizing infants was derived from the *Jews* initiating proſelytes by baptiſme, but ſome paſſages in the Fathers ſhew rather that they took it as inſtead of Circumciſion. Mr. *Selden de Syned: Ebræ. Lib.* 1. *Cap:* 3. *pag.* 40, 41. mentions ſome who have conceived that the *Iewiſh* baptiſm in initiating Proſe-

lytes

lytes was in imitation of Christs example, though he do not beleive it; and that *Schickardus* conceives they added a certain Baptism to Circumcision to difference them from *Samaritans*, which I allege to shew that notwithstanding the Doctors supposition, that the whole fabrick of baptism is discernible to be built on that *basis* the customary baptism among the *Jews*, yet many will conceive it needs more proof than the bare recital of passages out of *Jewish* writers. I for my part conceive that there was a custom of baptizing proselytes afore Christs incarnation among the later *Jews*, but that either it should begin from *Jacobs* injunction to his household *Gen.* 35.2. or Gods Command, *Exod.* 19.10. for the *Israelites* to wash their clothes afore the giving the Law (though the *Jewish* Doctors allege these for it) I do not conceive, those places speaking of washing *Jews* by nature, not proselytes, whereas the *Jews* baptized not *Jews* by nature, as *Selden l.2 cap.4. de Jure nat. ac Gent. juxta discipl. Ebra.* Sayth, but by profession, nor do I conceive Mr. *Seldens* exposition in his Book *de Syned, l.1. cap.3.* that the sea was some vessel or receptacle of waters wherein they washed their bodies before the giving of the Law *Exod.*19.10. but the read sea. For *as the drinking of the rock*, is a relation of an accident of Gods providence for them, signifying to them the Lords supper, so *their passing through the sea* declares, not what they were injoyned to do, but what God did for them, that *under the cloud they passed through the sea*, to signify to them the same thing that baptism doth to us, our safe passage to life by Christ, nor do I think Dr. *Hammonds* exposition *sect.7. pag.*181. right, *that they were baptized into* Moses *in the cloud and in the sea v.2. i.e.* were (*by these two great solemnities, the cloud that gave them light by night, and a guard by day, and the sea that was a wall to defend them, and a devouring deep to their enemies*) *received and initiated into Gods Covenant under the conduct of* Moses, *as since they are wont to be initiated by baptism:* For when it is said, *our Fathers were baptized*, it is not meant were baptized as since Proselytes were baptized among the *Jews*, but as Christians were baptized, even as when he sayth *v.3. and they did all eat the same spiritual meat*, it is meant they did all eat the same spiritual meat, with us Christians, that is, they had Christ signified to them by the Manna they did eat, as we eat

Christ

Christ spiritually in the Lords Supper. There's no more an allusion to a custom of the *Jews* in the one then in the other, bu a narration of what happened to them by Gods providence, which the Apostle interprets as signs to them of the same thing that baptism, and the Lords supper are to us Christians. And therefore I conceive that the Scripture doth not make the customary use of baptizing Proselytes by the *Jews* as a thing from God, or eyed by Christ as his pattern, but that the custom of baptizing proselytes was a tradition of the Elders as the baptisms mentioned *Mark* 7. 3,4. and many other things they held. Nor do I think it true that the customary use of the *Jews* in baptizing proselytes and their children, was the pattern of Christs institution of baptism, and the Apostles and first Churches practise. For according to the custom of the *Jews* set down out of Maimony and other *Jewish* Rabbins by Mr. *Selden l. 2. de Jure natur. ac gent. &c. cap. 4 lib. 1. de syned. Ebr. cap. 3. John Baptist*, and Christs Apostles should have baptized no native *Jews*, but onely Gentiles that embraced the faith, for after the baptism *Exod.* 19.10. the *Jews* did not baptize *Jews* but onely proselytes. Whereas not onely *John Baptist*, but also the Apostles both before, and after the ascension of Christ did baptize *Jews* as well as Gentiles upon their profession of repentance and faith in Christ, as being agreeable to Christs institution *Matth.* 28.19.2. Christ would not have avouched the baptism of *John* to be from Heaven, and not from men, if it had been in imitation of and conformity to the *Jewish* custom. 3. It is likely some where or other some intimation would have been given of that custom as the Directory for Christians in the use of baptism. 4. The institution and practise would have been conformable to it. But the contrary appears. 1. In their baptizing no infants of the Gentiles at their first conversion: whereas the *Jews* baptized onely the Gentiles infants at their first proselyting, not the infants of those who were baptized in infancy. *Selden l. 2. de Jure nat. &c. cap. 4 (sed vero, non aliter atq; Israelitæ ipsi filii proselytorum circumcidendi tantum erant nec quemadmodum parentes sive illi sive filiæ baptizandæ. Nunquam enim solennis proselyti baptismus ille iterandus erat, nec in ipso qui primo baptizatus (tametsi apostata factus in ritus Judaicos rediret) nec in posteris.* So that if it be true that the *Jewish* baptism of Proselytes

is the pattern of the Christian, then no infant of Christian race is now to be baptized, but such as were born when the first Gentile Ancestors were converted. Yea the *Jews* were so far from baptizing any infants of proselytes born after their first conversion and baptism, that they resolved, as may be seen in *Selden ubi supra*, and Dr. *Hammond* himself allegeth *sect.* 109. *if a woman great with childe become a proselyte, and be baptized her childe needs not baptism when tis born.* So that whereas the Doctor brings the *Iewish* custom as a pattern for Christian baptism *so as that it may be reasonably thought to belong to all that among the* Jews *were usually baptized*, his own arguing will prove that no infant of Christians now descended from Christian Ancestors, or born of parents formerly infidels after the parents were baptized, should be baptized, because it is against the *Jewish* custom of baptizing any childe of a Gentile infidel born after the parents were become proselytes, and baptized; But secondly besides this first and main thing wherein the Doctors patern is incongruous to Christian baptism there are many more disparities, which shew that the *Iewish* baptism of proselytes was not the patern of Christan baptism, As *v.g.* 1. The baptism of males must be also with Circumcision and an offering. 2. There must be a kinde of court of three *Israelites* skilfull in Law to approve it or else it is voyd, Dr. *Hammond sect.* 114. "Among the *Iews*, saith the *Gemara Babyl.* the infants used to be baptized upon the profession or confession of the house of judgment, the consistory, and the Gloss saith, the *Triumviri* are set over baptism and are necessary to it, and so they become to him a father. and *Maimonides*, he must be baptized before the *Triumviri*. 3. It was not to be on the Sabbath or feast day, or in the night. 4. The body must be washed not in a made receptacle of waters as a vessel, or font, but a natural one as a river, pool, well. 5. No part of the body but must be washed, if any scab, or blood hardned or filth stuck on the body so as that water could not come to the whole *superficies* it was not accounted right baptism, yet they allowed garments which separated not the water from the body. 6. While the proselytes stood in the water the precepts of *Moses* were recited by the three *Israelites* skilfull in the Law, and he was to take on him the observation of them all not one excepted, or else not accounted

a Proselyte. 7. *A* woman proselyte was placed in the water unto the neck by women which baptized her, while the three *Israelites* stood after the manner observing the baptism, yet they were to turn away their faces, and go away when the woman came out of the water. 8. Elder Gentiles were made proselytes according to their own choice, younger as males before thirteen years and a day old, females before twelve and a day old according to the minde of their father or the court to which they were subject were admitted to Judaism. The same right was of a natural foole. Yet if a person under years when baptized did after as soon as he came to age renounce Judaism, then he lost what privilege he had by baptism either by assent of the parent or the court. 9. The baptism did give them interest in the policy of the *Iews* as other *Israelites*, except some things peculiarly reserved to natural *Israelites*. 10. Yet a servant without his Masters consent was not made free. 11. A blessing was to be used at baptism, but unless he were made free, not by the servant, but by the master. 12. A young one as an infant, whether taken or found, the *Israelite* that possessed it might baptize it, either into the state of an ingenuous person, or freed person, or a servant. 13. They taught that a person baptized was so born again, that lying with his own natural sister was no incest. 14. If the person be privily baptized, though before two, yet he was not counted a Proselyte. All which may be seen in *Selden l. 2. de jure nat. & Gent. juxta discipl. Ebr. cap. 2, 3, 4. lib. 1. de Syned. Ebr. cap. 3.* So that if the baptism of Proselytes among the *Iews* be the patern of Christian baptism, baptizing of women must be by women, no one single Bishop or Presbyter must baptize, but three at least, there must be no private baptism, no baptizing in Fonts or Basons, no baptism without the whole body be washed, and so as that no filth or scab hinder the water from coming to the skin, there should be no infants baptized but at the first conversion of the parent, no *Iew* should be baptized, none baptized in the night, on the Sabbath, or other Feast-day. In most of which Christ, *Iohn* the Baptist, and the Apostles varied from the *Iews*, and therefore they took not their baptism for their patern, and if they did not make the *Iews* baptism their patern in baptizing, neither are we to do so, but to follow the rule of Christs institution, and the Apostles practice,

and not the *Iews* uſe, which is not delivered in Scripture, and much of it according to the ſuperſtition and dotages of their Rabbins, and was not a meer religious Sacrament, but a kinde of mixt rite partly religious, and partly civil, intitling to Civil as well as Eccleſiaſtical right, and done by perſons Civil rather than Eccleſiaſtical, and ſo of a far different nature and uſe from the Chriſtian baptiſm. I think Dr. *Hammond* were he a Biſhop would cenſure ſuch baptizing as the *Iews* uſed as irregular, and then he may well bear with Antipaedobaptiſts, though they reject his new conceit of making the *Iewiſh* baptiſm our patern, and thereupon grounding the baptizing of infants. Himſelf in his *Practical Catechiſm lib.6. Sect.2.* allows of ſprinkling, though the *Iewiſh* cuſtome was dipping, yea they ſo preciſely require it, that it was not counted baptiſm, except the whole body were waſhed, and yet the Doctor confeſſeth, *that by Chriſts appointment the baptized was to be dipt in water*, i.e. *according to the primitive ancient cuſtom to be put under water*, *and the words* [*I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*] he ſayth, *Being by Chriſt preſcribed to his Diſciples muſt indiſpenſably be uſed.* So that when the Doctor pleaſeth, the *Jewiſh* cuſtom muſt be the patern, and when he likes it not, or the Biſhops Canons otherwiſe order it, he may vary from it: in one thing which Chriſt did not preſcribe, as the Doctor ſayth, nor did the Apoſtles that we finde ſo conceive it, yet Chriſts preſcription muſt be indiſpenſably uſed, yet in another thing though appointed by Chriſt, and according to the primitive ancient cuſtom, a diſpenſation is allowed by the Doctor, becauſe later cuſtom varies from Chriſts appointment and the primitive ancient cuſtom. Such a *Lesbian* leaden Rule the Doctor dictates by, fit for ſuch as have reſolved rather to forgo Chriſts appointment than the Biſhops Canons. It is conceived Chriſt inſtituted the Lords Supper, ſomewhat like the *Jews Poſtcœnium* after the Paſſover Shall then the *Iews* after-Supper be the patern to the Chriſtians in the Lords Supper? If ſo, the Lords Supper muſt be in private, in the night, adminiſtred by the maſter of the houſe, no more to receive than were uſually at the Paſſover, not many hundreds, *&c.* The Apoſtle *Paul* 1 *Cor.* 11.23. in the uſe of the Lords Supper, ſets down what he received from the Lord, without mentioning the *Iewiſh* uſage, which ſhews he would have

Chriſtians

Christians in that rite keep to what Christ appointed, not what the *Iews* practiced. And should it not be so in baptism also? It is conceived the use of laying on of hands in Ordination, and the term [Presbyters] were from the *Iews*: Must we then or may we take Rules from their practice in Ordination, and not ty our selves to the Apostles Canons and practice? One Presbyter or Doctor it's sayd, according to the ancient manner of the *Iews*, might create another, and sometime by an Epistle or Books an absent person might be created, as may be seen in *Selden de Syned. Ebræ. vet. l.2. c.14.* Must these usages of theirs be a patern to Christians? The use of Excommunication came from the *Iews* discipline into the Christian, yet so as that the same manner & effect was not retained in both, sayth the same Authorin the same book, *c.7.* Out of all wch I infer that in the use of those rites which were taken from the *Iews*, and brought into the Christian discipline; yet our Rule according to which Christians are to observe those rites, is to be taken from the words and example of Christ and his Apostles, which I doubt not to make it appear do no whit serve for Dr. *Hammonds* purpose.

Mr. *Marshall* in his *Defence*, p.170,171. thinks, "this to be a good Argument, that baptism belongs to infants as well as grown men, because, baptism being in use before as an Ecclesiastical rite, though it begun to be a Sacrament of divine institution when *Iohn* was sent to baptize into the name of Christ, there are special testimonies in the *Talmud*, which declare that infants both of *Iews* and Gentiles were thus admitted, the male children by Circumcision and baptism, the females by baptism, *&c.* especially since there is not the least hint given in the word that when it was thus advanced to be a Sacrament it should not be applied to those persons to whom before it was, *viz.* infants as well as grown men."

But I think Mr. *M.* cannot finde in the *Talmud* the *Iews* or their infants were thus baptized since the time of giving the Law, *Exod.*19.10: I confess the Gentiles infants were baptized as is abovesayd; yet as Mr. *Ms.* learned men mentioned in his *Defence, pag.*227. confess "that the baptism of *Iohn* and of the Pharisees was for a different end, so Dr. *Lightfoot Harmony part.*1. *pag.*138. saith, "the *Iews* baptism was clean of another nature from *Iohns*." "And in the second part of his *Harmony* on *Iohn* 1.25. *pag.*76. he shews sundry differences between them,

and cites out of the *Iewish* Doctors some of those differences before alleged; which are enough to shew that our baptism is not to be regulated by their practice. Sure it is a wonder to me that Mr. *M.* engaged to reform the worship of God according to Gods Word, and in his Sermon on 2 *Chron.* 15. 2. "Admiring that ever mortal man should dare in Gods worship to meddle any jot further than the Lord himself hath commanded," should yet in the point of infant-baptism follow the *Talmud* quite besides the Lords command. But I return to Dr. *Hammond.*

SECT. XXV.

Dr. Hammonds *elusion of Matth.* 28. 19. *alleged against infant-baptism is resolved.*

SECT. 25. *Ubi supra*, he sayth thus, "And in the New Testament I cannot foresee any words that may come under suspition of doing so, but those of *Matth.* 28, 19. Go teach all Nations, baptizing them, *&c.* And those words being duly weighed are far from doing so. For the phrase which is there used in the original is a singular one, not duly expresst by our *English* [teach] It is μαθητεύσατε, make Disciples, or receive into Discipleship all Nations, baptizing them in the Name, *&c.* making this form of baptism their ceremony of receiving them. You may see the word explained in a parallel phrase *John* 4 1. The Pharisees heard that Jesus makes more Disciples and baptizeth than *John*, μαθητὰς ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει, where to make Disciples and baptize is all one with μαθητεύσατε βαπτίζοντες, where the baptizing being immediately annexed to the making or receiving Disciples, and the receiving Disciples not supposing any precedent instruction, but, looking wholly on it as subsequent (in like manner as in this place *v.* 20. διδάσκοντες [teaching] follows after βαπτίζοντες, baptizing) all that are thus brought and received *ad discipulatum*, to be for the future instructed, and instituted in the Christian faith, may surely be received by baptism, the ceremony which is there prescribed by Christ, with which to receive Disciples. "

Answ. Though I conceive Dr. *Hammond* to ascribe more power

power to the Canons of Prelates about the Sacraments than is meet, being one who hath written in defence of the Common-prayer Book, yet by this allegation of *Matth.* 28.19. he seems tacitely to yield that if the words there include not infants under the *discipled*, then there is something in the New Testament, which excludes infants from baptism, although he say, *Sect.* 96. *I do not believe or pretend that that Precept of Christ doth necessarily infer (though it do as little deny) that infants are to be baptized.* But me thinks if the Doctor will stand to his own words elsewhere, he must acknowledg that by the precept of baptizing, *Matth.* 28. 19. infants are excluded. For the Doctor sayth, *Sect.* 55. "Christs institution makes dipping or sprinkling with water a Sacrament; which institution is *Matth.* 28.19. and therefore the Doctor will have the words there indispensably used in baptism; and *Sect.* 92. he sayth, Baptism is a Sacrament, that Sacrament an institution of Christ, that institution not founded in any reason of immutable truth, but onely in the positive will of Christ, and so that there is nothing considerable in this question, (or any of this nature) but how it was delivered by Christ. And *Sect.* 94. that which was don by the Apostles, if it were not a Rule for ever, yet was an effect of such a Rule formerly given by Christ, and interpretable by this practice to be so." And *Practical Catech. lib.* 6. *sect.* 2. he expounding Christs institution, sayth, *that the words import that the person baptized acknowledgeth, maketh profession of believing in three, delivers himself to three, as Authors of his faith, and to be ruled by the direction of this Master, and this he will have to be meant by baptizing into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.* Whence I infer, that if baptism be a Sacrament, and made so by Christs institution, and that institution founded onely in his positive will, and the will of Christ be that baptism be into the name of the Trinity, and this is when the baptized makes profession of believing in three, to be ruled by them, and the Apostles practice interprets Christs rule; no infant that doth not profess faith is baptized into the name of the Trinity, nor was appointed to be baptized by Christ, nor did the Apostles baptize them, and therefore they are not baptized according to Christs institution, and so no Sacrament to them. Yea, if the positive will of Christ be the reason of baptism, they usurp upon

Christs

Christs prerogative, who baptize otherwise than Christ hath appointed & then if the precept of Christ doth not necessarily infer infant-baptism (which the Doctor ingenuously acknowledgeth) it doth by manifest consequence deny it, sith he forbids that to be done otherwise than he hath appointed, when he hath determin'd how it should be done. The Doctor when he sayth above, *the words* [*I baptize into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*] *must be indispensably used*; me thinks by the same reason should conceive Christs institution should be unalterably used in baptizing those onely whom he hath appointed to be baptized. But let us consider what shift the Doctor makes to elude the force of Christs institution, *Matth.* 28.19. that it may not be thought to exclude infants from baptism. I grant that μαθητεύσατε is best rendred [*make Disciples*] and like it well, that he acknowledgeth [*makes Disciples, and baptizeth, John* 4.1.] *is all one with* [*making Disciples, baptizing them, Matth.* 28.19.] But I deny, 1. that μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη βαπτίζαντες αὐτούς, is well paraphrased by [*receive into Discipleship all Nations, baptizing them in the Name, &c. making this form of baptism their ceremony of receiving them*] For by it the making Disciples is made the same with receiving into Discipleship or receiving Disciples, and baptism the ceremony of receiving into Discipleship, which is as truly the act of the baptized thereby professing or avouching his Discipleship. 2. *That the making or receiving Discipleship supposeth not any precedent instruction, but looks wholly on it as subsequent.* For 1. that which in *Matthew* is expressed by, *Go ye therefore and make Disciples all Nations*, is in *Mark* 16.15. *Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature*; which shews how they should disciple all Nations. Now they who are made Disciples by preaching the Gospel are made Disciples by precedent instruction. *Ergo*, the making or receiving Disciples *Matth.* 28.19. supposeth precedent instruction. 2. Such as the making Disciples was *Ioh.* 4.1. such is the making Disciples, *Mat.* 28.19. For by the Doctors confession *they are all one.* But that was by preaching, as is plain concerning *Iohn*, *Matth.* 3.1,2,5,6. and concerning the Apostles, *Mat.* 10.5,6,7. *Ergo.* Whence, 3. I further argue, That way the Apostles were to disciple all Nations by which they were to disciple the lost sheep of the house of *Israel*, but that

was

was by preaching, *Ergo*, discipling supposeth precedent instruction. 4. From the use and notation of the word, which is to teach as that they learn, and so is used *Matth.* 13.52. μαθητευθεὶς, is rendred [*instructed*] by our last Translators, and can be no otherwise rendred than [made a Disciple by teaching] So *Acts* 14.21. it is sayd, *Having preacht the Gospel to that City,* καὶ μαθητεύσαντες, and *having taught* or *made many Disciples.* Whence, 5. it may appear how the Apostles understood the Precept of Christ to preach the Gospel to persons, and thereby make them Disciples. 6. A Disciple and a believer appear to be the same by comparing *Matth.* 28.19. with *Mark* 16.15,16. For as the way of making Disciples is more fully expressed by *preaching the Gospel*; so the Disciple to be baptized is expressed by [*the believer*] which is put before baptism. Nor is it against this that after baptism they are to be taught, *Matth.* 28.20. For that teaching is expressed to be *the teaching the observation of all that he commanded*: But the teaching that makes Disciples is the preaching the Gospel. So that the plain order and meaning of Christs words is this, that 1. the Apostles should not stay onely within the Land of *Israel*, but go into all the World. 2. That they should by preaching the Gospel, declaring that Jesus was the Christ, make them Disciples, that is, taught concerning Christ, or believers in him. 3. That they should baptize them. 4. That they should then teach them to observe all his commands. Now infants are not made Disciples by preaching the Gospel, therefore by Christs institution not appointed to be baptized, and therefore are baptized without his warrant, and consequently unlawfully.

What Dr. *Hammond* sayth *sect.* 26. were it all granted him, yet it would no whit avail to prove that an infant may be a Disciple appointed by Christ to be baptized. For let putting to school be as early as the Doctor will imagine, yet none is put to school till he doth know his Teacher, and so none is Christs Disciple in the Scripture-language till he know Jesus to be Christ, and take him for his Lord, which infants being not capable of, they are not Disciples, nor to be baptized according to Christs appointment. What he adds *s.* 27,28. is not right. For 1. it is not true, that *a Disciple and a Proselyte are perfectly all one.* For a Proselyte notes one that is by birth an alien from the Common-wealth of

Israel, and comes to the *Israelites* to own their God, and be part of their policy, not to be taught but to enjoy privileges with other *Jews*, whether Civil or Ecclesiastical. There is no mention of the Disciples of the Priests, but of the Pharisees and Sadduces; But a Disciple of Christ is one that owns Christ for his Teacher and Lord onely for spiritual benifits. Nor doth the Holy Ghost at any time call Christians Christs proselytes but his Disciples, that we might not confound the notions of these terms. And though the origination of the word [*proselyte*] be from προσερχεῖν, *to come to*, and Christ saith, *Suffer little children to come to me*, and this infers their capacity of proselytism, and the next words [*For of such is the Kingdom of God*] suppose them particularly qualified for it, yet that coming and imagined proselytism being onely for ablessing by prayer, and laying on of hands, not to be made Disciples or baptized, this will not prove them capable of being made Disciples according to Christs appointment till by hearing the Gospel they own Christ as their Master. The like may be said of *the entering into Covenant*, *Deut.* 29, 10. which though in some sense it should be yielded, that infants may enter into Covenant, that is, by their parents act engaging them under a curse or oath to own God as theirs, in which sense the posterity then unborn did enter into Covenant, *v.* 15. yet this is insufficient to prove, that such an entering into Covenant makes infants Disciples or subjects of baptism according to Christs appointment. For in it such a discipling is injoyned as is by Preaching the Gospel, and they onely are Disciples to be baptized who are believers, and they onely are appointed to be baptized who in their own persons do enter into Covenant, or engage themselves to be Christs followers.

SECT. XXVI.

Dr. Hammond *neither from* 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *nor from Sayings of Ancients proves that the Apostles baptized infants.*

HEreto Dr. *Hammond* adds, to "confirm his opinion of Christs intention to include infants in the institution of baptism for all Nations, and not to exclude them from it, the passage

1 *Cor.*

1 Cor. 7. 14. in which he imagines is a remain and footstep of the Apostles practice of baptizing infants. 2. The practice of the first and purest Ages of the Church, which received infants to baptism, and either by so doing testifie the Apostolical usage transcribed by them, or else affirm, that they received it by tradition from the Apostles. " In both which how he is mistaken remains to be shewed.

First he sets down this, which he cals *A brief Paraphrase*, though it be too large for a Paraphrase, and takes in more than he can with any colour shew to have any thing in the Text answering to it. His words of Paraphrase of 1 *Corinth.* 7. 12, 13, 14. are these.

Vers. 12. *If any Christian Husband hath an heathen Wife, and she be desirous to continue with him, he ought not to put her away, unbelief being no sufficient cause of Divorce by the Law of Christ.*

Vers. 13. *And so in like manner, for the Christian Wife that is married to an Infidel, if he be desirous to live with her, let her by no means separate from him.*

Vers. 14. *For (beside the command of Christ, Matth.* 5, 32. *which obligeth to this) other advantages there are of the believers living with the unbeleiver, worth considering. For by this means it hath oft come to pass that the unbelieving party hath been brought to the faith by the company and conversation of the believer; and considering the efficacy of good example,* 1 *Pet.* 3. 1. *and seasonable exhortation and instruction on presumption of the great zeal (and consequent endeavours and diligence) that by the Law of Christianity the Husband will have to the eternal good of any so near him, as a Wife is, there is great reason of hope that still it may be so, that their living together may produce this effect in the unbeliever, and the intuition of that (more than possible) effect may reasonably move the Christian party not to forsake the other voluntarily. And this one consideration, viz. the probability that the conversation of the believer* 1 *Pet.* 3. 1. *should gain, i. e. bring the unbeliever to the faith, and the reasonable presumption that it will be so, is the reason why the young children of Christians, which cannot as yet be deemed believers, are yet admitted to baptism, because by their living in the family with*

Christian parents they probably, and by the obligation lying on the parents ought to be brought up in the faith, and kept from heathen pollutions, and the Church requiring and receiving promise from the parents) doth reasonably presume they will. And upon this ground it is, that though the children of Christians are, yet the children of heathens are not admitted to baptism.

Answer. This Paraphrase is many ways faulty, and far from the meaning of the Apostle. 1. It puts in many things as explicatory of the Text, to which there is nothing answerable in the Apostles words. For, 1. there is nothing that answers to [*by this means it hath oft come to pass*] Nor, 2. to these words [*by the company and conversation of the believer*] yea the term [*believer*] is quite omitted by the Apostle, which considering the term [*unbeliever*] twice expressed seems to have been done wittingly, that it might not be taken, that he ascribed the sanctification to the faith of the one party. Surely when men specially in Arguments place the force of a reason in a term they use not to omit it, as the Apostle doth here, but to express it remarkably, and with *Emphasis*. 3. All the words [*and considering the efficacy of good Example, 1 Pet. 3. 1. and seasonable exhortation and instruction on presumption of the great zeal (and consequent endeavours and diligence) that by the Laws of Christianity the Husband will have to the eternal good of any so near to him as a Wife is, there is great reason of hope that it still may be so, that their living together may produce this effect in the unbeliever, and the intuition of that (more than possibly) effect, may reasonably move the Christian party not to forsake the other voluntarily*] are added without any thing in the least intimated by the words of the Text, but the contrary, even according to his exposition, who makes the term [*ἡγίασται sanctified*] refer to some past known Examples, and therfore the forepart of the verse hath not at all that which answers to [*on presumption &c. there is great reason of hope, &c.*] which import a contingent event for the future, not a thing past, which is always certain. 4. The term [*young children of Christians which cannot as yet be deemed believers*] is more and otherwise than is in the Text, which hath onely [*your children*] which is not restrained to infancy, nor doth it appear, that [*your*] doth imply they were considered as Christians, so as that there should be this

construction [*your children are holy, because they are children of Christians*] distinguishingly from infidels, but [*your children*] that is, the children of you that doubt, who have had unbelieving husbands and wives, and have had or may have children by them. So that the term [*your*] onely notes the particularity and individuation of the persons, and if considered in any respect besides, it is their doubting condition, or their having unbelieving yoke-fellows. 5. There is nothing to answer those words [*because by their living in the family with Christian parents they probably, and by the obligation lying on the parents ought to be brought up in the faith, and kept from heathen pollutions, (and the Church requiring and receiving promise from the parents) doth reasonably presume they will*] 6. Nor is there any thing answering to these words [*your children*] which his own Paraphrase applies to Christians children. So that the Doctors Paraphrase is beyond measure culpable in respect of addition.

2. It is blameable also in omitting that which the Text expresly and emphatically mentions, to wit, the terms [*Wife, Husband*] when he sayth, [*the unbelieving party hath been brought to the faith by the company and conversation of the believer*, and after, *the probability that the conversation of the believer should bring the unbeliever to the faith*] which may be meant of a companion, brother, father, mother, neighbour. 3. There is much faultiness in quite altering the importance of the Apostles words, by substituting instead of *were or should be*] in the Apostles words [*ought to be, they will be*] in the Paraphrase. Which is the more blameable in that himself *Sect.* 82. *pag.* 257. doth more truly retain the force of those expressions in the Apostle, when he sayth, [*The method of the Apostle must needs be this, unless there were, &c. 'twould certainly follow that their children were unclean*] so that the pretended brief Paraphrase of the Apostles words is very faulty, far from the Rule of a Paraphrase, and instead of explaining doth quite pervert the meaning of the words.

2. For many other reasons the exposition of the Doctor cannot be right. For 1. In his paraphrase of the Apostles resolution *v.* 12. he puts [*ought*] and of *v.* 13. [*let her by no means*] as if the Apostle did make it a necessary duty, that they must continue

together, whereas the Apostle answerably to their doubt doth onely resolve them of the lawfulness of their continuing together, not of the necessity of it, and so *v.* 14. is a reason of the lawfulness of it notwithstanding their doubt, which appears from the resolution *v.* 15. [*If the unbeliever will depart let him depart*] which cannot be expounded otherwise than thus, you are not bound to stay as you are not bound to cause her to depart or to relinquish him, you are at your liberty. For the very next words [*a Brother or Sister is not under bondage in such cases*] do shew that the resolution was of liberty, not of duty, contrary to the Doctors paraphrase. Now that resolution *v.* 15. is of the same form with his determination *v.* 12, 13. 2. He makes the resolution to be of a duty *v.* 12, 13. yet makes *v.* 14. to be a motive of the will, when he saith, [*may reasonably move*] as if the Apostle were not deciding a doubt, but perswading the will, and that from such a thing as cannot be reason of duty or liberty, but as it is by him expounded a perswasive to win on the affections, not to settle the judgment, and yet p. 207. he saith, [*the unbeliever having been sanctified by the believer is used as an argument why they should live together.*] 3. He puts [*unbelieving Husband v.* 14.] as if he were another than he that is mentioned *v.* 13. for *v.* 13. the unbelieving husband was at that present an unbeliever: But according to his sense expounding *v.* 14. thus, [*it hath oft come to pass that the unbelieving party hath been brought to the faith by the company and conversation of the believer*] the unbelieving husband must be meant of one that was once an unbeliever, not so then. Now then the Apostle should after this exposition give a reason why the present believing wife need not leave her husband, because another unbelieving husband by another believing wife hath been brought to the faith. Which wherein it could tend to any satisfaction for them that doubted whether they might lawfully live together because of the present unbelief of the yokefellow I see not. 4. Such a reason will appear the more unlikely to be satisfactory, because as it hath often happened that the unbeliever hath been won by the wife, so it hath often happened to the contrary, and it is likely the persons whom he resolved had complained, that they had small hopes of their husbands conversion, and so the reason of their living together from experience

would

would be more likely to be retorted back thus, You perſwde us to live together, you tell us we may, becauſe it often comes to paſs that the unbeliever is brought to the faith: But our experience is to the contrary, we ſee many not converted, and our own are obſtinate and hardned, and therefore this reaſon doth diſſwade us, and reſolve us that we may not live with him. 5. Hence another exception is againſt this expoſition, that it makes the Apoſtle to reſolve them of their duty or liberty by that which was a meer contingent event which might be or not be. For this expoſition makes the reaſon of their living together to be from what had hapened & might be: whereas a contingent event is impertinent to that end, to ſay, we may lawfully do ſuch a thing, becauſe its likely ſuch a good effect may follow. A contingent event is unfit to reſolve of the lawfulneſs or unlawfulneſs of a thing without ſome other rule, things being unlawfull or lawfull not according to diſagreement from or agreement to Gods will of purpoſe what ſhall be, but his will of Command what he requires to be omitted or done. Beſides this contingent event here was uncertain as appears *v.* 16. *what knoweſt thou?* implies, thou canſt not tell whether thou ſhalt ſave thy husband? Perhaps thou mayſt. Nor doth the Apoſtle mention any promiſe it ſhould be ſo, but mentions it onely as a contingent event that might be or not be. 6. Beſides it is from ſuch an event as is impertinent to the lawfulneſs or unlawfulneſs of living together. For the paſt converſion of others and the future converſion of our own yoke-fellows is meerly extrinſecal to our duty or liberty, though it be much to our conveniency, and therefore it is fitly urged *v.* 16. after the reſolution of the judgment *v.* 12, 13, 14 15. Is there any ſhew of reaſon why I ſhould live with my own unbelieving husband, becauſe anothers unbelieving husband was converted by her, or beeauſe there is great reaſon of hope it will be ſo with mine? This would intimate that future events make our preſent ſtate or acts lawfull or unlawfull, which is ſomewhat like the *Turks* conceit who judged, that pleaſeth God which ſucceeds proſperouſly, and that to diſpleaſe, which fals out unhappily. 7. According to this Expoſition, *v.* 14. ſhould be the ſame Argument with *v.* 16. and ſo there ſhould be an unneceſſary re-

Knolls Hiſtory of the *Turks* in *Solyman* the magnificent.

petition of the same Argument. 8. By this exposition the sanctifying of an unbeliever should be ascribed to a woman, whereas (though I deny not that she is said *to save*, *v.* 16. *to win*, 1 *Pet.* 3. 1. *to convert*, *James* 5. 20.) sanctifying is never ascribed to any but God and his Spirit. So 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. *Ye are sanctified by the Spirit of our God.* 9. The word [*holy*] is expounded in a sense no where else found, nor is there any reason of that sense by way of allusion or otherwise given by the Doctor, though according to him a known fact is expressed which had another appellation used commonly even in that Epistle, *ch.* 1. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. & 12. 13. For he expounds [*holy*] by [*are admitted to baptism*] and so makes the Apostle in narration of a fact to use a term to express what was in his conceit well known to them by a term not imagined to note the thing elsewhere, when there was another term [*baptized*] used in the same Epistle and familiar to them. 10. He makes the Apostle to infer the lawfulness or duty of living together from that contingent event, which might with like probability be brought to pass by another than the believing yoke-fellow, even by the endeavour of a Father, Mother, Brother, Sister, Companion, especially a Preacher of the Gospel. So that if this reason were of force to conclude husband and wife might live together, because one may bring the other to the faith, the reason might be as good for Father and Daughter, Son and Mother, Brother and Sister, Companions, Preacher and people to couple or live together, because it hath been and there is great reason to hope one may convert the other. 11. According to his exposition the Apostles speeches were not right. For according to him the meaning should be unless there were cohabiting, and there had been an unbelieving husband brought to the faith by the wife, and *vice versa* the *Corinthians* children could not reasonably be presumed to be admitted to baptism. 2. Upon this ground that an unbelieving husband was brought to the faith by the wife and *vice versa*, and there is great reason it might be so for the future the children of believing *Corinthians* unequally matched were admitted to baptism, Himself *p.* 9. 2, 7. saith *This must needs be the method of the Apostles arguing unless there were some hope, that the cohabiting of a believer should be a means to bring an unbeliever to the faith: would certainly follow, their children were unclean,*

that

that is not admitted to baptism. Now I think all Pædobaptists will disclaim as manifestly false this proposition, That the believing *Corinthians* young children were not or could not be, or it could not be reasonably presumed they should be admitted to baptism, till the unbelieving yoke-fellow were converted, or without hopes or reasonable presumption, that he might be won to the faith by the believer. It is such a toy as I cannot imagine they will own when they discern it. If they do they must quite change their plea and practise about infant baptism, their plea being from the imagined federal holines of the childe of one believer without consideration of the others present or future faith, and their practise being to baptize infants of one believer, though the other parent died or should die in professed unbelief. And for the other proposition it is a like false, that whether νῦν ἅ, note as much as *hoc posito, upon this ground* as the Doctor expresseth it, or to be an Adverb of time noting when their children were holy it is most false, that upon the ground of hopes of cohabiting and the conversion of the unbelieving, yoke-fellow, and experience of what happened, the *Corinthian* believers yonger children not deemed yet believers, were admitted to baptism, or were reasonably presumed to be admitted, or that they were then admitted to baptism when the unbelieving husband was converted, or likely to be converted by the believing wife and not before. This proposition I make no question other pædobaptists will disclaim, nor need I any other proof against his sense than his own words against another interpretation brought in as the Anabaptists, though I know none that so interpret it. I use his own words *pag.* 257. *sect.* 82. *mutatis mutandis. Now I demand of this pretended interpretation, whether it be possible* Saint *Pauls argument should conclude in this sense? Suppose* the *Corinthian* parents of these younger children *had been one a believer, and the other an unbeliever, could it of them be concluded, if they did not upon the hope of doing good one upon the other cohabit, their children could not be* holy by designation of the Church in baptism, to which when they are brought by the congregation and admitted by the Minister they are thus consecrated and devoted to God? *This were absolutely to confine the Churches designations* to holines and the Ministers admissions thereto *to none but the children of believers, as if the*

childe of parents whereof one is a believer were not thus holy, and admitted to baptism without experience of what hath been done in converting the unbeliever by the believer, and hopes it should be so. *It is known* that admission to baptism depends upon Christs institution, *not upon such accidental conditions as is the cohabiting of the parents*, the experience of the converting some unbeliever by the believing yoke-fellow, and hopes so of theirs. 12. Unto all these I add, that I never read or heard any Expositor antient or modern so expounding, as this Doctor or Dictator doth, nor do I think he can shew any. Sure I am *Augustin. tom. 7. de pecc. merito & remiss. c. 26.* saith, *Ac per hoc et illa sanctificatio cujuscunque modi sit, quam in filiis fidelium esse dixit Apostolus ad istam de baptismo & peccati origine vel remissione quæstionem omninò non pertinet.*

But let us consider what Dr. *Hammond* brings for this Paraphrase, *Sect.* 32. he speaks thus, *That this is the true importance of the Apostles words, and force of his arguing doth for the former part of it appear evident. First, by the word ἡγίασται, hath been sanctified, which must needs refer to some past known examples and experiences of this kinde, or else there could be no reasonable account given of the Apostles setting it in the Preter-tense.*

Answ. As Dr. *Hammonds* Paraphrase expresseth it, ἡγίασται should signifie not onely that an unbelieving husband hath been sanctified, but also that there is hope they will, and so it should note, not onely some example past, but also some to come, of which there can be a less reasonable account given than of putting it in the Present-tense in *English*.

But sayth he, *It is put in the Preter-tense in* Greek.

Answ. I presume the Doctor knows that *enallage* or change of Tense is frequent in Languages, even in the *Greek*, though it abound in Tenses above other Languages. In the same Epistle *c.* 11. 24 κλαύσιον in the Present-tense is put for the Future, even in the same Verse ἀναμάρτητα ἐστὶν, is rendred by Dr. *Hammond* himself, *Else were your children unclean*, so that ἐστὶν must be put for ἦν or εἶεν, & so an Enallage either of Tense or Mood, or both. And in the very next vers. κεκάλωται is manifestly put in the Præter-tense for the Present, as all Interpreters I know render it, & the same *enallage* or change

of

of Tense *Camerarius* conceives in the term ἡγιάσται. And, which is chiefest, this sense seems to befit it best, there being no plainer and cleaner than this, *Therefore the believer may live with the unbelieving yoke-fellow; because the Husband though an infidel, yet is to his own Wife, in respect of her, and to her conjugal use, as if he were sanctified.* But if it be in the Præter-tense, yet it may be understood of a past thing yet continued, as κέκριται, *John* 3.18. notes an act still continued in force. So that notwithstanding the Doctors conceit, yet there may be a very reasonable account given without understanding it of an Example of another person sanctified heretofore by another Wife, which is very far from the Apostles meaning, as I shew before.

Secondly, sayth he, *by the Phrase* ἐν τῇ γυναικὶ, *by or through the Wife. This the Preposition* ἐν, *so ordinarily signifies, that it cannot need to be farther testified, (in this notion it is that we here take it) whereas the notion which by opposers is here affixt to it, that it should signifie to (that to which is a sign of the Dative-case) [sanctified to the Wife, (as meat to the believer) made lawfull to her to live with] is never once found to belong to it, in the New Testament, nor can with any tolerable congruity or Grammatical analogy be affixt to it. All the places that are produced for this sense are commonly mistaken. So Matth.17.12.* [ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ] *is not* fecerunt ei, *they have done to him, but on him or against him: so as* ἐν *is used for* εἰς, *which is an ordinary acception of it. So Acts* 4.12. *There is no name* δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις, *it is not* [*given unto men*] *but among men: and that is an ordinary notion of* ἐν, *for among,* εἰ θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν, *Is God among us? and* χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, *Christ among us, and many the like. So* 1 *Cor.* 7.15. *God hath called us,* ἐν εἰρήνῃ: *It is not to, as the note of a Dative-case, but unto peace, as* ἐν *is again taken for* εἰς. *So Gal.* 1.16. *to reveal his own Son,* ἐν ἐμοὶ: *It is not* [*to me*] *but* [*by or through me to others*] *as it follows, that I might preach him. And when it there follows,* ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, *it is not* [*to but again among the Gentiles*] *And* 2 *Pet.* 1.5. χορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν ἀρετὴν, *is Add unto your faith virtue, &c. in the notion of* ἐν *for* εἰς, *unto your faith, or over and above that,* ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἀρετὴν, *superadd virtue, or fortitude, or constancy, that which in this time of persecution they stood so much in need of. And so still the*

rendring it [to the Wife] will be without any one example, and the turning it quite into another phrase, as if it were γυναικὶ, *without* ἐν; *which to do without any necessity or reason (save onely* δυλόυν ὑποδύσει, *to serve the opposers turn upon the place, and support his false opinion, must needs be very unreasonable.*

Answ. I subscribe to this last speech: But all that the Doctor saith makes me not to recede from the rendering of ἐν, 1 *Cor.* 7.14. [*to*] as noting the Dative case, and being redundant. Not out of any necessity to serve my turn: For if it be read [*in the wife* and expounded as *Beza* doth *Annot. In locum respectu uxoris, in respect of the wife*, expounding [*is or hath been sanctified in the wife*] thus, hath been or is enioyed in coniugal use lawfully in respect of his wife, it will as well serve my turn. And in this sense ἐν, is as much as *erga* towards, *apud* with, and is as much as εἰς *in*, the sense that ἐν and εἰς are used, 2 *Cor.* 13.3. ἐν ὑμῖν, *v.*4. εἰς ὑμᾶς. But it will not serve the Doctors turn unless he can prove that [ἐν] must be renderd [by] and notes the instrument, yea and [*by the wife*] must signify [*by the company and conversation of the believer*] which supplement is not yet proved, nor do I think can be proved to be necessary. The reason why I still adhere to the reading of [ἐν *to*] is, 1. Because it seems to me the fairest, easiest, and most congruous sense thus to expound it. *The believer may abide with the unbelieving yoke-fellow. For though he be an unbeliever, and so in himself unsanctified, yet in or to the wife or his wife he is as if he were sanctified, it's all one in respect of lawfull conjugal use as if he were sanctified.* 2. Because, though the Doctor deny it, yet I aver the notion of [ἐν for *to* as a sign of the Dative case] is found more than once in the New Testament, and may with good congruity and Grammatical analogy be affixt to it. Of the which places the first he brings cannot be eluded. 1. Because the same speech which is *Mat.* 17.12. ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ is *Mark* 9.13. ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ, and rendered by *Beza* in the former place *fecerunt ei they did to him.* 2. whereas he saith ἐν is used for εἰς *on him or against him*, and that *this is an ordinary acception of* ἐν for εἰς, I grant that it is an ordinary acception to use ἐν for εἰς, but not in the sense he here conceives, to wit as εἰς notes [*on or against a person.*] It had been meet the Doctor should have given at least one instance of such a construction, which I do

not

not yet believe he can do. However if he could, yet me thinks it should satisfie that ἐν αὐτῷ, notes no more than αὐτῷ, and is a sign of the Dative case, because *Mark*, who seems to have abbreviated *Matthew*, so expresseth it; and the common use of ποιεῖν, when it notes dealings of man to man whether good or bad is usually expressed by the Dative case: as *Matth.*7.12, & 18.12. & 20.32. & 21.36,40. & 25.40,45. There is another instance which I conceive cannot be eluded, to wit, *Col.*1.23. τῷ κηρυχθέντι ἐν πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει, *which was preached in every creature.* Where, 1. There is no other sense than that of the Dative case that hath any tolerable conguity or Grammatical analogy affixt to it. Mr. *Den's* conceit of preaching the Gospel in the Sun, Moon, &c. is so wild that I presume, it will be easily rejected. For let men imagine the most they can of Gods grace discernible in the creature, yet the Gospel in which Christians hope and of which *Paul* was a Minister is not discernible thereby. Nor is here any place for those conceits of putting [*in*] *for on, against, among, over and above* or the like] For the use of κηρύσσω, *to preach*, is commonly with a Dative case of the object, as 1 *Cor.*9.27. 1 *Pet.*3.19. *Acts* 8.5. & 10.42. *Luke* 4.18. I deny not but 1 *Tim.* 3.16. it is ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν. But our Translators have there rendered it [*unto the Gentiles*] the vulgar [*prædicatum est gentibus*] Beza [*prædicatus est gentibus*] as if there it noted onely the Dative case. And if there it should be [*among the Gentiles*] yet it cannot be so *Col.*1.23. because the object is in the singular number: But ἐν when it is for [*among*] is joyned still to a noune of the plural. It is true 1 *Thes.*2.9. it is ἐκηρύξαμεν εἰς ὑμᾶς, but *unto you* is no more than *to you*, and shews not onely ἐν but εἰς also notes the same with the Dative case without either preposition. 2. That which puts this thing out of all doubt the phrase *Col.*1.23. answers (as *Beza Camerarius, Piscator*, &c. conceive, and me thinks none should deny) to that *Mark* 16.15. where our Lord Christ bids κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει, *preach the Gospel to every creature*, and there that which was expressed by ἐν *Col.*1.23. is expressed onely by the Dative case without it *Mark* 16.15. nor do I yet conceive but that δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις, *Acts* 4.12 is better rendered [*to men*] than *among men.*] 1. Because the verb δίδωμι in the several voyces and other verbs of giving have most regularly and constantly

ſtantly a Dative of the perſon after them, as both Grammarians in their *Syntaxes* teach, & many inſtances in the New Teſtament prove, as *Acts* 3.16. & 4.29. & 5.31. 32. & 7.5,8,10,25,28. Beſides many more there and throughout the ſacred Writings. 2. Becauſe if it had been [*among men*] it had been to be placed after ἕτερον, *other*; for ſo the ſenſe would have been clear, *there is no other name among men given*, but being placed after *given*, it is to be expounded as referred to *given*, not to *other*, and ſo muſt not be read *among men*, but *to men*. 3. It ſeems to me not good ſenſe, or not true, that Chriſt was a name given among men; for though he were among men, yet he was given from above. 4. To all which I add the words of *Beza Annot. in Act. Apoſt. c.4. v.12. Inter homines*, ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, *Hebr.* בְּאָדָם *beadam, id eſt, hominibus ut rectè convertit vetus interpres, & Irenæus quoque lib.3. cap.12. ſicut infra 7.44.* ἐν τοῖς παρέσιν, *non aliùs declarat quàm* παρέσιν. *Camerarius* renders it, *Attributum hominibus*. And for the other Text *Gal.1.16.* Me thinks the Doctors expoſition makes the Apoſtle tautologize ineptly, when he expounds *when it pleaſed God to reveal his Son*, ἐν ἐμοὶ, *not to me, but by or through me to others*. For what is it to reveal his Son by him or through him to others, but to preach the Goſpel to them? And is it not then to tautologize to ſay, when it pleaſed God, that I ſhould preach the Son of God to others that I might preach the Goſpel? Can preaching the Goſpel be fitly ſayd to be the end or conſequent of preaching the Son of God which is all one with preaching the Goſpel? And for 2 *Pet.1.5.* ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει, there is no reaſon to imagine ἐν to be put for εἰς, ſith the ſimple and compound are uſually put with the Dative after them, as 2 *Cor.9.10. Gal.3.5.* and in other Authors. Nor do I finde εἰς τινὰ, or τὶ χορηγεῖν, in any Author, and what the Doctor obſerves, that ἐπιχορηγήσατε notes *ſuperadde*, it rather confirms it, that as ἐπὶ notes *over*, ſo ἐν notes *to*; nor is the Doctor I ſuppoſe ignorant of that Rule in Grammar, *Verba addendi, ſupplendi regunt Dativum*. Beſides theſe I have alleged in the firſt part of this *Review* ſ.11.*pag.*96. out of the *Septuagint. Deut.*28.60. 2 *Kings* 7.27. plain paſſages of putting ἐν, ſo as to note the Dative caſe, with the ſpeeches of ſome learned men, whereto I add that *Pſal.*68.18. that which the *Septuagint* hath ἔλαβες δόματα ἐν ἀν-

ἀνθρώποις, the Apostle hath *Ephes.* 4.8. ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, which I take to be more than enough to refute the Doctors speech *that the notion wherein ἐν signifies* To, *which is a sign of the Dative case is never once found to belong to it in the New Testament, nor can with any tolerable congruity or Grammatical analogy be affixt to it*, and that he talks *ad randum*, when he intimates, that by construing it so, 1 *Cor.* 7.14. ther's a turning it quite to another phrase to serve the turn upon the place. The Doctor goes on thus.

*Thirdly, this appears most irrefragably, by the express words added on this Argument, v.*16. *where* [*the unbelievers having been sanctified by the believer*] (*used as an Argument why they should live together*) *is farther explained by these words of an undoubted perspicuous sense; For what knowest thou O Wife whether thou shalt save thy Husband? Or how knowest thou O Husband whether thou shalt save thy Wife? where the word σώζειν, save. which ordinarily signifies to reduce, as it is* 1 *Pet.* 3.1. κερδῆσαι, *to gain*) *to repentance from heathenism or wicked life is set parallel to ἁγιάζειν, sanctifying, and makes it clear what was meant by it.*

Answ. However the Doctor conceive, yet doth it not appear to me probably, much less irrefragably by express words, that *v.*16. is added further as an explanation of the words, *v.*14. *The unbelieving Husband hath been sanctified in the Wife.* For, 1. though some conceive *v.*15. to be put parenthetically as *Grotius*, and that *v.*16 belongs to the matter of *v.*12,13,14. yet *Beza*, *Piscator*, and others conceive that *v.*16. hath reference to the words *v.*15. *God hath called us to peace*, that is, to live peaceably together, & as an encouragement thereto *v.*14. is added: none that I know besides the Doctor makes *v.*16. to explain the forepart of *v.*14. 2. Nor is there likelihood that the Apostle doth use *v.*16. as an explanation of the forepart of *v.*14. it being not his wont to express a thing obscurely, and than presently to express it more plainly, or to use unnecessary repetitions in such short resolutions as are here, especially there being not any thing mystical in it, but matter of fact. 3. If he had made *v.*16. an explanation of the words *v.*14. *The unbelieving husband hath been sanctified in the wife and vice versâ*, he would have used τὸ-

τὸν

τέκνα, as *Rom.*9.8. or some such like term; But he useth 1 *Cor.* 7.16. the expression τί γὰρ, *For how knowest thou?* Which plainly sheweth it to be a further argument to move them to live together, not an explanation of a former speech: for [γὰρ *for*] is a particle shewing it to be a further reason of it. 4. It to me appears irrefragably, because according to the Doctors exposition *v.*16. doth not explain the forepart of *v.*14. For according to him the word [*hath been sanctified*] must needs *refer to some past known examples* and experiments of converting of other unbelieving yoke-fellows by the believing parties, or else sayth he, *There could be no reasonable account given of the Apostles setting it in the Præter-tense.* But *v.*16. *For what knowest thou O Wife whether thou shalt save thy Husband? Or how knowest thou O man whether thou shalt save thy Wife?* Mentions a thing to be, and that as a possible but not certain event, and that concerning one that is an unbeliever. Now that the words mentioning a possible uncertain event concerning others should explain the words that speak of a thing past about others is out of my reach: Surely it seems to me ridiculous to paraphrase, *v.*14. *The unbelieving Husband hath been sanctified in the Wife,* thus, *For what knowest thou O Wife whether thou shalt save thy Husband?* and therefore I take the Doctors conceits in this to be his dotage.

The Doctor adds, *Sect.*33. *Which being once yielded to be the true meaning of the first part, there will then be little reason to doubt but that this of the admission of the Christian children to baptism on this score, is the importance of the later part, that and no other being it, which exactly accords with the former reasoning, and it being not imaginable, that this should be here added in that argumentative stile* [ἐπεὶ ἄρα, *whereas* (or for) *elsewere, &c. if it were not an enforcing of the foregoing Position thus proved by him.*

Answ. It is true the style is argumentative, and [ἐπεὶ ἄρα, else were] shews the latter part of the verse, 1 *Cor.*7.14. to be an inforcing of the foregoing posi ion of the same verse asserted, I say not proved by him. But that this exposition [*else were your children unclean. that is, not admitted to baptism, but now they are holy, that is, admitted to Christian baptism*] exactly accords with the former reasoning yielded, so as that the Doctors para-

phrase

phraſe being once yielded to be the true meaning of the firſt part there will be little reaſon to doubt but that this, of the admiſſion of the Chriſtian children to baptiſm on this ſcore is the importance of the later part, is ſo far from having any colour of truth, that in my apprehenſion the Doctors expoſition makes the Apoſtles words *Are nam ſine calce, ſand without lime*, that is without connexion. For what ſhew of connexion is there in this conſequence, *If ſome other unbelieving yoke-fellow had not been converted by the faith, diligence and converſation of the believing party that then was, then the children of you who are believers, but begotten or brought forth by one that yet is an unbeliever had not been admitted to Chriſtian baptiſm in infancy: but now, that is upon this ſcore that ſome former unbelieving yoke-fellows have been brought to the faith of Chriſt by the faith, converſation and diligence of the believer, they have been admitted to baptiſm?* According to the tenour of this reaſoning theſe propoſitions ſhould be included in the Apoſtles argument. *The children of a believing yoke-fellow who is joyned to an unbeliever had not been admitted to Chriſtian baptiſm, if ſome other believing yoke-fellow had not been brought to the faith. The children of a believer by a unbelieving yoke-fellow have been admitted to Chriſtian baptiſm by reaſon that it hath been uſual that other believers have brought the unbeliever to the faith.* Whence will follow. 1. That at the firſt converſion of a people, at which time there is no experiment of ſuch events of the believing yoke-fellows bringing the infidel to the faith, then the infants of the believer were not admitted to Chriſtian baptiſm: which is directly contrary to the *Jewiſh* batizing infants of proſelytes, which is onely at firſt converſion, which yet the Doctor will have the patern of our Chriſtian baptiſm. 2. That the Doctor derives a title to baptiſm of this believers infant children from the diligence and happy ſucceſs which another believer hath had, which is a thing meerly extrinſecal to the inſtitution of baptiſm. For where did ever Chriſt ſay, Baptize thoſe or their children who are yoke-fellows to unbelievers, for ſome other believing yoke-fellows have had good ſucceſs in converting their yoke-fellows to the faith? I can hardly forbear to call ſuch reaſoning *à baculo ad angulum*. On the other ſide, the Doctors expoſition makes the children of the believer

joyned to the unbeliever not capable of Christian baptism, if there had not been some experiment of a believer bringing to the faith the unbelieving yoke-fellow, and some hopes that the present unbeliever would become a Christian by the diligence of the other yoke fellow, which would exclude the believers childe from baptism whose yoke-fellow is deceased in unbelief, and so the conversion of that person is hopeless. So that what ever pretences are made for infant-baptism, no children (according to the Doctors exposition) of a believer can be rightly baptized without proof of such experiment of the converting of the unbeleiving yoke-fellow by the believer; it would not suffice that the conversion be by a Minister, *&c.* Now this being rare and hard to prove, it will certainly make questionable, if not void most of the pretended infant-baptisms that are. Confident I am that no Pædobaptist ancient or modern besides the Doctor ever asserted Pædobaptism on this score, which is the onely ground, if the Doctors exposition of the Apostle be right. The Ancients did admit to baptism any ones childe whether Pagans or Believers being brought to them, as I shew in my *Examen part.* 1. *sect.* 8. But I need say no more to refute this exposition being the most unlikely of all that I have hitherto met with.

He tels us *Sect.* 34. *What is thought fit to be brought for the eluding and avoiding this interpretation will be most fitly considered anon in answer to the Anabaptists plea.*

Answ. The falsly so called Anabaptists have not allowed Dr. *Jeremiah Taylour* to make their plea, nor do they all, if any of them frame their plea as he lays it, yet it is shewed above, that the Reply Dr. *Hammond* makes to overthrow their pretended answer overthrows his own exposition.

But he goes on, *Mean while for the confirming of it, it may be remembered, what ἅγιος, holy is known to signify in the sacred dialect, not onely an inherent, but a relative holiness, being separate or set apart to God, discriminated from common ordinary things, or persons, and as that belongs to higher degrees of separation, the office of a Prophet or the like, so the lowest degree of it is that of being received to be members of the Church, into which all are initiated by baptism. And accordingly, all visible professors, and not onely those that are sincerely such, are in* Ezra

9. 2.

9.2. *the holy seed, and in the Epistles of the Apostles called* ἅγιοι, *holy.*

Answ. This being all granted confirms not Dr. *Hammonds* exposition, *now they are holy that is admitted to Christian baptism.* The Doctor knows its no good argument *à genere ad speciem affirmative*, the children are holy that is set a part for God, discriminated from common ordinary things or persons, *Ergo* they are set apart by the special way of baptism. And it being granted that all visible professors, and not onely those that are sincerely such are in *Ezra* 9.2. *the holy seed, and in the Epistles of* Paul *called holy* (though that term *Ezra* 9.2. hath a far different notion, as I shew in this *Review Antipæd. part.* 1. *sect.* 13,25. from what the Doctor imagines) yet till the Doctor prove infants to be visible professors he hath not confirmed, that the taking of [*holy* 1 *Cor.* 7.14.] for [*infants admitted to baptism*] is agreeable to the Apostles language.

He adds *Sect.* 35. *And secondly how the word* ἀκάθαρτα, *unclean, is used by* St. Peter, *Acts* 10.14. *for those that must not* (*as he conceived*) *be received into the Church, as* [*Gods having cleansed*] *is Gods reputing them fit to be partakers of that privilege. Whereby it appears how fitly receiving and not receiving to baptism may be expressed by those phrases.*

Answ. I deny not the fitness of the expressing receiving and not receiving to baptism by the terms of holy and unclean, if the Holy Ghost had so thought good. But sure the Doctor is mistaken in the notion of unclean, *Acts* 10.14. For it is plain from *Acts* 11.3. that an unclean person is in that place one that was not onely out of the Church, but also one that a *Jew* conceived he might neither go into, nor eat with him, yea though he were a Proselyte of the Gate, and owned the God of *Israel.* Now then if the same notion of unclean and holy be 1 *Cor.* 7.14. as is *Acts* 10.14. an unclean person is one that a man may not go into, nor eat with. which applied to infants is ridiculous; else if the unbelieving yoke-fellow had not been sanctified, that is, brought to the faith by the conversation and diligence of the believer your children had been unclean, that is, such as they might not go in to, nor eat with them, but now their infants are holy, such as they might go in to and eat with them.

Thirdly, sayth he, *how the word* קדש *which is ordinarily to sanctifie, doth among the* Jews (*whence this word* ἁγια, *is taken*) *as when the high Priests washing his hands and his feet ten times on the day of Expiation is called* עשרה קדושין *ten sanctifications, Joma, cap. 3. sect. 3. which being the word which denotes the washing some part of the body, and distinguished in use from the* טבולה *which is the immersion of the whole body, may perhaps be an intimation, that the primitive baptisms were not always immersions of the whole body, but that sprinkling of some part the literal importance of the* קדושין *sanctifications might be sufficient.*

Answ. If this reason were good, it would rather confirm this exposition [*The unbelieving Husband hath been sanctified by the Wife, that is, the unbelieving Husband hath been baptized by the Wife or washed*] than this, the children are baptized, for they are not sayd to be sanctified, but to be holy. And then the Apostle relates it as a thing oft used among Christians, that believing Wives did baptize or wash unbelieving Husbands: which so expounded is a plain testimony for womens baptism of their own unbelieving Husbands, & so hath better ground from this Text than infant baptism. What the Doctor draws in besides the business, to put some colour on their sprinkling instead of baptism, is but a fig-leaf too narrow to cover the nakedness of their practice. The Doctor himself *pag.* 180. makes *the baptism which was a* Jewish *solemnity, the washing of the whole body.* And *Sect.* 71. *pag.* 185, 186. he sayth, Jethro *was made a Proselyte by immersion or baptism in waters, and the manner of this immersion is sayd to be that they should be set up to the neck in water.* And *pag.* 184. *Unless he be* טבול *baptized he is a Gentile.* And out of *Arrian* the *Jewish* Proselyte is called βεβαμμένος, *dipped, and he that is onely so in shew not indeed,* ψευδοβαπτισης, *a counterfeit baptized person.* In his *Pract. Catech. lib.* 6. *sect.* 2. *By Christs appointment whosoever should be thus received into his family should be received with this ceremony of water, therein to be dipt,* i. e. *according to the primitive ancient custom to be put under water three times.* His words following intimating as *if sprinkling were appointed by Christ instead of it,* are his own figment. *Pag.* 35. he makes *the ancient manner of putting the person under water, and then taking him*

out

out again, to denote dying and rising again, with more of the like confessions, and even in this place sayth, *the washing some part of the body is distinguished in use from the* טבולה (which answers to the *Greek* word Baptism) *which is immersion of the whole body.* And yet the Doctor is not ashamed to say, *that primitive baptisms were not always immersions of the whole body,* (which me thinks he should hardly believe himself in) and because the besprinkling of some part, (which I think is not true, if sprinkling by water and not bloud or ashes be meant, for the Priests in their sanctifications dipped their hands and feet in water) is called קדושין sanctifications, to intimate *as if any kinde of sanctification of a part of the body though but by sprinkling with water were baptism.* It is a like abuse when Christ bids baptize, to sprinkle onely or pour water on the face as it would be, when he bids to eat, onely to chew in the mouth; or when he bids to drink, to wet the lips onely. But that to sprinkle is not to baptize, is elsewhere asserted, *Addition to the Apology, Sect.* 22.

The Doctor goes on in his dictating way thus. *Fourthly, it is known of the legal uncleannesses, contrary to those their sanctifications, that they were the cause of removing men from the congregation, they that were so ἀνάβαπτοι, unclean, might not partake of the privileges of the Temple, till they were washed and sanctifyed, and that is proportionable also to the notion here given of it, that the Christian children are holy,* i.e. *not inherently, (they are not capable) but in the account of God and men capable of separation for the service of God, of being entered into the Church, into Covenant, which denominates men holy, (as the Gentiles as long as they were out of it were unclean and unholy, Acts* 10.) *now are they holy,* i.e. *it is the present practice of the Church, that Apostolical Church of S.* Pauls *time, to admit to baptism such infant-children of Parents of whom one is Christian, though not of others.*

Answ. It is sayd without proof, that the uncleanness excluding from the Tabernacle and sanctification restoring are proportionable to the notion here given of childrens being excluded or included in the Church. Why should *Cornelius* be counted out of the Church by God or men, when God sayth, *He was a devout man, and one that feared God, with all his house, who gave much alms to the*

people, and prayed to God always, Acts 10.2. It's true, he was excluded from the familiar ſociety of the *Jews* according to their ſuperſtition, and ſo unclean, but not accounted by God to be out of the Church, but in it. *That Chriſtians children are denied to be capable of holineſs inherently,* will not be granted him, much leſs his paraphraſe on the words [*now are they holy*] i. e. *it is the preſent practice of the Church that Apoſtolical Church of S.* Pauls *time to admit to baptiſm ſuch infant children of parents, &c.* It will not ſtand with his own expoſition, as hath been ſhewed, and it makes the Apoſtle relate a matter of plain fact in obſcure terms. *Auguſtin* did diſclaim this interpretation *Hierom* and *Ambroſe* gave another, and ſo did *Tertullian de animâ, cap.* 39. what he adds is frivolous. *And to put all out of queſtion, the aneient Fathers which certainly knew the ſacred Dialect, call baptiſm ſanctification. So* Cyprian Epiſt. 59. Eum qui natus eſt baptizandum & ſanctificandum, *He that is born muſt be baptized and ſanctified; where baptizing is ſanctifying of infants. So* Greg. Nazian. Orat. 40. Edit. Bill. pag. 658. Κρεῖσσον ἁγιασθῆναι ἢ ἀπιλθεῖν ἀσρεάγιςα, *'Tis better to be ſanctified without ſenſe of it,* I. e. *baptized in infancy when they are not ſenſible of it, than to depart or die without the ſeal of baptiſm. And again pag.* 648. ἐκ βρέφους ἁγιασθήτω, *let him be ſanctified from the infancy,* I. e. *baptized then. And many the like.*

For 1. That the Ancients of the third or fourth Century knew certainly the ſacred Dialect eſpecially the Latin Doctors, me thinks the Doctor ſhould know them better than to aſſert it. He ſure is not ignorant that in multitudes of things later writers do finde their many miſtakes about the ſacred Dialect, and how few of them had any skil in *Hebrew* or *Greek* the Doctor is not ignorant I preſume. 2. In this very thing if thoſe Fathers certainly knew the ſacred Dialect and from their uſe *Paul* muſt be interpreted, then the word [*ſanctified*] not the word [*holy*] (for the Doctor doth not ſhew they uſed the word [*holy* for [*baptized*] but the word [*ſanctified*]) muſt be 1 *Cor.* 7.14. as much as [*baptized*] and then the ſenſe is, The unbelieving husband is baptized by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is baptized by the husband, of the abſurdity of which interpretation I need ſay no more.

The Doctor proceeds *ſect.* 37. thus. *This paſſage thus being*

thus

thus interpreted, is a clear proof of the point in hand. And were not this the importance of it there were no privilege imaginable, no ſanctity, which could be attributed to the infants of Chriſtians which would not belong to the infants of heathens alſo, which yet is here diſtinctly affirmed of the one and denied of the other by the Apoſtle.

Anſw. How abſurd the Doctors interpretation is hath been ſhewed before, yet were it granted him it would not be a clear proof for infant-baptiſm, unleſs [*your children*] were all one with [*your infants*] which will not be cleared till it be ſhewed that the *Corinthian* Chriſtians had then no children but infants, or that he meant no other under that term then the infants. Which ſure is not according to the *Jewiſh* pattern, in which they baptized Proſelytes children if females under twelve, if males under thirteen, not according to their will, but of the Father or court to which they were ſubject, I add, if the Apoſtle ſhould by [*holy*] underſtand a privilege where upon they were baptized he ſhould conceive otherwiſe than the *Jews* did, who conceived all unclean, whom they baptized, till by baptiſm they cleanſed them and made them holy. And for what he ſayth *that no privilege imaginable &c.* I anſwer, 1. By denying that the Apoſtle there attributes a privilege or ſanctity belonging to the infants of Chriſtians, which would not belong to the infants of heathens. I have I conceive in the firſt part of this *Review* demonſtrated the contrary againſt Mr. *M* Mr. *B. &c.* 2. If there were a privilege attributed yet it might not be baptiſm. For. 1 That belonged according to the Fathers opinion and practiſe to unbelievers children alſo, if they were brought as I ſhew *examen part.* 1. *ſect.* 7. 8. 2. There are other imagined privileges or ſanctities belonging to them, as, by ſome real actual inward holineſs, by others federal external holineſs, by others holineſs in hope and expectation.

He goes on. *And as this evidently concludes ſuch a cuſtom, known and acknowleged among Chriſtians at that time: ſo it is directly the thing that the* Jewiſh *practiſe, in which Chriſt founded his inſtitution, hath laid the foundation of, in baptizing Proſelytes and their children, and to which the primitive Church conformed. And ſo though that Judaical practiſe taken alone were not deemed any demonſtrative evidence, that Chriſt thus in-*

instituted his baptism for the Gentiles, yet being taken in conjunction with this Testimony of the Apostolical practise, and the primitive usage it brings all the weight with it, which a Divine Testimony interpreted by practise can afford, which is as great as any such matter can be capable of.

Answ. 1. It is false *that Christ founded his institution in the* Jewish *practise of baptizing proselytes and their children.* If he had done so he would have bid the Apostles, baptize Disciples and their children as the *Jews* did. There is not any thing that is brought by the Doctor that proves it, yea if it were the minde of Christ to baptize Disciples and their children, as the *Jews* did Proselytes, it would utterly overthrow all use of baptism of water after the first conversion of Progenitors to be Christs Disciples, none but they and the children then born should be baptized, all Disciples and their infants which descended from the first baptized should not be baptized with water being clean or holy without baptism. For they baptized because they were unclean till baptized, not because holy before. Nor did they baptize any of the posterity of the first baptized though born but a few moneths after their first baptism. So that this conceit of the Doctor would help much for the *Socinian* conceit, as if water-baptism belonged onely to the age of the Apostles. 2. It is false *that there is any evidence in the Apostles words* 1 *Cor.*7.14. *of such a custom of baptizing Christians and their children as was among the* Jews *of baptizing the Proselytes and their infants.* Nor do I think ever any of the Fathers did interpret the Apostles words as this Doctor doth. *Tertullians* words in his Book *de anima cap.*39. are not as the Doctor saith *an exact parallel to the Apostles speech* 1 *Cor.*7 14. as the Doctor renders and interprets it The terms *candidati sanctitatis* or *designati sanctitatis*, or *candidati fidei*, *in Hieromes Epist.*153. to *Paulinus* do note, not that they were baptized as the Doctor interprets [*Holy* 1 *Cor* 7.14.] but that they were in expectation, as they that were seekers for Offices in *Rome*, while they stood for the Offices were *candidati in White* so the infants were as it were in expectation of being believers and baptized, *Quod veluti ambiunt, & expectant baptismum* as *Erasmus* in his note on *Hierom Ep.*153. to *Paulinus*, or *designed* that is intended to be holy by the parents, that is to be bred up to

profess

profeſs the Faith, and ſo to be baptized. Both which ſenſes do indeed oppoſe the Doctors aſſertion and ſhew that they were not baptized in infancy. And for that which the Doctor talks of *Tertullian* as ſaying *they were holy that is baptized ex ſeminis prærogativa from the prærogative of their birth*, it is a manifeſt miſtake as the very reading the words ſhew. For. 1. The holineſs he aſcribes to believers children was not onely by *prærogative of birth*, but alſo *ex inſtitutionis diſciplina, by the diſcipline of their inſtruction*, which is afore baptiſm. 2. *The prærogative of birth* the very words of *Tertullian* ſhew to be no more but this, that believers children were born without thoſe idolatrous ſuperſtitions, which were uſed in the birth of infidels children, which he there particularly recites. There is no one of the Fathers interprets *Paul* as the Dr. *Ambroſe* and *Hierom* interpret the words of legitimation in birth, *Auguſtin*, what way ſoever he go, ſaith expreſly, *the words belong not to baptiſm*. 3. It is falſe *that the* Jewiſh *practiſe in baptizing Proſelytes and their children layd the foundation of infant-baptiſm*; neither the Scripture gives any hint thereof, nor any of the Ancient Chriſtian writers, no not any of thoſe the Doctor cites ever derives it from the *Jewiſh* practiſe: But the ſpeeches of *Tertullian de bapt. cap.* 8. of *Gregory Nazianzen Orat.* 40. *de baptiſmo*, diſſwading from it except in caſe of neceſſity by reaſon of apparent danger of death, the very decree of the Council in *Cyprians* 59. *Epiſtle*, the ſpeeches of *Auguſtin*, *Hierom* againſt the *Pelagians*, the words of the counterfeit Authors of the Book of *Queſtions and anſwers to the Orthodox* impoſed on *Juſtin Martyr qu.* 56. *The queſtions ad Antiochum* impoſed on *Athanaſius qu* 114. the words of the Author of the *Eccleſiaſtick Hierarchy* impoſed on *Dionyſius Areopagita*, the ſtory of the baptiſm of *Gregory Nazianzen*, the intended baptiſm of *Auguſtin*, when in danger of death, *tom.* 1. *confeſſ. lib.* 1. *cap.* 11. and other evidences do ſhew that the Fathers took the baptiſm of infants not to have foundation in the *Jews* practiſe, but in the conceit they had that baptiſm did regenerate, give grace and ſave, and that it was neceſſary for them to enter into the Kingdom, and that they were in danger of periſhing if they were not baptized, and therfore they practiſed baptizing of infants in that caſe. Which thing the Papiſts avouch at

this day, and in order thereto womens baptizing. The Protestant reformers who composed the *Common Prayer Book*, do appear to have had the like conceit, in that in the preface before publique baptism they use the old reason from *John* 3.5. *Rom.* 5.12. for infant-baptism, affirming *infants to be regenerate, and undoubtedly saved dying baptized, allowing Midwives to baptize*, till the words [*lawfull Minister*] were added in the Rubrick after the conference at *Hampton* Court, where had not King *James* overruled them the Bishops had not yelded to that reformation; yet still they kept private baptism, with that ridiculous use of propounding the questions of repentance and faith to the infant, to which the sureties must answer in the childes behalf, with profession of the childes desire to be baptized into the faith recited, though the childe were then crying when the words were spoken; and for the sureties they had no desire to be baptized; and the Bishops and Presbyters requiring it would have censured them as Anabaptists had they indeed minded baptism according to Christs minde: which thing was a meer mockery, as *Chamier* calls it. Yet in the Rubrick it self in the Common prayer Book in the title of Publique baptism it is confessed that *the Ancient custom was of baptizing onely at* Easter *and* Whitsuntide, & baptizing is acknowledged to have been by dipping: sprinkling or pouring water on the face I do conjecture by reports and such writings as I have seen, was most after the *conference at Hampton Court*. Dr. *Hammond* himself in his *Practic Catech. lib.* 1. *sect.* 3. *pag.* 23. saith, *All men were instructed anciently in the foundamentals of faith before they were permitted to be baptized*. And therefore for the present I shall put by the answering of the stale and rotten allegations out of the Fathers for infant-baptism brought by the Doctor, because having sayd so much in my *Examen part.* 1. and my *Apology sect.* 16. I presume those that are not willing to be deceived will not be swayed with Dr. *Hammonds*, Mr. *Bs.* Mr. *Ms. friends*, or any other citations from them, some being of meer counterfeit Authors, as *Justin Martyr*, *Pope Hyginus*, *Dionysius Areopagita*, *Athanasius*, some suspected as *Origens* words, some misinterpreted as *Irenaus* and *Tertullian*, some the very Authors shew that they maintained infant-baptism but in the case of danger of death, as *Tertullian* and *Nazianzen*. *Cyprian* as he avouched infant-baptism, so he

did

did rebaptization, and that as from the Apoſtles. *Auguſtin* as he avouched infant-baptiſm by Apoſtolick tradition, ſo he did alſo infant-communion. But of theſe things if God will more hereafter if it appear neceſſary. This I take to be ſufficient for the preſent to anſwer Dr. *Hammonds* new device which he vainly boaſts *to have all the weight that a Divine Teſtimony interpreted by practiſe can afford, and is as great as any ſuch matter can be capable of.*

FINIS.

Errata.

Page 1. *line* 7. *reade* my Apology. *p.*4. *l.*8. *r.* Areo. *p.*8 *l.* 15. *r.*Church. *p.*13. *l.*10. *r.*interfering. *p.*17. *l.*1. *r.*mens. *p.*18. *l*30 *r.*not. *p.*22 *l.*3. *r.*materially. *p.*23. *l* 1. *r.*is. *p* 24. *l* 23. *r.*did. *p* 25 *l* 31. *r.*that. *l* 32. *r.*Circumciſion. *p.*26. *l.*11. *r.*he. *p.*27. *l.*33. *r.*17. 12. *p.*28 *l* 8. *r.*12. *p.*31. *l* 19. *r.*15. *p.*45. *l*3. *r.*keep. *p.*46. *l.*33. *r.*ſuperiours. *l* 35. *r.*to. *p.*47. *l* 3. *r.*excommunication. *p.*50. *l* 6, 7. *dele* will be proved. *p.*51 *l.*22 *dele* not. *l.*25 *r.*paria, *p.*52. *l.*36. *r.* παρομοιώσις. *l.*38. *r. Mathematicis. p.*53. *l.*3. *r. malus. l.*5. *r.* ἐστὶν. *p.*61. *l* 31. *r.*refute. *p.*63 *l.*16. *r. Janu.* 1. or in. *p.*64 *l.*38. *r.* is, or. *dele* can. *page* 65. *line* 2. *r.*he. *page* 68 *line* 6. *r.*Anti. *page* 69 *l.*29. *r. actus. p.*70. *l.*6. *r.*Biſhops. *page*76. *line* 4. *r.* fearfull. *page* 86. *line*20. *r. gentes. page* 87. *line*4 *r.* precipitur. *p.*88. *l.*21. *r. arbitror. p.*99. *l.*23, 24. *r.*renewing. *p.*104. *l* 29 *r.*There. *p.*112. *l* 2. is it. *p.*119. *l.*1. *r.*miraculous. *p.*126. *l.*2. *r.*ſerve. *p* 148. *l.* 16. *r.*28. *l.*20 *r.*accept. *p.*153. *l.*34 *r.* Diſciple is. *p.*162 *l.*31. *dele* not. *p.*170 *l.*28. *dele* not. *p.*171. *l.*9. *dele* in, *l.*10. *r in locum. p.*175. *l* 38. *dele* not. *p.*179. *l.*2. *r.*I finde. *p* 182, *l.*16. *r.*heating. *p,*191 *l,*18, *r,*19, *p,*195, *l,*37. *r,*peculiar, *p,*197, *l,*9, *r,*relation, *p,*220, *l,*37, *r,*uſe of, *p,*226, *l.*9, *r.*them, *p,*265, *l,*35, *r,*oft, *p,*276, *r,*without, *p,*279 *l,*1, *r,*the, *p,*290, *l,*9. *r,*29, *p,*294, *l,*17, *r,*in, *p,*306, *l,*18, *r,*right, that the ſeat, 1 *Cor.* 10, 1, 2, *p,*308, *l,*28, *r,*before, *p.*314, *l,*17, *r,* βαπτίζοντες, *p.*321. *l.*6. *reade* them. *p.*329. *l.*29. *reade v.*16.

To be added after *many*, *p,*220, *l,*29, what Dr, *Ward* and Dr, *Davenant* have ſayd for Regeneration and Juſtification of infants by baptiſm hath been accurately examined and enervated by Mr, *Gataker* in *Latin.*

Books formerly published by the Author.

Christs Comination against Scandalizers on *Luke* 17.1.2. printed for *Richard Royston* at the sign of the *Angel* in *Ivy lane London.* *Jehovah Jireh* or Gods providence in delivering the Godly in two Sermons on 2 *Pet.*2.9. on occasion of preserving *Bristoll* from a plot to deliver it to Prince *Rupert March* 7. 1642. printed for *Michael Sparkes* at the *Bleu bible* in *Green Arbour, London.*

Fermentum Phariſæorum or the leaven of Phariſaical will-worſhip in a Sermon on *Matth.*15.9. printed for *Andrew Crook* at the *Green dragon* in *Pauls Church-yard London.*

Anthropolatria or the ſin of glorying in men on 1 *Cor.*3.21. printed for *John Bellamy* at the three *Golden Lions in Corn-hill, London.*

5 DE 69

Two treatiſes concerning Infant-baptiſm to wit An Exercitation and Examen of Mr. *Stephen Marſhals* Sermon, printed for *George Whittington* and to be ſold at the *Blackmore* at *Fleet bridg London* by *William Larnar.*

An Apology for the two Treatiſes, printed for *Giles Calvert* at the *Black-ſpread Eagle* at the Weſt-end of *Pauls, London.*

An Antidote againſt the Venom of a paſſage of Mr. *Richard Baxter*, printed for *Thomas Brewſter* at the *three Bibles* at the Weſt-end of *Pauls, London.*

An addition to the Apology in a letter to Mr. *Robert Bailee* of *Scotland* printed by *Henry Hills* at the ſign of Sir *John Old caſtle* in *Pycorner, London.*

Præcurſor or A forerunner to the Review, Printed for the ſame, *Antipædobaptiſm* or the Firſt part of the full Review of the diſpute, concerning infant-baptiſm, printed for *Henry Crips* and *Lodowick Lloyd* in *Popes head Ally* near *Lumbard-ſtreet London.*

A Plea for Antipædobaptiſts againſt Mr. *John Craggs* diſpute and Sermon at *Abergavenny*, printed for *Henry Hills* above named.

4323 L6-45*

Anti-Pædobaptiſm:

OR THE

THIRD PART.

BEING,

A full REVIEW of the Diſpute concerning Infant-Baptiſm.

IN WHICH,

The Arguments for Infant-Baptiſm from the Covenant and Initial Seal, Infants Viſible Church-membership, Antiquity of Infant-Baptiſm, are refelled.

AND

The Writings of Mr. *Stephen Marſhal*, Mr. *Richard Baxter*, Mr. *John Geree*, Mr. *Thomas Blake*, Mr. *Thomas Cobbet*, Dr. *Nathaniel Homes*, Mr. *John Drew*, Mr. *Joſiah Church*, Mr. *William Lyford*, Dr. *Daniel Featley*, Mr. *John Brinſley*, Mr. *Cobbets Sidenham*, Mr. *william Carter*, Mr. *Samuel Rutherford*, Mr. *John Craig*, Dr. *Henry Hammond*, Mr. *John Cotton*, Mr. *Thomas Fuller*, Mr. *John Stalham*, Mr. *Thomas Hall*, and others, are examined; And many points about the Covenants, and Seals, and other Truths of weight, are handled:

By JOHN TOMBES, B. D.

ISA. 5. 20.

Wo unto them that call evill good and good evill, that put darkneſs for light and light for darkneſs, that put bitter for ſweet and ſweet for bitter.

LONDON, Printed by E. ALSOP, over againſt the Upper Pump in *Cornhill*. 1657.

BRITISH MUSEUM

TO THE PARLIAMENT OF THE Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland.

HAving presented the two former Parts of this Review to His Highneſs, and His Council; I take boldneſs to tender this to your Honours, as those who are intruſted with the affairs of these Nations (in which are many Churches of Christ, whose safety, and welfare doth much depend under Christ on your wisedome, and uprightneſs) that it may serve to justifie your Honours in allowing those who agree with me in the point herein discussed liberty, employment, and maintainance alike with dissenters. wherein your equity and wisedome is very conspicuous and laudable, notwithstanding the clamours and practises of those our opposites, who would have the ship of this Commonwealth so ordered, that the power of it should all incline to one side to the endangering of the whole. 'Tis true the asserting of this truth hath heretofore been unhappily managed, partly by reason of the conjunction of some errours very dangerous in the Asserters of this truth, and partly by reason of the violence of spirit in them and their opposites, which have occasioned hard Lawes against them, and great hatred towards them. Nor do I know any likelihood but that still not onely about this, but also about any other point in difference, when one party seeks to oppreſs the other there will be much unquietneſs, unleſs Governours become moderatours between them. In the Declaration of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, Ordered to be printed 4. Martii 1647. I read these words. The name of Anabaptism hath indeed contracted much odium, by reason of the extravagant opinions and practises of some of that name in Germany, tending to the disturbance of the Government and peace of all States: which opinions and practices we abhor and detest. But for their

their opinion against the Baptism of Infants, it is onely a difference about a circumstance of time in the administration of an Ordinance, wherein in former ages as well as this, learned men have differed both in opinion and practice: And though wee could wish that all men could satisfie themselves, and joyn with us in our judgment and practise in this point: yet herein wee held it fit that men should bee convinced by the Word of God with gentleness and reason, and not beaten out of it by force and violence: And yet May 2. 1648. *there was an Ordinance which made it punishable with imprisonment, to affirm that the Baptism of Infants is unlawfull, or that Infants Baptism is void, and that such persons are to be baptized again. Notwithstanding which, it is to be acknowledged with all thankfulness to His Highness and your Honours, that we enjoy our Peace and Liberty as Dissenters do; which they who value not, forget the goodness of God, and make forfeiture of their own good. For those who so do, I plead not, but for that Truth and Practise which is delivered and appointed by Christ, which should be encouraged not suppressed by Governours. For this I am moved to appear out of Conscience of my duty to Christ, commiseration of them who have been condemned and injured for avouching my position, and my engagement by Solemn Covenant enjoyned by Parliament, to endeavour Reformation in Doctrine and Worship according to Gods Word; And do humbly present it to your Honours, craving that if any Lawes do remain in force against it they may be repealed; And that while we walk according to the rule of Christ, Liberty, Peace, Encouragement may be granted to us as to others who have joyned in the Common Cause, which will be a motive to us the more affectionately to pray for your Honours prosperous and happy proceedings in repairing the Breaches, and building up this Commonwealth whereto you are advanced, and for which I am*

1 AU59

Your Honours Humble and

Devoted Servant:

JOHN TOMBES.

TO
The christian Reader.

THough all personal Pleas and Narrations are suspected to be partial, and are usually judged to have something of ostentation, or dissembling, or some such inordinate affection which may abate their credit and esteem, yet the practises of opponents in Controversies, and the great prejudice to the Truth, and person opposed they create thereby, and the difficulty for persons who are not actors in such contentions to understand the truth without them make them necessary. Doubtless if such pleas were not necessary, the Apostle *Paul* would not have thought his course justifiable, who hath written one Epistle, to wit, the second to the *Corinthians*, almost wholly Apologetical for himself, that the misunderstanding of himself and wayes might not be advantage to Seducers for hindering the success of his preaching. It is true my credit and esteem is nothing comparable to the Apostles, the Church and Truth of God may stand, though I be buried in perpetual silence; yet sith I am a Preacher of the Gospel as *Paul* was (*absit verbo invidia*) and my labours therein as I hope not altogether without fruit, and sith the Lord seems to me to have set me, though in a lower Sphere, for defence of that *One Baptism* which *Paul* mentions *Ephes.* 4. 5. as one of the chief points of Christianity, and *Heb.* 6. 2. is counted as a foundation point. I assure my self *Paul's* practise doth justifie mine, and that I should be wanting not onely

to mine own credit, but also to that truth which is dearer then my credit, if I should pass by with silence those misrepresentations whereby both are abused, and the mindes of men alienated from them. Which is the more necessary, because of the great repute which my Antagonists have in this generation, and their confident speeches, and their incessant endeavours upon all occasions in Pulpits, Presses, Disputes, Conferences, to represent the way I avouch as dangerous, my self as instrumental to an evil designe of perverting and dividing the Churches of God, unto which the proneness of men to uphold an Errour inveterate, and speciously pretended to be approved and blessed by God, and the contrary opinion accursed, besides the advantages it hath for their carnal ease, and for the begetting of a favourable opinion of themselves and their children (which are more to most then demonstrations out of Gods word) do gain an easie assent. And though I am not out of hope that those who have opposed the truth I assert with impetuous zeal, will be (especially the most tender conscienced, who examine their wayes, and review their doctrines) awakened and see and confess their errour, yet I fear the obloquy, and perhaps detriment in repute and outward estate and peace, which men either are likely or doubt they may incur by owning the truth I hold forth, or the seeming inconsistency of the reformation I seek to promote, with the peace of the Churches of God, will divert the thoughts of many from an exact consideration, and an equall judgement of what I shall write, either of my self or the matter under debate. What was wont to be opposed against the reformation of Popish and Prelatical corruptions, shall we go against all antiquity? Be wiser then our Fathers? condemn all the Churches? make rents in the Church? and such like objections, though they be upon examination but vain, yet like *Gorgons* head they are apt to turn men into stones, and to make men not see what they do or might see, and to be insensible of the evil of the practise, which otherwise their Consciences would be affrighted with. And truely though it be the wise and just contrivance of Divine providence, and congruous to his end, that the vanity of all things under the Sun might appear, yet is it an humane irregularity, that not only for evil labour, but also *for all travel and every right work a man is envied*, maligned, or disliked *of his neighbour*, *Eccl.* 4. 4. chiefly when it crosseth self ends

and

and conceits. Nor is it incident onely to the prophane and unbelievers, to dislike and oppose such acts as are rightly done, but also to the godly, until their mistakes are discovered to them. The building of the Altar of *Ed*, *Josh.* 22. 12. was likely to have been an occasion of war betweeen the rest of the Congregation of *Israel* and some Tribes, till the intention of the builders was cleared to *Phinehas*; and *Peter's going in to Cornelius*, *Act.* 11. 2. occasioned contention with him, though it were from God, til his warrant was shewed. *Paul* knew that his promoting the collection for the poor Saints at *Jerusalem* might be distasted of the best, and therefore he prayes that *his service which he had for* Jerusalem *might be accepted of the Saints*, *Rom.* 15. 31. Even holy uplight men have their weaknesses, passions, mis-prisions, prejudices, which oft times hinder a right understanding of tenents and actions of Christian Brethren, and thereby no small contentions arise. God would have us discern thereby humane imperfection, and keep our spirits humble and heedfull how we manage the rightest actions. Surely no action is more necessary then the discovery of truth in the things of God, nor should any endeavours be more acceptable to holy persons, then such as tend thereto, yea though there should be imperfection in actings and defect in the success. Yet too much experience hath shewed that such attempts meet with much opposition, and are ill entertained even by those who are or seem friends to truth. It is unnecessary to give instances: in the Scripture *Acts* 15. 2, *&c.* in the Ecclesiastical Story there are so many as verifie it beyond all contradiction. If there were no other example but what hath befaln me about the point in this writing discussed, yet it were sufficient to verifie what I said of the difficulty to gain entertainment of that truth against which men are prepossessed, and of the ill usage of them that in a due manner endeavour to cleer it. That Infant Baptism was not according to Gods will, I thought might be made manifest by the silence of it in Scripture, and the Writings of the two first Ages, and by shewing how it was counted but an Ecclesiastical humane tradition unwritten, induced upon such reasons by the Leaders of the Churches in after ages as are now judged erroneous; and how false and dangerous the grounds are on which it is made a Divine institution, to wit, an imagined Covenant of grace to a Believer and his seed natural, the

nature

nature of Sacraments to be seals of the Covenant of grace, the inference of duties about positive rites of the new Testament from analogy with abrogated Ceremonies of the old, the command of Circumcision to have been in the extent of it commensurate to and derived from the Covenant with *Abraham Gen.* 17. as the adequate reason, the succession of Baptism into the room and use of Circumcision; all which or most of them, are so contrary to the Scripture and Protestant doctrine, as that I presumed they would quickly have been discerned by those who are acquainted with the controversies of Divines, and sought reformation in Discipline, and removal of humane inventions in Gods worship, and had entered into a solemn oath and Covenant to that end. And for my way of manifesting my doubts first to the Ministers of *London*, and then to the Committee of the Assembly then sitting at *Westminster*, and after to a prime man in it in the years 1643, 1644. and what opposition I found is so manifest in my two Treatises and Apology published 1645, 1646. as that it were but *actum agere* to say any more thereof. Which I hoped would have taken off such prejudices, as my Antagonists writings had raised against my writings and person, that I might securely apply my self to review the Dispute, without hearing of any more personal objections. But when I found the like usage continued by Mr. *Robert Baily* of *Glasgow* in *Scotland*, I published an *Addition to the Apology* 1652. though it were framed before, and sent in a letter Manuscript to him. Yet the hottest charge was behinde. After my necessitated removal from the *Temple* in *London* to *Bewdley* in *Worcestershire*, *anno* 1646. it happened that a publike Dispute was between Mr. *Richard Baxter* of *Kidderminster* near to *Bewdley* and my self, at *Bewdley* Jan. 1. 1649. which how it was occasioned, managed, injuriously divulged, may be perceived by the writings on both sides; his Epistle before the first Edition of the *Saints Everlasting rest*, his Book of *Baptism*, *Praesestinantis Mortor*, and my *Antidote* printed 1650. and *Praecursor*, *anno* 1652. By Mr. *Baxters* book of *Baptism*, my self, doctrine, answers, practise have been so unworthily dealt with, as that they have been painted out in deformed shapes quite besides their true features, and thereby exposed to the unrighteous censures and contempt of so many, that Mr. *Blake* in his *Preface* to his *Vind. foederis* thought he might

without

without controul say, *Mr. Tombes is generally look upon low enough under hatches.* It is indeed too manifest that upon the publishing of Mr. *Baxters* Book of *Baptism*, which was often printed and very much dispersed, floods of reproaches were cast on me and those who are of my judgement in that point, triumphant boastings of that book as the *Mawl of Anabaptism*, a most excellent piece, a lasting monument, *&c.* which had laid me flat on my back, with many the like vaunts in print and colloquies. Nor did mens loose tongues and pens stay here, but many insolent speeches were vented, trampling upon me and the Cause with me as Captives subdued by that mighty hand; my actions were censured, my abilities disparaged, yea people possessed with conceits as if I and those of my judgement were accursed of God, left over to a spirit of delusion, a hardened heart; Magistrates were provoked to make Lawes against us, as intollerable authors and fomentors of the errors, heresies, and divisions now in the Land; the rage and violence of common people shewed it self against the practise of Baptism enjoyned by Christ, people were deterred from hearing us, Schollers from reading our Writings, ancient acquaintance alienated, liberty formerly allowed to preach in publike places restrained, those that by Baptism were added to Communion withdrawn from society, yea violent courses taken to hinder Wives, children, servants from associating with them that were baptized, and that which was in former ages the onely Baptism, and highly honoured by the ancient Writers with titles of dignity exceedingly debased and derided, insomuch that in many parts of this Land, I have been taken at best for a self-conceited man, affecting novelty and singularity, of a dangerous spirit, a ring leader of a sect of giddy men adversaries to unity, discipline, opening a door to all fanatique conceits, whose end would prove wicked, with many more imputations, which neither my books nor known conversation afore and since the wars, my labours and imployment in places not obscure, the confessed holiness, orthodoxy, unblameableness of those Churches over which I had any inspection, or with whom I associated could so acquit us, but that *with your wound is uncured or a skar remains.* Mr. *Blake* in his *Preface* to his *Vind. fæd.* saith thus of me. *And indeed I think it a special providence that he should thus appear with a shew of learning, a volumn of words, a rhapsody of Authors, getting a name to be the strongest sword and buckler that was ever lift up in this Cause, to draw the eyes of his party towards him, and then fall so flat, able to make good nothing; so that men far from censorious vanity well able to judge (upon serious perusal of his works and converse with him) do conclude,*

that it is not possible but he goes against the dictates of his own conscience; so that these it seems count me for an autocrit or self-condemned heretick. What other imputations Mr. *Blake* casts on me, may be seen here Sect. 26. And what Mr. *Firmin*, Mr. *Gattaker*, and Mr *Simon Ford*, Sect. 53. Besides what Mr. *John Goodwin*, Mr. *Wood*, and many more have judged of mine and Mr. *Baxters* writings. After Mr. *Baxter* Mr. *John Crag* would needs take up the cudgels and play his part in this matter, which how he hath done may be seen by our writings, compared chiefly here *sect. 87, &c.* Books after books have been published from *England* and *Scotland*, by Dr. *Hammond*, Mr. *Carter*, Mr. *Rutherford*, Mr. *Fuller*, Dr. *Savage* in Latin, and others for Infant-baptism; besides Sermons in the Pulpit, and determinations in the Universities at most solemn times. Yea upon occasion of a meer accident at *Oxford* in July 1652. I have been baited in the Weekly News books, and I have just cause to conceive that by clancular Letters, conferences, consultations, not onely my doctrine hath been decried, my writings vilified, my way represented as pernicious that people might not know the truth, but also my station undermined, and my silencing endeavoured; and which is of all other the most grievous to me, the fruit of my labours in the Gospel of Christ not a little hindered: so that whereas Mr. *Baxter* would have in his *Gildas Silvianus* all Ministers tied to confer with the people in private, by his misrepresenting of me, the people (whom I would gladly teach) are deterred from hearing me in publike, and conferring with me in private. Yea notwithstanding the Quakers have been so often opposed by me, and my doctrine as contrary to theirs as light to darkness, by reason of Mr. *Baxters imputing the rise of Quakerism to Anabaptism*, as he terms it (which how far he chargeth on me may be seen by his Questions to me set down here sect. 63.) one *Blashfield* a bookseller in *Lempster* hath openly reviled me at the close of my Sermon while I was in the Pulpit *Decemb.* 26. 1656. though I then refuted the Quakers, and told me *if there were no Anabaptist there would be no Quaker*; and somewhat afore Mr. *Farmer* a preacher in *Bristol* making a relation of *James Naylors* riding into *Bristol*, prints a passage in a private letter, which he with much ado signifies to mee was written by Mr. *Robert Breton* of *Pembridge* in *Herefordshire* but four miles from me, in which I am charged to say, that in a Sermon which I disavow in my writings upon the report at table of a man of this Town, who (what ever his qualities be) being pressed twice by me, once before some of the most intelligent and indifferent men here, another time before all or the most part of the Governours

vernours of this Town, to deal plainly whether I did speak those words which Mr. *Farmer* hath printed doth refuse to do it, shuffles in his answers, and will neither affirm nor deny it. Such dealings as these from men reputed godly, preachers of the Gospel, some of them fellow-sufferers for the common cause of reformation, and by the same Covenant engaged to it, do make me amazed to see what strange courses the intemperate zeal of Pædobaptists carries them, discerning thereby what a malignity of spirit they have towards me, who have so far as I can remember done no such thing to them, nor have been wanting in any good office I could do for them with a good conscience, but willing to joyn with godly dissenters in the common Cause of Christ. Nor do I finde any relenting in *Mr. Baxter*, but as he shews his spirit in his letters printed here sect. 53, 63. so by his preaching at *Bewdley May* 4 1656. in which he gave ten frivolous reasons for his practise of Infant-baptism, for the confirming of his party who opposed my preaching there at that time, and since, and by the late passages in most of his writings, and in his last book of *Conversion p.* 109. I finde him still the same he was. *No doubt* (saith he) *but God doth pardon original sin to multitude of infants by the blood of Christ, through the Covenant of grace which is made to the faithfull and their seed, and this pardon bestowed by the Covenant is sealed by baptism which more solemnly conferreth it. It is most probable that God doth also make some change on the hearts of infants, secretly giving some seed of inward grace before or in their baptism.* And *p.* 299. he hath this foolish passage. *Others withdraw upon pretence we are unbaptized, to which end they must coin a new baptism, or else they are at a loss. And their arguing with us will be much like the Papists, in the point of Transubstantiation, which requireth that men renounce their sense and say, that they see not that which they see, and feel not or taste not that which indeed they feel and taste, and then they may come to be in the right; and so we must believe that we see none baptized in our Churches, nor hear it, nor know of any such thing, and then we may come to be a Church:* As if the arguing were that there is nothing which Pædobaptists call baptism in their Churches, not, there is nothing that may bee truely called Christian baptism according to Christs institution, and then *p.* 300. after his fashion when he wants arguments, he adds. *Oh if it were the will of God that we could have as clear light in some other weighty points as we have in Scripture for the baptism of the children of believers, how much would it do to quiet the understandings of many that are willing to know* I dare not say it is a wonder to me to finde such passages in *Mr. Baxter*

but having examined his book *of baptism, his ten reasons for his practise of Infant baptism* delivered *in Bewdley Chappel May* 4. 1656. *His Letters* to me 1655. set down here *sect.* 53, *&c.* I cannot but bemoan the sad condition, first of Ministers and people who are carried away with such shallow disputings, and confident speeches as Mr. *Baxter* hath used in these writings. 2. Of my self, and all who go about to cleer truth, that they be necessitated to stir up such a nest of Wasps and Hornets, as these have shewed themselves to be who have opposed me, if they do never so brotherly and fairly and regularly declare their judgments contrary to the common received tenents. Yet I must confess two things have somewhat refreshed mee against the hard censures of those whom Mr. *Blake* mentions and the rest, the one that His Highness and Council and the Parliament since (as I am informed) confirming the Ordinance for approbation of publique Preachers seem to have better thoughts of me in putting that trust on me, the other that (to mention no other) two of the ablest acutest and well read Divines and accurate Disputants, which I have known the University of *Oxford* in my time to have bred, and who have been thought fit for the Divinity Chair, have had far other conceits of my writings then these have had, the one not long after the publishing of my *Examen*, expressing his rejoycing to see so accurate and scholastical a discussing of the point, which he found not in the *Assembly*, wishing he had known of it afore the publishing of it that he might have prefixed an Epistle, yet wishing it had been written in *Latin*, as foreseeing that the publishing it in *English* was likely to beget me more trouble, then it would have done if printed in *Latin*; the other who since that wrote thus to me. *I am a friend to your person (whom I have known (though not known to you) this* 31. *years) and to your opinion too (as to the main of it) for I believe and know, that there is neither precept nor practise in Scripture for Paedobaptism, nor any just evidence for it for above two hundred years after Christ. The first who bears witnesse to Infant baptism practised in the Church is* Tertullian, *but so as he expresly dislikes and condemnes it as an unwarrantable and irrational custome: and* Nazianzen *a good while after him (in his Oration* εἰς ἅγιον βαπτισμα*) dislikes it too, and would not have infants brought to baptism till they were of some age and able to answer for themselves. Sure I am that in the Primitive times they were first to be* Catechumini, *and then* illuminati, *or* baptizati, *and that not onely children of Pagans, or Pagans converted, but children of Christian parents,* Nazianzen *(though a Bishops son) being not baptized till he was above* 30.

years

years of age, as appears in his life, and the like is evident of some others. The truth is, I beleeve Paedobaptism did (how or by whom I know not) come in in the 2d. *Century, and in the* 3d. *and* 4th. *began to be practised (though not generally) and defended as lawfull from that text (grosly misunderstood)* Jo. 3. 5. *Upon the like gross mistake of* Jo. 6. 53. *they did for many Centuries (both in the* Greek *and* Latin *Church) communicate infants and give them the Lords Supper, and I confess they might do both as well as either: But although they baptized some infants and thought it lawfull so to do, yet* Augustin *was the first that ever said it was necessary* inde durus pater infantum. *I have read what my learned and worthy friend* Dr. Hammond, Mr. Baxter *and others say in defence of it, and (I confess) I wonder not a little that men of such great parts should say so much to so little purpose, for I have not yet seen any thing like an argument for it.* Nor is it a small case to me that I finde after all Mr. *Baxters* shamefull and vain arguings against the truth, and injurious dealings with me and the baptized Christians, with whom I hold Communion, that yet at last, though quite besides his intentions, he hath so befriended our cause as to lend us twenty-good arguments against Infant baptism, in his 2d. *disputation of right to Sacraments*, in the close of the 16th. saying thus *p.* 156. *I conclude that all examples of baptism in Scripture do mention onely the administration of it to the professors of saving faith: and the precepts give us no other direction. And I provoke Mr.* Blake *(as far as is seemly for me to do) to name one precept for baptizing any other, and make it good if he can.* I know what he will pretend, that he intended this onely against Mr. *Blakes* opinion of baptizing upon a dogmatical faith and he means what he argues onely in the case of adult persons. But that doth not avoid his own arguments against himself, though he otherwise intended; nor will his evasion serve till he prove, that there is a different precept or example for baptizing Infants from that of baptizing adult persons, or that any are to be accounted beleevers or disciples by their parents or, as his term is, propatents profession, which will never be done by him. I will not say as Mr. *Blake* saith some have said of me, that it is not possible but he goes against the dictates of his own conscience: But this I dare boldly say, that Mr. *Baxter* hath strongly disputed against Infant Baptism in the place forenamed, *pag.* 53. asserting and proving *Arg.* 1. *We must not baptize any who profess not true repentance*, pag. 62. *Arg.* 2. *We must baptize no man that first professeth not to beleeve in God*, p. 68. *Argum.* 3. *It's the very nature or appointed use of the external part of Baptism it self (yea essential to it) to signifie and profess*

the saving faith and repentance of the baptized, pag. 710. arg. 4. *We must baptize none that profess not their consent to enter themselves presently into the Covenant of grace with God in Christ*, p. 79. arg. 5. *we must not baptize any without the profession of that faith and repentance which are made the condition of remission of sins*; the rest have speeches to like purpose, in which though he puts in sometimes [*and their seed*] yet his proofs do all overthrow that his own addition, and tear off his patch which he hath printed to his argument, and as fully militate against his book *of baptism* as *Mr. Blakes* tenet; so that to me it seems that by Divine providence without his intention, *una eademque manus vulnus opemque tulit*: Nor do I think but that if conscientious Christians chiefly Schollers, would read over that second disputation, they would be satisfied that infants ought not to be baptized but themselves, and that *Mr. Baxter* hath cheated the world by his book *of baptism*, and shewed himself therein an inconsiderate writer. But however this fall out, it is a great rejoycing to my soul, that God hath so long preserved my life and strength though now declining, to finish this part of the *Review* also, and to see that part of it printed which is in answer to *Mr. Baxters* second main argument in his book of baptism, about his pretended ordinance of infants visible Church-membership and its repeal, which some have given out as unanswerable, because this answer hath been so long in publishing; not considering that besides the not knowing of his minde about it till 1655. I have been necessitated to answer many others, and together with my constant labours, some other employments extraordinary with domestick distractions, necessity of respect to my bodily strength, want of help of books in some points, of learned men to whom I might have recourse, of an amanuensis, and chiefly the difficulty of getting it printed by reason of the great charge, which this book amounts to, and yet is not so readily put off as other smaller writings, and such as suite more with the minde of Readers, of whom few seem to search after truth impartially, especially in controversies of this kinde. In this which is done my witness is in heaven how faithfully and sincerely I have dealt, which makes me slight the unrighteous censures of those *Mr. Blake* mentions, of *Mr. Baxter*, Mr. *Firmin*, Mr. *Gattaker*, Mr. *Ford*, Mr. *Crag* and the rest. And for *Mr. John Goodwin* who so much magnifies *Mr. Baxters* book, I wish he and Mr. *Horn* his second would read this writing, which I take to be a sufficient answer, with the two fore-parts of this *Review*, to what is said by *Mr. Baxter* and themselves in the point of Infant-baptism. As for the point of Schism or Separation which Mr. *Baxter*, and he charge Anabaptists

tists with, I take my self no further concerned then mine own fact, which if they can prove to have been unbrotherly or unrighteous, I hope God will so frame my heart as to testifie my repentance: if not, I advise them to take heed of rash judging, and all their followers of following them in that sin. If the objection be still set on foot, That those that are, as they term us, Anabaptists, do fall into many false opinions, prove Quakers, &c. I wish them better to examine reports of us, then Mr. *Farmer*, Mr. *Breton*, and others have done of me afore they spread them, and to look into the state of the societies of their own judgement, who if they be not guilty of such fallings, I shall rejoyce with them, and hope they will learn to pitty and endeavour to restore those who are fallen in the spirit of meekness; if they be, that they will remember that it should be no more objected to us then to themselves. For my own part, I hope I shall not abet any such errour, nor do I know of any such errours or miscarriages in the Churches to which I have associated which are not opposed and censured by us: Nor do I think it equal we should be charged with that errour or miscarriage which we condemn. And I make bold to admonish Pædobaptists in the Lord, that they take heed of those practises which tend to the disquieting, defaming, hindering their brethren in the work of Christ because of the supposed errour, as they term it, of Anabaptism, lest they happily fight against God, and wrong their brethren, remembring that *he that doth wrong shall receive for the wrong he hath done, and there is no respect of persons* with God, *Col.* 3.25. And to the end they may search their own consciences, and rightly judge of themselves, I presume they may do well to lay to heart these following questions. 1. Whether it be not a manifest perverting of the Gospel of Christ, to maintain that the Covenant of Gospel grace is made to each beleever and his seed. 2. Whether it be not against the Gospel to maintain, that the command of Circumcision *Gen.* 17. doth any way bind Christian beleevers now in their practise? 3. Whether it be not against the Gospel to entitle persons to the Church visible Christian by their natural generation of beleevers? 4. Whether it be not a manifest will-worship to practise the positive Rite of Infant Baptism as Gods worship, which is confest to have neither precept nor example in the New Testament? 5. Whether it be not a profanation of Baptism to use it otherwise then Christ appointed? 6. Whether by justifying Infant Baptism, the relinquishing of many Popish and Prelatical ceremonies which have as much of reason, tradition, authority of the Church as it, be not condemned? 7. Whether it be not an oppression, and exercising of dominion over mens consciences, to tie them to acknowledge Sacrament

to be in their nature seals of the Covenant of grace which the Scripture terms not so, nor can be proved plainly from it, and to impose on *them the practise* of Infant baptism under pain of guilt of sin which Christ never appointed? 8. Whether it be not manifest hypocrisie to oppose the Cross, Surplice, &c. and to be zealous for Infant baptism? 9. Whether they who justifie Infant baptism and oppose baptism of Believers at age confessed to be according to the institution of Christ and primitive practise, are not partial in Gods Law and may expect to be made contemptible before all the people? 10. Whether they who do so, do not break the solemn Covenant of endeavouring reformation according to Gods word? 11. How they that say they baptize infants into the Name of Christ, who sprinkle or powr onely some water on them, without any profession of the infant can be acquitted from saying falsly? 12. By what rule those who are acknowledged visible Church-members in infancy can be denied the Lords Supper? 13. Whether it be not a signe that Pædobaptism is not according to rule, when there are so many differences about the title to it between Papists and Protestants, and the ablest Protestants themselves? 14. How they can make good the regularity of Church-constitution, and the ordination of Elders, who have no other baptism but that in infancy? 15. How they can be free from the guilt of hardening souls in deadly presumption, who avouch the Christianity of infants by natural birth, and Infant baptism which is the great plea of ignorant and profane persons on which they rest? 16. Whether it be not a signe of injustice and want of love to truth, or adherence to a party, in them that will read and hear what one party saith for Infant baptism, and refuse to read or hear what the opposits say, though they bring the plain institution of Christ and his Apostles practise for them? 17. Whether it be not an unrighteous course to charge the miscariages of persons either dead or strangers, on that doctrine or practise which countenanceth not them, or to persons who are no way abettors of them becaus of agreement in one opinion? 18. Whether division or Schism is not chiefly to be imputed to those who violently oppose & inveigh against their Brethren for holding & practising that which they conceive themselves bound to do by the plain command of Christ which their opposites do acknowledge? 19. Whether such as impose Infant baptism on their Brethren who hold the faith and baptism confessed to be from Christ, and deal rigorously with them for not owning it, do not as the Papists, who impose with cruelty their own additions on those who otherwise are not denied to hold the true faith and practise? 20. Whether such pretences as are made for Infant baptism, and the imagined evil of Anabaptism, can be a sufficient plea for

baptism, and the imagined evil of Anabaptism can be a sufficient plea for any truly godly person to neglect that baptism which Christ hath so strictly commanded *Mat.*28.19. *Mar.*16.16. & the Apostles constantly practised? And sith Mr. *Baxter* hath with so much earnestness ministred so many interrogatories to me, I shall take the boldness to advise him to consider his own ways. 1. In giving such a title to his book of *Plain Scripture proof of Infants baptism*, when there is not one text in all his Book which speaks plainly or obscurely for it, yea it's confessed by himself, that it *is not plainly determined in Scripture*, p. 3. *and is so dark in Scripture that the controversie is become hard* p. 301. 2. In his abusing so many texts of Scripture as he hath done, chiefly the institution of Baptism *Matth.*28 19. for infant Baptism, as if they were disciples appointed there to be baptized, which is sufficiently refuted by himself in many places *of Baptism*, p. 299, 300. *of the right to Sacraments* from p. 91, to 96. 3. In coyning a new title to Baptism by the profession of parents or pro parents, of which the Scripture is altogether silent. 4. In his devising an ordinance of infants visible membership in the Christian Church, of which there is no foot step in all the Bible. 5. In his many years clamorous abuses, and some kind of violent persecutions of my self and others of my judgement for not acknowledging these figments of his, but promoting reformation of Baptism according to our duty. 6. In his unbrotherly printing my answers I made in the dispute at *Bewdley Jan.* 1. 1649. without so much as acquainting me with it though living near him. 7. In blazing it abroad that he had driven me to gross absurdities, which yet he hath not in his answer to the 17. sect. of of my *precursor* or elsewhere shewed to be so. 8. In his light passing over my urging his own words against infant baptism, about Christs institution *Mat.*28.19. in my *precurs.* p. 66. in his *Praefat. monit.* sect. 16. which is noted in the 2d. Part of the *Review*, p. 66, 67. which sure being from Christs institution, deserved better consideration. 9. In condemning our rejection of infant Baptism, though but an humane tradition, on no better grounds then Papists build many of their ceremonies which he condemns, in asserting the Covenant of grace to the faithfull and their seed, which in disputes against *Arminians* is commonly denied by *Contraremonstrants*. 10. In his many false accusations of me as a *sect master disturber of the Church*, which he cannot prove, in his scornfull expressions in the dispute and his books, in his injurious insinuations of me, as if I were blinded or hardened, occasioned the rise of Quakerism and other errours, thereby indirectly creating *odium* to me and to the truth, and which is worst of all, weakning my hands in the work of Christ, and particularly in taking off my *quondam* hearers at *Bewdley*

from hearing me, or permitting me there to preach in publike. None of which, nor any of the rest of his evil suggestions of me or the people baptized there or elsewhere, I pray God may be laid to his charge.

I have no more to add, but to commend the reading of this and the other parts of the *Review* to thy care, hoping that as the differences between the *Cis-Jordan* and *Trans-Jordan Israelites*, and *Peter* and the circumcised Christians were composed by right intelligence of their actions, so it may be in this, and that God will awaken the eyes of those who have opposed the truth I assert, with devices of an anti-Evangelical Covenant of grace to Believers and their seed, a Law and Ordinance of infants visible Church membership no where extant, of baptizing infants according to the Jewish pattern of baptizing Proselytes, of an additional promise of casting elect children on elect parents ordinarily, of a command in force now, *Gen.* 17. 9. of Baptisms succession to Circumcision and fetching a rule from it, of baptisms conferring Grace, *&c.* will discern their errour, and embrace that light which they have hitherto shut out, and laying aside their vain disputes about the baptizing of Infants of not Churchmembers, profane, excommunicate parents, or proparents and such like, endeavour to restore that *one Baptism* which with that *one faith once delivered to the Saints*, may bring the Churches of God to a right constitution and holy unity and order, and without which a right reformation covenanted will not be, and that godly parents of tender consciences will take heed of bringing infants to baptism whereby it is profaned, and discern that it is their own duty to be baptized in the name of Christ, and that the *use of baptism* is, as Mr. *Baxter* confesseth *p.* 68. *Of right to Sacraments, yea essential to it to signifie and profess the saving faith and repentance of the baptized* (which shews infants are not baptized, sith they do not that which is essential to baptism and that which is essential must be in all) and not to look upon it as their childrens privilege, but as it was by Christ appointed, by it engage themselves to follow the Lord JESUS; which is the prayer of

I AU59

Thy loving Brother and real Servant in Christ;

JOHN TOMBES.

The Contents.

Sect. 1. THe second argument against infant Baptism that it is will worship is confirmed.

Sect. 2. Dr. *Homes* his arguments to prove infant Baptism from *Gen* 17. are examined.

Sect. 3. Mr. *Drews* argument for infant Baptism from *Gen.* 17. is examined, and it is shewed that there is not the same reason of infant Baptism as of infant Circumcision.

Sect. 4. The Covenant *Gen.* 17. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. was a mixt covenant.

Sect. 5. *Acts* 2. 38, 39. proves not either the identity of covenant now with that to *Abraham Gen.* 17. 7. as it comprehends his natural seed, nor the connexion between it and baptizability.

Sect. 6. The argument of Mr. *Josiah Church* in his *Divine warrant for infant baptism*, from their being judged in the promise of propriety in God is answered.

Sect. 7. Bare judgement of charity concerning a persons interest in the promise is not a warrant to baptize.

Sect. 8. *Acts* 2. 38, 39. proves that interest in the promise intitles not to baptism without repentance.

Sect. 9. Infants are not proved by Mr. *Church* to bee of the visible Church Christian.

Sect. 10. Infants capacity of some respects different from discipleship intitles them not to baptism.

Sect. 11. The agreements between circumcision and baptism do not justifie infant baptism, and the validity of sealing infants with an initial seal is shewed to be null.

Sect. 12. Dr. *Featley* his argument for infant Baptism from the Covenant is examined.

Sect. 13. The arguments of Mr. *William Lyford* from the Covenant for infant baptism are answered.

Sect. 14. The arguments of Mr. *Stalham*, Mr. *Brinsley*, Mr. *Hall*, and a nameless Author from the Covenant for infant Baptism are examined.

Sect. 15. The dispute of Mr. *John Geree* about the extent of the Gospel Covenant to prove thence infant Baptism is examined, and it is shewed that interest in the covenant did not intitle to circumcision; nor is it proved it doth now to baptism.

Sect. 16. That the Gospel covenant is not extended to infants of believers as such.

Sect. 17. Mr. *Cottons*, the *Assembly's*, and *London Ministers* way of arguing for infant Baptism from the Covenant and Circumcision is recited, and the method of the future progress in the *Review* expressed.

Sect. 18. Mr. *Marshals* reply to the first section of the 3d. Part of my *Exam.* about the connexion between the Covenant and seal is reviewed.

Sect. 19. Mr. *Blakes* exceptions againſt my ſpeeches in the point about the connexion between the Covenant and initial ſeal are refelled.

Sect. 20. The exceptions which in the firſt part of my *Review* or *Antipædobap. tiſm ſect.* 5. are made againſt the proof of connexion between the Covenant and initial ſeal, are confirmed againſt Mr. *Blake vind. fed. ch.* 42. *ſect.* 3.

Sect. 21. The ten exceptions of the firſt part of my *Review* againſt Pædobaptiſts expoſition and allegation of *Acts* 2. 38, 39. for the connexion between the Covenant and ſeal, are vindicated from Mr. *Blakes* anſwer *vindic. fed. ch.* 37, 43.

Sect. 22. Animadverſions on *ch.* 2. *part.* 1. of Mr. *Thomas Cobbet* his *Juſt vindication* touching the explication of *Acts* 2. 38, 39. in which his expoſition is ſhewed to be vain, and mine juſtified.

Sect. 23. The arguments drawn from *Acts* 2. 38, 39. againſt the connexion between Covenant intereſt, and Baptiſm right, and infant Baptiſm are vindicated from Mr. *Cobbets* anſwers.

Sect. 24. Mr. *Sidenham's* notes on *Acts* 2. 39. in his *Exercitation ch.* 5. are conſidered.

Sect. 25. Mr. *Marſhals* reply to my *Examen* about his firſt concluſion is reviewed, and the Covenant *Gen.* 17. ſtill maintained to be mixt, and that Gentile ſelf-juſtitiaries, though reputed Chriſtians, are not termed *Abraham's* ſeed, nor *Gal.* 4. 29. proves it, and that the diſtinction of outward and inward Covenant is not right.

Sect. 26. The mixture of the Covenant as by me aſſerted, is vindicated from Mr. *Blakes* exceptions *vind. fed. ch.* 26.

Sect. 27. The four firſt chapters of Mr. *Sidenham's Exercitation* are examined, and his vanity in his conceits about conſequences proving infant baptiſm, the purity of the Covenant *Gen.* 17. infants of believers being *Abrahams* ſeed and in Covenant is ſhewed.

Sect. 28. It is proved from *Luk.* 1. 54, 55. & 19. 9. *Job* 8. 39. *Rom.* 4. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. *Gal.* 3. 7, 16, 29. & 4. 28. *Rom* 9. 6, 7, 8. *Matth* 3. 9. that the ſeed of *Abraham* to whom the promiſe as Evangelical is made *Gen.* 17 7. are onely true believers or elect perſons.

Sect. 29. The allegation of *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. *Matth.* 3. 7, 8, 9. to prove that the ſeed to which the promiſe *Gen.* 17. 7. as Evangelical belong are true believers or the elect onely, is vindicated from Mr. *Blakes* anſwer *vindic ſad. ch.* 36. and Mr. *Sidenhams Exercitation ch.* 6.

Sect. 30. Of the meaning of Mr. *Marſhals* ſecond concluſion, the ambiguity of which is ſhewed.

Sect. 31. Of the novelty and vanity of Mr. *Marſhals* and others doctrine about ſacraments being ſeals of the Covenant of grace, and the ſeveral ſealings of them.

Sect. 32. The exceptions in my *Examen part.* 4. *ſect.* 5. againſt Mr. *Marſhals* ſpeeches about the Covenant and conditional ſealing, are made good againſt Mr. *Marſhal* and Mr. *Blake*.

Sect. 33. That it is no error, as Mr. *Baxter* calls it; but a truth, that the Covenant of grace is made onely to the elect.

Sect. 34. Mr. *Baxter* hath not proved that the abſolute promiſe or Covenant is not it that is ſealed in baptiſm.

Sect. 35. My ſpeech about Gods ſealing to none but believers, is cleered from Mr. *Baxters* objections.

Sect. 36. Chriſtianity is not by birth, nor the Church as civil corporations, Mr. *Marſhals* equivocation in the uſe of the term [Covenant of grace.]

Sect. 37. That the promiſe *Gen.* 17. 7. proves not an external priviledge of viſible Churchmemberſhip and initial ſeal to infants of Gentile believers, as Mr. *Marſhal* aſſerts.

Sect. 38. Animadverſions on the 3d. *ch.* of the firſt *part* of Mr. *Thomas Cobbets Juſt vindic. ſect.* 1, 2, 3. about *Gen.* 17. whereby his poſitions about Church Covenant and external priviledges of the Covenant of grace are reſelled.

Sect. 39. Animadverſions on *ſect.* 4th. of the ſame chapter, whereby the conceits of Mr. *Cobbet* about external being in the Covenant of grace, are ſhewed to be vain.

Sect. 40. Animadverſions on *ſect.* 5. of the ſame *ch.* ſhewing that Mr. *Cobbets* ſuppoſed viſible intereſt in Gods Covenant is not the rule of baptizing.

Sect. 41. Animadverſions on the 6th. *ſect.* of the ſame *ch.* ſhewing that Chriſt is not head of any unſound members, nor parents profeſſion unites children to Chriſt ſo as to entitle them to baptiſm.

Sect. 42. Animadverſions on *ſect.* 7th. of the ſame *ch.* ſhewing that the body of the Jewiſh Church, even the worſt of them, was not under the Covenant of grace in reſpect of external intereſt therein.

Sect. 43. That the Covenant at Mount *Sinai* was a Covenant of works and not of Evangelical grace, and that the Jewiſh Church and ſtate were but one body.

Sect. 44. Animadverſions on the 9th. *ſect.* of the ſame *ch.* in which the Covenant intereſt external and Eccleſiaſtical of infants of inchurched believers, is pretended not proved to be Goſpel, and his allegations of *Deut.* 30. 6, &c. *Gen.* 17. 8. *Luk.* 19. 9. *Deut.* 29. 10, &c. *Ezek.* 16. 1, &c. *Gen.* 9. 25, 26. and other places are examined.

Sect. 45. Mr. *Cobbets* anſwers to objections againſt his 7th. *concl. part.* 1. *c.* 9. *ſect.* 9. of his *Juſt vindic.* are conſidered, and Mr. *Blakes* tenet concerning the general nature of a Covenant that it is a mutual agreement.

Sect. 46. The 27, 28, 29. *chapters* of Mr. *Blakes vind. fad.* are examined, and it is ſhewed that he hath not proved the Covenant of grace in Goſpel times to admit or to be made to any but the elect regenerate.

Sect. 47. Mr. *Blakes vindic. fad. ch.* 34. concerning the ſtating the queſtion of the birth-priviledge of the iſſue of believers is examined, and his objections againſt my ſtating it removed.

Sect. 48. The 35th, and 37th. *chapters* of Mr. *Blakes vindic. fad.* are examined, and his argumens concluding the natural iſſue of believers to be taken into covenant are anſwered.

Sect. 49. The 4th. *ch.* of Mr. *Baxters part.* 1. of *plain Script. proof*, &c. is examined, his conceits about infants viſible Churchmemberſhip and their admiſſion conſidered, and ſundry animadverſions made on that chapter.

Sect. 50. The 5 *ch.* of Mr. *Brs. plain ſcrip.* &c. *p.* 1. is examined, and the texts *Gal.* 4. 1, &c. *Mat.* 28. 19. cleered ſo as to prove infants now no viſible *churchmembers*.

Sect. 51. The arguments from altering of the Jewiſh Church conſtitution and call, the ceaſing of the High Prieſt, &c. to prove infants now no viſible Churchmembers, are made good againſt Mr. *Baxters* 5 *ch. plain, &c. part.* 1.

Sect.

Sect. 52. It is proved that infants were not reckoned to the visible Church Christian in the primitive times, nor are now.

Sect. 53. Letters between me and Mr. *Baxter* are set down, concerning the Law and Ordinance of infants visible Churchmembership unrepealed, which he affirms, whereby the point is stated.

Sect. 54. Infants were visible Churchmembers onely in the Congregation of *Israel*.

Sect. 55. Infants of the Jews were not visible Churchmembers by promise or precept, as Mr. *Baxter* teacheth.

Sect. 56. That the people and thereby the infants of the Hebrews were made visible Churchmembers by a transeunt fact, is made good against Mr. *Baxters* exceptions.

Sect. 57. Mr. *Baxters* Law of infants visible Churchmembership unrepealed is not proved from *Gen.* 1. 26, 27, 28. or *Gen.* 3. 15.

Sect. 58. Infants visible Churchmembership is not proved by the Law of Nature.

Sect. 59. The sayings of *Adam*, *Eve*, *Noah*, concerning *Cain*, *Seth*, *Shem*, the term [*sons of God*, *Gen.* 6. 2.] prove not Mr. *Baxters* Law of infants visible Churchmembership unrepealed.

Sect. 60. Mr. *Baxters* Law of infants visible Churchmembership unrepealed, is not proved from *Gen.* 12. or 17. or 22.

Sect. 61. Covenants, promises and speeches in the Old Testament of *Israel*, the righteous, prove not Mr. *Baxters* Law of infants visible Churchmembership unrepealed.

Sect. 62. Mr. *Baxters* 9th. and 10th. questions about the repealableness and repeal of his imagined Law of infants visible Churchmembership, and his 8. additionals are answered

Sect. 63. Mr. *Baxters* ten calumniatory questions and the conclusion of his Letter are answered.

Sect. 64. My answer in the Dispute and sermon to the argument of Mr. *Baxter* of *Baptism part.* 1. *ch.* 6. about the nonrepeal of infants Churchmembership because neither in justice nor in mercy is vindicated.

Sect. 65. Mr. *Baxters* arguments from *Matth.* 23. 37. *Revel.* 11. 15. for infants visible Churchmembership *ch.* 12, 13. are answered.

Sect. 66. Mr *Baxters* 9th, 10th, 11th, concerning infants better condition in the N. T. in his 14th, 15, 16th, *chapters part.* 1. *of Baptism*, to prove their visible Churchmembership are answered.

Sect. 67. Mr. *Baxters* argument *ch.* 17. *part.* 1. *of baptism*, from *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12. is answered, and my answers vindicated.

Sect. 68. Neither from *Rom.* 4. 11. nor by other reason, hath Mr. *Baxter* proved *ch.* 18. 19. *part.* 1. *of baptism*, that infant Churchmembership was partly natural, partly grounded on the Law of grace and faith.

Sect. 69. Mr. *Baxter ch.* 20. by his 15th. argument from infants being once members of the universal visible Church, hath not proved their visible Churchmembership unrepealed.

Sect. 70. Mr. *Baxters* 16th. and 17th. arguments from the promise of mercy *Exod.* 20. 6. and of blessing *Psal.* 37. 26. are answered.

Sect. 71. Mr. *Baxters* 18th. argument from the priority of infants Churchmembership before Circumcision, his 19th. from Gods mercy, his 20th. from

from blessing and cursing *Deut.* 28. are answered.

Sect. 72. Mr. *Baxters* 21. argument from the absurdity of my doctrine making all infants members of the Devils visible Kingdome is answered.

Sect. 73. Mr. *Baxters* 22. argument *ch.* 27. that my doctrine leaves no ground of hope of salvation of infants dying is answered.

Sect. 74. Mr. *Baxters* allegations *p.* 76, 77, 78. shew not a stronger ground of hope of infants salvation so dying then mine, his 23d. argument *ch.* 28. his 25th. *ch.* 30. are answered.

Sect. 75. My arguments to prove the ingrassing *Rom.* 11. 17. to be into the invisible Church by giving faith, are vindicated from Mr. *Blakes* exceptions *vindic. fæd. ch.* 38. and Mr. *Sidenhams Exercit. ch.* 8, 9.

Sect. 76. My sense of matrimonial holiness 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. is vindicated from Mr. *Blakes* exceptions *vindic. fæd. ch* 39. and Mr. *Sidenhams Exercit. ch.* 7.

Sect. 77. Mr. *William Carters* attempt of proving the Christian Sabbath from *Heb.* 4. 7, 9, 10. is shewed to be successeless, and so useless for proof of infant baptism.

Sect. 78. Mr. *Carters* exposition of *Gen.* 22. 16, 17, 18. as if God promised to make every believer a blessing, so as to cast ordinarily elect children on elect parents is refuted.

Sect. 79. Neither did Circumcision seal Mr. *Carters* additional promise, nor was *Abraham* thence termed father of believers.

Sect. 80. Mr. *Carters* conceit as if *Gen.* 17. 9. were a command in force to *Abrahams* spiritual seed in the N. T. is shewed to be vain.

Sect. 81. The succession of Baptism to Circumcision, and their identity for substance to us is shewed to be unproved by Mr. *Carter*, Mr. *Marshal*, Mr. *Church*, Dr. *Homes*, Mr. *Cotton*, Mr. *Fuller*, Mr. *Cobbet*, from *Col.* 2. 11, 12. or elsewhere.

Sect. 82. Notwithstanding Mr. *Carters* allegations of *Acts* 2. 38, 39. 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Rom.* 11. 16, 24. *Mark* 10. 14. *Acts* 15. 10. *Matth.* 28. 19. the N. T. appears to be silent about Mr. *Carters* additional promise and infants baptism.

Sect. 83. Interest in the Covenant gave not title to Circumcision as Mr. *Marshal* in his 4th. concl. would have it.

Sect. 84. The enlargement of our priviledges proves not infant baptism as Mr. *Marshal* in his 5th. concl. would have it.

Sect. 85. Mr. *Cobbets* dictates *Just. vindic. part.* 2. *ch.* 1. touching childrens baptismal right are examined and refelled.

Sect. 86. The 13th. and 14th. chapters of the first part of Mr. *Rutherfords* book *of the Covenant* are examined, and found to make nothing for infant baptism.

Sect. 87. The disasters in *Germany* and our present distractions sprung not from Anabaptism as Mr. *Crag* saith.

Sect. 88. *Austins* saying about Apostolical traditions is not to be rested upon, nor his testimony about the antiquity of infant baptism.

Sect. 89. The testimonies of the Ancient writers of the *Greek* Church concerning infant baptism are examined and my exceptions made good against Mr. *Crag*, Dr. *Hammond*, Dr. *Homes*, Mr. *Marshal*.

Sect. 90. The arguments to prove infant baptism an innovation in the *Greek* Churches *Exam. p.* 9. are made good against Mr. *Marshal*, and Dr. *Homes*.

Sect. 91.

Sect. 91. The testimonies of *Tertullian* for infant baptism, and Dr. *Hammonds* interpretation of *ch. 39. de Animâ*, are examined with 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.

Sect. 92. Dr. *Hammonds* imagined evidence from [hath been sanctified] for his sense of the forepart of 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. nullified, and my opinion of enallage of tense vindicated.

Sect. 93. Dr. *Hammonds* rendring [*by* 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.] is refelled, and my rendring it [*to*] justified.

Sect. 94. It is shewed that Dr. *Hammond* hath no proof from 1 *Cor.* 7. 16. for his sense of the forepart of *v.* 14. nor will his sense of holy for baptized agree with the Apostles argument, though his sense of the forepart of the verse were granted.

Sect. 95. Dr. *Hammonds* reasons from the terms holy and unclean for his sense of baptized or not baptized are refelled.

Sect. 96. The Jewish custome of baptism for initiation was not the pattern of Christian baptism, as Dr. *Hammond* would have it.

Sect. 97. *Matth.* 28. 19. Infants are excluded from being subjects of baptism notwithstanding Dr. *Hammonds* pretensions.

Sect. 98. The testimonies of *Cyprian*, *Augustin*, and other Latin Fathers for infant baptism, are shewed to have come from their mistakes, and the evidences why the antiquity of infant baptism should not be deemed such as is pretended, are vindicated.

Sect. 99. Mr. *Crags* objections about my nine untruths, his discourse about rebaptizing are refelled.

Sect. 100. The Arguments of Mr. *Crag* for infant baptism are re-examined.

LAU 59

ERRATA.

Pag. 2. l. 17. r. *he premiseth.* p. 3. l. 18. r. 44. p. 7. l. 7. r. *nor is*; l. 39. r. 2. p. 4. l. 39. r. *mere.* p. 10. l. 3. r. *motive*, l. 10. r. *they are vain.* p. 22. l. 12. r. *not onely.* p. 23. l. 30. r. *yea.* p. 25. l. 6. r. *commenders*; l. 20. r. *opinion*; l. 25. r. *probability*; l. 28. r. *disputation*; l. 35. r. *external.* p. 29. l. 8. r. 13. l. 9. r. 7. l. 46. r. *speci.* p. 39. l. 16. r. 2. 17. p. 40. l. 31. r. *peculiar*; l. 46. r. 7. p. 41. l. 41. r. *seal.* p. 55. l. 11. r. *conveys.* p. 62. l. 43. r. *ejection.* p. 67. l. 12. r. *not sealed.* p. 70. l. 34, 35. *the lines are misplaced.* p. 75. l. 22. r. *and not still be admitted to the like initiating Sacrament.* p. 81. l. 29. r. *erant.* p. 86. l. 16. r. *own.* p. 94. l. 35. r. *persecuted*; l. 43. r. *some.* p. 100. l. 4. r. 43 p. 108. l. 2. r. *find.* p. 113. l. 18. r. *fiction*; l. 30. r. *wont.* p. 114. l. 2. r. *invisible*: p. 115. l. 3. r. *swerved.* p. 108. l. 33. r. *then*; l. 13, 17. r. *apposite.* p. 120. l. 10. r. *par.* p. 121. l. 4. r. *he tels.* p. 123. l. 8. r. *Baxter.* p. 124. l. 31. r. *apposite.* p. 126. l. 21. r. *remission of sins.* p. 109. l. 35. r. *incognitum.* p. 141. l. 23. r. *number.* p. 146. l. 1. r. *eyed.* p. 148. l. 3. r. *mistike*; l. 5. r. *apposite.* p. 150. l. 2. r. *meant by*; l. 17. r. *comprehended.* p. 152. l. 22. r. *dichotomie.* p. 158. l. 26. r. *branches*, d. *and.* p. 159. l. 23. d. *or the inward.* p. 160. l. 15. d. *not.* p. 166. l. 46. r. *they*; l. 48. r. *unbaptizable.* p. 171. l. 37. r. *belong.* p. 172. l. 5. r. *of this.* p. 173. l. 26. r. *seed which*; l. 22. r. *because And as.* p. 177. l. 1. r. *that knows.* p. 178. l. 44, 45. r. *doth not agree:* p. 183. l. 38. r. *regenerate:* p. 185. l. 5. r. *Rom.* 3. 1. p. 186. l. 9. r. *now:* p. 184. l. 22. r. *visible:* p. 197. l. 35. r. *type:* p. 204. l. 19. r. *is not:* p. 209. l. 44. r. *Abrahamites antecedently:* p. 213. l. 36. r. *pentance neither have ours*; l. 43. r. *nor is:* p. 215. l. 21. r. *L. C.* l. 24. r. *e g.* p. 221. l. 42. r. *mediation:* p. 222. l. 4. r. *revelation*; l. 30. r. *of science or:* l. 33. r. *an act*; l. 47. r. *contenting:* p. 223. l. 7. r. *types of Christ*; l. 28. r. *hath not*; l. 34. r. *in this*; l. 40. r. *alluded:* p. 224. l. 19. r. *me to:* p. 226. l. 37. d. *not:* p. 228. l. 6. r. *vent*; l. 33, 34. r. *syncretism:* p. 229. l. 4. d. *not*; l. 5. r. *derive*; l. 35. r. *to be a seal be:* p. 230. l. 20. r. *term*; l. 44. r. *Jews:* p. 231. l. 20. r. *he had:* p. 232. l. 5. r. *our*; l. 12. r. *passing*; l. 30. r. *if it:* p. 234. l. 5. r. 15. p. 237. l. 48. r. *P.* p. 238. l. 7. r. *in my*; l. 14. r. *revieved:* p. 239. l. 8. r. *flings:* p. 240. l. 15. d. *not*; l. 17. r. *and seals*; l. 33. r. *cerning:* p. 241. l. 7. r. *first grace*; l. 13. r. *what sense:* p. 244. l. 21. r. *contradistinguisheth:* p. 245. l. 33. d. *not*; l. 47. r. *asserting:* p. 246. l. 20. r. *as.* p. 249. l. 10. r. *there*, l. 39. r. *and not:* p. 250. l. 35. r. *charged:* p. 252. l. 20. r. *& ward.* p. 254. l. 1. r. *xn:* p. 256. l. 32. r. 28. l. 41, 43. r. *all at age* p. 257. l. 8. r. *my*; l. 14. r. *instance*; l. 42. r. *stony:* p. 258. l. 37. r. *futility:* p. 261. l. 1. r. *it were*; l. 4. d. *to*; l. 39. r. *sealing:* p. 268. l. 29. r. *ly*; l. 42. r. *that*; l. 43. d. *I:* p. 272. l. 1. r. *reason is*; l. 9. r. *and the:* p. 273. l. 23. r. *art:* p. 275. l. 37. r. *external:* p. 276 l. 45. d. *not:* p. 277. l. 37. r. *during the*; l. 44, 45. d. *in the right administration of it*: p. 278. l. 12. r. *no where*; l. 47. r. *elect allusive:* p. 279. l. 2. r. *afore*, l. 15. r. *contain*, l. 17. r. *it proper to Israel:* p. 280. l. 35. r. *but that such are to be*; l. 37. r. *act is a*; l. 39. r. *they are:* p. 281. l. 20. r. *were:* p. 282. l. 46. r. *without that*; l. 47. r. *John:* p. 283. l. 44. r. *professor:* p. 285. l. 36. r. *or:* p. 286 l. 19. d. *and*; l. 26. r. *yea under yet were:* p. 287. l. 7. r. *was*; l. 13 r. *that which*, l. 20. r. *visible interest:* p. 293. l. ult. r. *noting* p. 294. l. 24. r. *unto:* p. 295. l. 38. r. *winding:* p. 300. l. 9. r. *expected:* p. 301. l. 24. r. *no transgressors:* p. 310. l. 12. r. *know not:* p. 311. l. 3. r. *of grace:* p. 317. l. 46. r. *come:* p. 319. l. 8. r. *meer professor:* p. 330. l. 16. r. *is a seal to the Gentiles that believe of*

the

ERRATA.

the righteousness of faith though they be never circumcised; l. 24. r. *were such*; l. 27. d. *were*: p. 332. l. 40. r. *are*: p. 334. l. 3. r. *inference*; l. 37. r. *exilia*: p. 335. l. 7. r. *assert*; l. 47. r. *whence*; l. 13. r. *tenet*: p. 340. l. 36. r. *condition*.

At *Yy* the figures are wrong by reason of the use of two Presses; for after 344. *sect.* 46. is p. 245. again; p. 249. l. 14. r. *of which*: p. 256. l. 4. r. *vesorum*: p. 261. l. 48. r. *desert*: p. 269. l. 31. r. *ever*: p. 283. l. 6. r. *to*: p. 284. l. 35. r. *nor*: p. 292. mis-printed 284. l. 38. r. *unto what*: p. 297. l. 6. r. *indefinitely*: p. 304. l. 28. r. *special*: p. 318. l. 25. r. *desertion*: p. 323. l. 8. r. *mere*: p. 382. l. 23. r. *cause*: p. 387. l. 22. r. *of all*: p. 398. l. 6. r. *he is*: p. 401. l. 37. r. *many*: p. 403. l. 20. r. *use no*: p. 407. l. 19. r. *churchmembers*: p. 501. l. 43. r. *on condition*: p. 503. l. *penult.* r. *righteousness*: p. 509. l. 9. r. *can*: p. 510. l. 47. r. *not*: p. 557. l. 18. r. *it was*. p. 559. l. 18. r. *who hath*. p. 561. l. 28. r. *is not*. p. 597. l. 34. r. *sarcastical*. p. 608. l. 23. r. *an*. p. 613. l. 43. r. *might well*. p. 621. l. 9. r. *there*. p. 647. l. 12. r. *import*. p. 653. l. 10. r. *concrete*. p. 678. l. 7. r. *deny*. p. 684. l. 46. r. *sanction*. p. 702. l. 36. r. *did not*. p. 703. l. 11. r. *were not*. p. 705. l. 42. r. *benefit*. p. 721. l. 8. d. *not*. p. 725. l. 14. r. *the time*. p. 727. l. 24. r. *is*. p. 735. l. 11. r. *there*. p. 745. l. 11. r. *formally*. p. 752. l. 43. r. *there*. p. 756. l. 7. r. *Fanna*. p. 783. l. 27. r. *there were*. p. 798. l. 7. r. *ambigua*. p. 799. l. 10. d. *of*. p. 803. l. 38. r. *not*. p. 816. l. 44. r. *one parent was*. p. 822. l. 7. d. *be*. p. 825. l. 7. r. *which it was*; l. 23. r. *nati*. p. 830. l. 18. r. *and also*. p. 834. l. 47. r. *inference which*. p. 844. l. 19. r. *of the Chair*. p. 848. l. 15. r. 23. p. 850. l. 16. r. *catachresis*. p. 851. l. 2. d. *in*; l. 10. r. *form*. p. 852. l. 46. r. *put*. p. 853. l. 31. r. *comprehend*. p. 854. l. 40. r. *or not*. p. 877. l. 29. r. *not as*. p. 883. l. 2. r. *denegandam*. p. 885. l. 7. r. *desert*. p. 889. l. 4. r. *contend*.

Books published by the Author.

CHrists Commination against Scandalizers, on *Luk.* 17. 1, 2. Printed for *Richard Royston*, at the sign of the Angel in *Ivy* Lane, *London.*

Jehovah Jireh, or, Gods Providence in delivering the Godly; in two Sermons on 2 *Pet.* 2. 9. on occasion of preserving *Bristol* from a plot to deliver it to Prince *Rupert*, *March* 7. 1642. Printed for *Michael Sparks* at the Blew Bible in Green Arbour, *London.*

Fermentum Phariſæorum, or, the Leaven of Pharisaical will-worship; in a Sermon on *Matth.* 15. 9. Printed for *Andrew Crook* at the Green Dragon in *Pauls* Church-yard, *London.*

Anthropolatria, or the sin of glorying in men; on 1 *Cor.* 3. 21. Printed for *John Bellamy*, at the three Golden Lions in *Cornhil*, *London.*

Two Treatises concerning Infant Baptism, to wit, an *Exercitation*, and *Examen* of Mr. *Stephen Marshals* Sermon; Printed for *George Whittington*, and to be sold at the Blackmore at Fleet-bridge *London* by *W. Larnar.*

An Apology for the two Treatises, printed for *G. Calvert* at the Black spread Eagle at the West end of *Pauls*, *London.*

An Antidote against the venome of a passage of Mr. *Richard Baxter*, Printed for *Thomas Brewster* at the three Bibles at the West end of *Pauls*, *London.*

An addition to the Apology in a Letter to Mr. *Robert Baillee* of *Scotland*: Printed by *Henry Hills*, next door to the sign of the Peacock in Aldersgate-street, *London.*

Praecursor, or a Fore-runner to the *Review*: Printed for the same.

Antipædobaptism, or the First Part of the full Review of the Dispute concerning Infant Baptism: Printed for *Henry Crips* and *Lodowick Lloyd* in Popes-head Alley near Lumbard-street, *London.*

Books published by the Author.

A Plea for Antipædobaptists, against Mr. *John Cragg's* Dispute and Sermon at *Abergavenny*: Printed for *Henry Hills* above named.

Antipædobaptism, or the Second Part of the full Review of the Dispute concerning Infant Baptism: Printed for the same.

Joannis Tombes Bendleiensis refutatio positionis Dris. Henrici Savage Londini: typis Henrici Hills.

Antipædobaptism, or the the Third Part of the full Review of the Dispute concerning Infant Baptism: *London*, printed for *Henry Hills* above named.

FINIS.

Anti-pædobaptiſm:

OR,

The third part of the full Review of the Diſpute concerning Infant-Baptiſm, refuting the proof of it from Circumciſion and the Covenant.

SECT. I.

The ſecond Argument againſt Infant-Baptiſm, that it is will-worſhip, is confirmed.

HAving proceeded ſo far in the *Review* of the diſpute concerning Infant-baptiſm, as to vindicate the Texts, *Rom.* 11. 17. *Act.* 2 38,39. 1*Cor.*7.14. from ſuch gloſſes as tend to wreſt them to the maintenance of it, and to make good my firſt Argument againſt it, from the inſtitution of Chriſt, *Mat.*28.19. *Mark.*16.16. The Apoſtles

and primitive Evangeliſts practice and ſayings, in two parts of the *Review* already printed, I go on to the finiſhing of the reſt of the forementioned *Review*.

My ſecond Argument againſt Infant-baptiſm is thus formed, That which is will-worſhip is not agreeable to the will of God, nor according to the rule of baptizing: But the ordinary Baptizing of Infants, though by a lawful Miniſter, is will-worſhip. *Ergo.*

The Major is proved, 1. From *Col.* 2. 13. where will-worſhip is diſallowed by the Apoſtle, and ſo generally Commentators and other Authors account will-worſhip a ſin. Doctor *Lakes defence about the Sabbath*, Theſ. 2. *Ye know that* ἐθελοθρησκεία *did never pleaſe God*; yet Doctor *Hammond* in his Treatiſe *of will-worſhip*, will have ἐθελοθρησκεία, or will-worſhip, to be underſtood in the better ſenſe. But againſt it are the frame of the Apoſtles words, and the driſt of them, which is to blame them for *being ſubject to ordinances after the doctrines and commandments of men, as not agreeing with a Chriſtians co-dying with Chriſt*; And he ſaith, *Such things have a ſhew of wiſdom*: and verſe 18. he that promiſeth that none *do beguile them of their reward* θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ, *willing in humility*, or as our Tranſlators, *in a voluntary humility*. I may not now divert from the preſent buſineſs to examine Doctor *Hammonds* Allegations, there being enough in that Text to prove, ſervice as done to God, invented by men, and practiſed after their commands, without Gods appointment, not to be after Gods will: and I take Doctor *Hammond* to be well anſwered by Mr. *Cawdrey*. 2. However the *Major* is plainly proved from Chriſts words, *Mat.* 15. 9. *In vain do they worſhip me, teaching for doctrine mens precepts*; which proves that worſhip which is taught after mens precepts (which is the ſame with will-worſhip in my propoſition) is in vain, and therefore not agreeable to the will of God. But I need not ſay any more about it, ſith my Antagoniſts do moſt of them except againſt will-worſhip as a ſin.

The *Minor* is proved thus, That which is worſhip not appointed by God, is will-worſhip: But the ordinary baptizing of Infants of Believers, Churched or unchurched, though by a lawful Miniſter, is worſhip not appointed by God. *Ergo.* The *Major* is confirmed from the very definition of will-worſhip, which is, A worſhip of God nor appointed by him, but taken up according to the command of man, out of *Mat.* 15. 9. The *Minor* is proved, by demanding a Scripture wherein God appointed Infant-baptiſm.

In anſwer hereto, in conference with me, it was once denied that Infant-baptiſm was uſed as a worſhip of God: But if ſo, then it is no holy thing, no Sacrament, no profaneneſs to contemn it, no matter if a Midwife do it, with many more of the like abſurdities.

Maſter *Blake* in his *anſwer to my letter* ch. 13. pag. 92. *Vindic. fœd.* ch. 44. denies *Infant-Communion, Bell-baptiſm, to be will-worſhip, he makes will-worſhip then when men deviſe an Ordinance, but not when it is onely an abuſe, profanation, miſapplication of an inſtituted worſhip to a wrong ſubject.*

And

And Master *Marshall* page 195. of his *Defence*, would put me to prove, *that all things belonging to Christian worship, even in the circumstances of it, even the ages and sexes of the persons to whom the Ordinances are to be applyed, must be expressely set down in the N. T.* pag. 196. *There is no absolute necessity, that every circumstance of an Ordinance, or the several sexes or ages to whom an Ordinance ought to be applied, must be set down in precept, or Apostolical example equivalent to a precept, found in the N.T.* pag. 205. *The point about Infant-baptism toucheth but a circumstance of age.* In which speeches Mr. *M.* seems to make Infant-baptism but an arbitrary circumstance; and if so, then much injury was in the *first use* of his *Sermon*, in which he made the denial of Infant-baptism, odious, as if it were as bad or worse than the facts of *Herod*, and *Hazael* in slaying Infants; then much guilt of oppression lies on them that have denied place in the Ministery, scourged, imprisoned, fined, banished, put to death men for opposing, or not owning Infant-baptism; and very unrighteous have been their declamations, who in Pulpits and elsewhere have inveighed against them as Hereticks, Sectaries, *&c.* censured their opinion as intolerable, as *Maresius qu.* 6. their practice as Sacrilege, as Master *Blake vindic. fæd.* ch. 4. If Master *M.* do indeed think the point of Infant-baptism *to touch but a circumstance of age*, and that it needs no divine institution, then it is an indifferent ceremony with him, such as the power of the Church may appoint, and if so, it is no otherwise blameable to omit it, than it is to omit any other Church-constitution. But the truth is, it is false which he saith, That the *matter toucheth onely a circumstance of age*: for indeed it toucheth the qualification of the person to be Baptized; and the very end and use of Baptism (which are the essentials of it, as it is a Sacrament) which is, that the person Baptized, do thereby testifie his profession of Repentance and Faith in Christ, and covenant to be his, as appears by the very phrase used, of being Baptized into the name of the Trinity, *Mat.* 28. 19. compared with 1 *Cor.* 1. 13. as I have proved before, Part 2. Sect. 5. And were it a circumstance onely of age, yet it being determined by Christ, who are to be baptized, to wit, Disciples and Believers, it is an arrogant presumption to alter it. Rightly saith *Chamier* {*Panstr. tom.* 4. *lib.* 8. *c.* 4. Sect. 32. *quæ non sunt institutæ circumstantiæ habeto sane sibi Ecclesia, ut tempus locumque celebrandi, & si quæ sunt similia. At quæ instituta sunt ea ne moveto.*

As for M. *Blakes* speech, that *a misapplication of an instituted ordinance to a wrong subject, is an abuse or profanation of it, but not will-worship*, 1. It is not right. For though every misapplication to a wrong subject of an instituted ordinance be not will-worship, yet a misapplication to a wrong subject of an instituted ordinance is a will-worship, when not onely the rite it self is made worship of God, but also the application of it to that subject, though it be but mens invention, yea and such a one as alters the end and use of the ordinance. as is in infant baptism, bell-baptism, altar-baptism, infant-Communion, Prayer, sacrifice, vows, keeping solemn feasts, offering incense, building altars, were instituted ordinances, yet *Jeroboams* sacrificing and keeping a feast at another time than God appointed, *Ahaz* his forming

an altar after the pattern of that at *Damascus*, *Nadab* and *Abihu* their offering strange fire, prayer to Saints, for the dead, vowes to Saints, monastick profession after such a rule, keeping of holy dayes to Saints, and many other things among Pagans, and Papists, are condemned as will-worship. Generally Protestants, even the *Assembly* in their *Confession of faith*, chap. 29. art. 4. make the *lifting up*, *reserving the elements in the Eucharist*, Contrary to *Matth.* 15.9. and chap. 21. they say, *the acceptable way of worshiping the true God is instituted by himself, and so limited to his own revealed will, that he may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or suggestions of Satan, under any visible representations, or any other way not prescribed in the Holy scripture*; yea the non-conformists have gone further in so censuring the three ceremonies, crosse at baptism, kneeling at the Lords Supper, the wearing the Surplice in holy ministrations, to be will-worship, as the *Abridgement of the Lincolnshire Ministers petition*, and other writings shew, and D. *Morton* in his *Defence*, and D. *Burges* in his *Rejoynder to the reply*, chap. 2. and elsewhere, acquit them onely from will-worship, in that they placed not holiness in them, made them not necessary parts of worship, which I presume M. *Blake* will not say of Infant-baptism, the denial of which he counts, though vainly, to be sacrilege, *Vindic. fœd. chap.* 40. And sure *baptisms* were instituted ordinances among the *Jews*, *Heb.* 9.10. yet our Lord Christ applies the Prophets censure of will-worship, *Isai.* 29.13. against the Pharisees placing holiness and fear of God in their washings of hands and other things so often and in the manner they used. *Mark.* 7.1,2,3,4,5,6,7.

Secondly, were it granted, that it is not properly will-worship to misapply an instituted ordinance to a wrong subject, yet if it be an abuse or profanation, the matter is no whit mended with M. *Blake*, if I put in my argument instead of the term (will-worship) the term (profanation or abuse) I presume Pædobaptists will not justify a profanation or abuse, which Infant-baptism is acknowledged to be if it be not after Gods appointment or Christs institution. Wherefore M. *M.* and the most of the pædobaptists, not trusting to these evasions seek for an appointment of Infant-baptism in the institution of Infant-circumcision, *Gen.* 17. Yet M. *Baxter* in his *plain Scripture proof, part.* 1. *chap.* 4. *&c.* declines the command of Circumcision for proof of Infant-baptism, and imagins an ordinance of their visible Church-membership, distinct from the ordinance of Circumcision, unrepealed, out of which he endeavours to prove Infant-baptism, though he no where that I know shew us where that ordinance is, notwithstanding in my *Præcursor* and elsewhere he hath been often pressed to shew it, which book of M. *B.* taking so much, that a third edition is printed, I had hoped pædobaptists would have stuck to his way, and declined the other way of analogy of the Command of Circumcision. But I see latter books, as M. *Sidenham*, M. *Fuller*, and others, still insisting on the hypothesis concerning the covenants and the seal, and Baptisms succession to Circumcision, *&c.* M. *Gataker* in his Latin treatise against D. *Ward about the force and efficacy of Infant-baptism*, though by his Epistle it appears he had seen M. *Baxters* books, yet *p.* 16. he speaks thus to D. *Ward*. *I would you had specially designed the Com-*

mand

mand concerning the baptizing the infants of believers, which you mean. For although from the analogy of Circumcision, and the nature of this very sacrament, as it is destined to initiation, the comprehension of infants in the Covenant of grace &c. I deservedly believe both the Antient Church to have used, and the Church at this day justly to use Infant-baptism, yet hitherto I have found no speciall Command concerning this thing. I wish he had formed and confirmed his proof for Infant-baptism from the Analogy of Circumcision, &c. so antient, learned a man, and so accurate in Controversies, me thinks should have yielded some better proof for Infant-baptism than others have don, or have forborn calling them *novel sectaries who with so much endeavour oppugn Infant-baptism* (which is the expression in his Epistle to the Reader) and with-held his hand from subscribing to that attestation wherein the Four positions of my *Examen* were censured as erroneous and pernicious. But not meeting with any other proof than this, I shall keep on in the *Review* of the dispute, and examine the pretended institution of Infant-baptism out of the Old Testament, taking in some texts of the New, and first Examine the way of proof by analogy of Circumcision, which seems to have been the Assemblies way, and then M. *Bs.* more refined way, as is imagined, desiring the Reader to take notice of what was before disputed in the Second Section of the second part of this *Review*, to prove that consequences drawn from analogy between meer positive rites of the Old and New Testament to prove a duty in the use of them, without particular institution, are not good.

SECT. II.

Dr. Homes *his arguments to prove Infant-baptism from* Gen. 17. *are Examined.*

Two wayes I finde Consequences framed, one in arguments formed syllogistically, the other in certain Conclusions or hypotheses from whence it is conceived they may deduce Infant-baptism. I begin with the former way. I had formed the argument from *Gen.* 17. 7. *&c.* three wayes, in my *Exercit.* Sect. 1, 2, 3. and that without disadvantage to my Antagonists, notwithstanding D. *Homes* his exceptions. But I am content to view the forms D. *Homes* sets down, as more agreeable to their minde. In his Animadversion on my *Exerc. chap.* 2. *pag.* 6. he saith, *Our first form of argument from* Gen. 17. 7. *&c. is this. Where there is a Command for a thing never remanded or contramanded, there the thing is still in force. But there is a Command for signing the infants of a believer with the sign of the Covenant of grace,* Gen. 17. 7, 9. *never yet remanded or contramanded: therefore the signing believers children with the sign of the Covenant of grace* (*namely baptism now*) *is still in force.*

To which I answer, 1. The conclusion is not of the thing in question, which is not *of the children of believers*, but of the Infant-children of believers, as it was in the *Minor*, now a person of 20. years of age is a believers

lievers child, as well as one of two dayes old. 2. In the *Minor* (*the ſign of the Covenant of grace Commanded*) is underſtood, either of the ſign of the Covenant of grace expreſſed in the Concluſion, to wit, Baptiſm, and if ſo, it is denied that there is any ſuch Command, *Gen.* 17.7,9. to ſign with the ſign of the Covenant of grace believers infants, theres no Command but of circumciſing the manchild of eight dayes old, not a tittle of baptiſm: or elſe of a ſign of the Covenant of grace there expreſſed, and if ſo, the *Minor* is denied, *that the Command for ſigning the Infants of a believer with the ſign of the Covenant of grace*, Gen. 17.7,9. *was never yet remanded or contramanded*. It was expreſſely contramanded *Acts* 15. 28. *Gal.* 5.1,2,3. If in the Concluſion by (*the ſign of the Covenant of grace*) be meant as the words (*namely baptiſm now*) import, the rite of Chriſtian Baptiſm, and in the *Minor* it be meant of the Command of Circumciſion, then there is a fault of the ſyllogiſm in the form, it conſiſting of four terms. If in the *Minor* ir be meant of the ſign of the Covenant indefinite, which is neither Baptiſm nor Circumciſion, I deny there is ſuch a Command, *Gen.* 17. 7, 9. and the ſyllogiſm hath alſo fourth terms.

Two other forms he hath *pag.* 9. 2. *Form of argument from* Gen. 17. *is this. To whom the Covenant in force runs in the ſame tenour in the New Teſtament as in the Old, to them the application of the firſt ſign or ſeal of the New Teſtament may be applied. as well as the firſt of the Old Teſtament: But this tenour of the Covenant of grace ſtill in force, is as true, and doth as truely run to a believing Gentile, I am thy God and the God of thy ſeed, as it did to Abraham the Father of believing Gentiles*, Rom. 4. Gal. 3. *Ergo, the firſt ſeal of the Covenant may be applied to believers children, now in the New Teſtament as well as in the Old to* Abrahams. *The* Major *is plain in* Gen. 17. *the tenor of the Covenant, and the application of the firſt ſeal, are Knit into a dependence one upon another. I am the God of thee, and thy ſeed*, V.7,8. *Therefore thou ſhalt circumciſe every male*, V.9. &c. *The* Minor *is unqueſtioned of any that I know.*

Anſwer 1. The thing to be concluded was, *that Baptiſm may be applied, but baptiſm and the firſt ſeal of the Covenant* I do not take to be all one. Baptiſm or Circumciſion I do no where finde in Scripture called the ſeal of the Covenant, much leſs the firſt ſeal, and why the blood of Chriſt, or the ſpirit of Chriſt, or the oath of God may not be called the firſt ſeal of the Covenant as well as theſe, I know not; again the Concluſion was to be (*may be applied to infant-children of believers*) where as the concluſion is (*may be applyed to believers children*) And the thing to be concluded was ſimply (*baptiſm may be applied to Infants of believers*) whereas it is propounded comparatively (*now in the New Teſtament as well as in the Old to* Abraham) now baptiſm was not applied to *Abraham*, and therefore the Concluſion may be granted (*baptiſm may be applied to infants of believers now as well as to* Abraham) that is, juſt never a whit, ſith it was never applied to *Abraham*. 2. But beſides, if the phraſes (*to whom the Covenant in force runs* &c.) in the *Major*, and in the *Minor*, (*doth as truely run to a believing*

believing Gentile) (as the words carry it) be meant onely of the believer, and in the *Major* (*the application to them*) be meant onely of the believing Gentile as in the *Minor*, then there are more than three terms in the syllogism, (*applied to believers children*) beeing not at all in either of the premises. But if it be put in the *Major* (*may be applied to them and their Infants*) and in the *Minor* (*to a believing Gentile and his Infant children*) I deny both *Major* and *Minor*. Nor the *Major* proved from *Gen.* 17.7,8,9. as in my *Answer to M. Bailee*, Sect. 3. in my *Ample disquisition* Sect 5. is made manifest, by shewing the nullity of the pretended connexion between the Covenant and the seal; The term (*therefore*) *Gen.* 17.9.) may be read (*and*) and it hath not reference to the promise onely, *V.* 7. but to the rest of the promises, *V* 4,5,6,7,8. or rather to the whole Covenant, and the making of it, and it imports not a right by vertue of the Covenant, but a motive inforcing a Command, and this command being of circumcising the male onely of 8. dayes old, shewes there is not a connexion between the Covenant and Seal, sith then it would belong to the female and male of the seventh day, they being in Covenant as well as the male of the eighth. The *Minor* he takes as unquestioned, But I deny it, till I finde it better proved than yet I have done. I omit the uncouthenes of the Phrase (*to them the application of the first sign may be applied*) and leave the *D.* to make good sense of it, which I cannot do.

His 3. form of Argument from *Gen.* 17. is, *Where there is the same reason of a precept, there may be the same practice: But the promise which is the reason of the precept runs in the New Testament* (*as flowing from* Gen. 17.) *to believers and their children, The promise is to you and your children*, Acts. 2. 39. *Ergo.*

Answer. What is the Conclusion he would prove he leavs to be gathered. It should be, Infants of believers are to be baptized. But then the predicate in the Conclusion would be found in neither of the Premisses. For the precept *Gen.* 17.9. is onely that male Infants of 8. days old of *Abrahams* house should be Circumcised. But a little after he puts this as the Conclusion, *that the same reason on which the administration of circumcision was grounded, the administration of baptism was grounded.* Which I grant true in this sense, that as the reason why Circumcision was administred to Infants was the Command of God, so the reason why Baptism is to be administred to believers, is the Command of Christ. But the D. would have it thus, that as infants were to be Circumcised by vertue of the promise, *Gen.* 17.7. so Infants of believers are to be Baptized by vertue of the same promise repeated *Acts* 1.39. concerning which, to omit the monstrosity of his syllogism, in which there are more than 4 terms, and neither the Predicate nor Subject in the Conclusion, *Major* or *Minor*, his speeches are without proof or trueth. For 1. it is not true, where there is the same reason of a precept there may be the same practice. For *Levit.* 19.5,9,10,19,23,25,26,27,28,30. are precepts concerning Mosaical ceremonies or observances, as of *offering a sacrifice, of peace offerings, not reaping the corners of the field, not sowing the field with mingled seed, not wearing a garment of linnen and woollen, not eating*

fruit

fruit of trees planted till the fourth yeer, not eating any thing with the blood, not rounding the corners of the head, reverencing the Sanctuary, to wit, the tabernacle or Temple, and these with other moral precepts mixed among them in the same Chapter, have in sundry of those verses, and the beginning and end of the Chapter, this as the common reason, *I am the Lord*, and yet we are not by the same reason tied to all the practices. 2. He doth not prove that *the promise*, Acts 2.39. is the same with the promise, *Gen.*17.7. It is more likely to be either the promise, *Act.*2.17,33,38. or *Act.* 2.30. or *Act.*3.25. which were eminent promises, and related to the covenant of grace. 3. He doth not prove that (*to you*, Act.2.39.) is (to you believers and to your children) that is, the Infants of believers as such: It doth not appear they were then believers when these words were spoken. 4. Nor is there a word that shews the promise was to them or their children, whether called or no. 5. Nor is it proved that the promise to *Abraham* and his seed, *Gen.*17.7. was the onely reason of the precept, *vers.* 9,10. 6. If it were so proved, it is not proved, nor ever can be, that it was the formal adequate reason, why an Infant was circumcised. 7. Nor is there the least hint in the words, *Act.*2.38,39. that the reason why a person hath right to be Baptized, is barely the being of the promise to that person, or *Gen.* 17. 7,9,10. any hint that the promise barely of it self, did either give right to Circumcision, or oblige to the duty, but in both places it is brought as a motive to excite to that duty, which the precept alone was the formal reason of, and in the former as well of Repentance as of being Baptized. So that when the Doctor hath formed his arguments, they are but mishapen things, having many ambiguities of speech, little or no proof for what he saith. And notwithstanding the Doctors cavils, I yet think the arguments from *Gen.* 17. were better formed by me in my *Exercitation* for Pædobaptists advantage, than by the Doctor in his *Animadversions*: But perhaps we may finde the Arguments better formed elsewhere.

SECT. III.

Master Drew's *Argument for Infant-baptism from* Gen. 17. *is examined, and it is shewed, there is not the same reason of Infant-Baptism, as of Infant-Circumcision.*

MAster *John Drew* is one of those to whose writings Master *Baxter* refers me, and is said by the *Author of the lawfulness of obeying the present government, to have written with sharp reasons and mild language.* Let's see how he hath disputed pag.23. of his *serious address*; *Where there is the same reason of a precept or command enjoyning any practice continued, there may and must be the same practice continued: But the reason of the command for signing Infants of Covenanters with the first signe or seal of the Covenant under the Old Testament continues still in force for that practice under the New Testa-*

Teſtament. Therefore now that command is in force to all perſons in Covenant, as it was then.

Anſw. The command in force then to all perſons in Covenant, is expreſſed by himſelf in the words before, *pag.* 22.23. *the command of Circumciſion,* Gen. 17.11,12. when he ſaith (*All the Infants of thoſe in Covenant with God were ſigned with the firſt ſigne or ſeal of the Covenant then inſtituted and commanded by the Lord, which was Circumciſion*) ſo that if he mean, as his words are, this is his meaning in his concluſion (*that command which is* Gen.17.11,12. *to Circumciſe the fleſh of the foreskin of* Abrahams *males of eight dayes old, is now in force to all perſons in Covenant, as well as it was then*) which neither hath nor can have any other ſenſe (taking words as they are uſed by other men) but that ſtill all in Covenant with God, are bound by the command, *Gen.* 17. 11, 12. to Circumciſe their male children of eight dayes old; which is to maintain that which the Apoſtles have abrogated, *Act.* 15. to intangle us with the yoak of bondage, which the Apoſtle ſaith, would make Chriſt unprofitable to us, *Gal.* 5. 1, 2, 3: But it will be ſaid, he means not the command of Circumciſion, but the command of ſigning with the firſt ſign or ſeal of the Covenant. *Anſ.* If he means ſo, he rather juggles than diſputes. For the words ſpeak of the command, which is *Gen.* 17. 11, 12. and that is no other than of Circumciſion; no ſuch command of ſigning Infants of Covenanters with the firſt ſigne or ſeal of the Covenant in the Old Teſtament, beſides that of Circumciſion, is either there or any where elſe that I know of; if there be let it be ſhewed. But this is the manner of Pædobaptiſts, in their diſputes to imagine a command of ſealing, as they call it, with the firſt ſeal, the Infants of Covenanters abſtractively or diſtinctly from Circumciſion in the Old Teſtament, *Gen.* 17. which is indeed a meer fiction, with which they mock their auditors and readers, who unwarily take what they ſay without examination. Now this were an anſwer ſufficient to this argument; yet becauſe this mans reaſoning is ſo commended, let's view his proofes.

For proof of the *Major* thus he writes. *For when God giveth the reaſon of any command, that reaſon is the ground of the command; and till that reaſon ceaſeth, he is very bold with God, that dare exempt himſelf from the practice. And again, If the firſt propoſition be denied,* viz, *where there is the ſame reaſon of a precept continued, there muſt be the ſame practice, then every man may ſet himſelf free from any command of God, and who can ſay unto him, what doeſt thou? For the Lord commands nothing without a reaſon, if there be no reaſon expreſt, the reaſon of his will is implyed, which is as cogent and binding as all reaſons in the world, till he makes it appear that it ceaſeth. This is very clear.*

Anſw. The reaſon of a Command may be underſtood, either of the reaſon why God commands a thing, or the reaſon why we are bound to obſerve that command. The reaſon why God commands is various, ſometimes one thing, ſometimes another, ſometimes expreſſed, ſometimes concealed. And ſometimes the ſame reaſon is given of very various com-

mands, as I said before (*I am the Lord your God*) is *Levit.*19. the promiscuous reason of moral and ceremonial and judicial commands; yea that the very reason which 1 *Pet.*1.14,15,16. is given for the command *to be obedient children, not fashioning themselves according to their lusts in their ignorance, but to be holy in all manner of conversation*, is cited from *Levit.* 11. 44,45. and is the very reason why he forbids the Israelits to eat certain meats, or to touch certain things unclean by the Law. And therefore by Master *Drew*'s reasoning (the reason of the precept not ceasing) we are bound still to the precept, *Levit.* 11. of abstaining from meats unclean by the Law, and from touching things legally defiling. But though there may be many motives to do it the rather, yet the onely formal adequate reciprocal reason why we are bound to observe any thing, is the command of our Lord revealed to us, besides which, we are to look no further, nor are we to neglect it, till by some declaration of his will, it appears we are discharged. Thus *Abraham* was bound to offer his son *Isaac* on the Altar, because of Gods command, without knowing any other reason; yea though he had known the reason from the end to be fulfilled, yet he had not been discharged till God signified it by the Angel, that he should not slay him. Now then to Master *Drews* argument. If he understand the reason of the precept in the first sense his major is false; the reason why God gave a precept may continue, and yet the practice is not to continue, as *Levit.* 11. 44,45. On the otherside the reason of a precept may not reach, and yet the precept reach; as though God brought not us out of Egypt; which is the reason of the command, *Deut.* 5. 6,7. yet the command pertains to us, and *vers.*15. It is said, *Remember that thou wast a bondman in Egypt, therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day.* Where I presume Master *Drew* will say the command reacheth us, though the reason of it do not. And as for his inference, *That if it be denied, where there is the same reason of a precept there must be the same practice, then every man may set himself free from any command of God*, it is true, if by *the same reason of a precept*, he understand the reason of a precept in the second sense, for the reason why we are bound to observe his precept, to wit, the declaration of Gods will it should continue: but if he understand it in the first sense, for that reason which God gives, why he declared his will, and bound us to observe it, though it continue, yet the precept may not be in force, nor on the other side doth the precept alwayes cease to binde, though that reason cease, as is proved before.

Now that reason of the precept *Gen.*17.11,12. which is *vers.*4,5,6,7,8. is a reason of the first sort, and not of the latter. And indeed in more positive rites which are by institution the precept continues not in force, however the reason God used to inforce it, remaine, except the institution be continued. Rightly *Parens comm.* in *Gen.* 8. 20. to an Objection, *That sacrifices are to be continued, because the cause is perpetual*, Answereth, *The perpetual cause of a thing necessarily co-hering with the thing, as a Cause continued with its effect, makes the same perpetual. But the said causes or ends do not so co-here with the sacrifies of the Ancients, but onely by appointment, that is divine ordination, which was that those sacrifices should be*

the

the confirmation of the faith of the fathers, and a signification of gratitude, unto the coming of the Messiah, &c. The like may be said of the ends of Circumcision, and the occasion of appointing it.

But let us view Master *Drew*'s proof of the Minor, *The reason* (saith he) *of the command for signing Infants of Believers under the Law, with the first signe or seal of the Covenant, was this promise, I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed, as is evident,* Gen. 17.7,8. *compared with the* 9. 10. *and* 11. *verses, where this promise of God, and the application of the first seal are knit into a dependence one upon another: I will establish my Covenant between me and thee,* &c. *to be a God unto thee and thy seed after thee; therefore thou shalt Circumcise every male, as a token of the Covenant,* vers 11. *But this same reason of the command continues in force under the Gospel; God doth as truely say to every Believing Gentile now, I am thy God and the God of thy seed, as he did to* Abraham *the Father of believing Gentiles, so he is called* Rom. 4.11. *Therefore I may conclude, that Believers under the Gospel, have the same command for signing their Infants with the first seal of the Covenant of promise (which now is baptism) as* Abraham *had to signe his under the Law with the first signe,* &c. *which then was Circumcision; and now Sirs, if the blessing of* Abraham *be come upon you, and if you be heirs according to the promise, you may easily finde a command for Baptizing your Infant seed.*

Answ. If Master *Drew* would prove what is to be proved, he should prove that the proper formal reason obliging to the duty of Circumcision, *Gen.* 17. 9, 10,11. was the promise, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed after thee.* But that is false. For the formal reason being put, the thing is put without any other thing, and it being not put, the thing is not put, though other things be put. But if the promise had been put, yet *Abraham* had not been obliged to Circumcise, unless a command were put, and the command being put, *Abraham* was bound to Circumcise; though God had made no promise.

Therefore, though the promise might be a motive to do it, yet as Master *Marshall* truely confesseth, *Defence of his Sermon* pag. 182. *the formal reason of the Jews being Circumcised was the command;* and therefore till Master *Drew* shew we have the same command to Baptize Infants, as *Abraham* had to Circumcise Infants, he can never shew we have the same or equal reason for Infant-baptism, as was for Infant-circumcision. But Master *Drew* thinks to prove his Minor from *Gen.*17.7,8. *compared with the* 9, 10, 11. vers. *Where it is evident* (saith he) *this promise of God, I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed, and the application of the first seal, are knit into a dependence one upon another.*

But he doth but dictate without any cleer explication, or thorough consideration of what he saith. For 1. He doth not plainly tell us, that the dependence he imagines to be one upon another of the application of the first seal and the promise, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed,* is upon that promise alone, and not upon the other promises, *vers.*4,5,6,8. And if he do so mean, yet he brings nothing to prove it, and it is unequal he should expect we should take it on his word, sith if we gather any thing from the placing of the words, the reason of the command, *vers.*9,10,11,12. may as well be from the promise of giving him and his seed the land of Canaan, *vers.*8. as the promise, *vers.*7. 2. Whereas the promise *vers.*7. hath diverse senses, one, so as to be meant of *Abraham* as a natural father, and his seed according to the flesh, another, of *Abraham* as a

ſpiritual father, and his ſpiritual ſeed, he neither brings a word, nor do I think can, why the reaſon of the Command, *verſ.* 9, 10, 11, 12. ſhould be from the promiſe made to *Abraham* as a ſpiritual father, and to his ſpiritual ſeed (which alone is for his purpoſe to bring Gentile-believers children to be in the promiſe) rather than to *Abraham* as a natural Father and to his natural ſeed, eſpecially thoſe of them that were to inherit the land of *Canaan*: yea it is manifeſt, that if the dependence were, as he ſaith, it is to be interpreted of *Abrahams* ſeed by nature, ſith the command there was given to the natural ſeed of *Abraham* only, and them that joyned to them. 3. Nor doth Mr. *Drew* ſhew what dependence one upon another they are knit into, whether contingent or neceſſary, or if neceſſary, in what degree of neceſſity, Whether, *de omni per ſe* or *quatenus ipſum*. This laſt ſeems to be moſt likely, and the dependence this, To whomſoever that promiſe is made, that perſon is to have the firſt ſeal; and whoſoever is to have the firſt ſeal, to that perſon the promiſe is made. But this were evidently falſe. For it appears from *v.* 19. that the promiſe was not made to *Iſhmael*, and yet he was to have the firſt ſeal, & others of *Abrahams* houſe had not the promiſe who were to be ſigned with Circumciſion, and the females had the promiſe made to them, and yet were not to be ſigned. If it be ſaid they were vertually ſigned, it ſerves not Maſter *Drew*'s turn, who aſſerts a dependence of the promiſe and actual ſigning in the perſon federate. 4. Nor doth he ſhew from what term or words his imagined dependence is evident. The onely term I know, he or any other gathers the ſuppoſed dependence from, is *verſ.* 9. (*thereſore*) But in the Hebrew it is ואתה which in the moſt uſual ſenſe is, *And thou*, noting a further addition to his ſpeech, not an illation of one thing from another. And ſo the Tigurines read *& tu*, *And thou*, *Parens Tu autem*, *But thou*, *Piſcator*, *Tu vero*, *Thou verily*. So that the evidence is very ſmall, which is from ſo uncertain a light. 5. Nor doth he nor can he ſhew from the comparing *Gen.* 17. 7,8. with 9, 10, 11. any dependence of application of any other firſt ſigne, than Circumciſion upon the promiſe there. The Command of an indfinite firſt ſeal, there or elſwhere to believers Infants, is a meer figment. 6. That dependence which is implyed by the term (*therfore*) is not at all ſuch as intimates a right competent to Infants, but a duty enjoyned to parents, which Infants are nor capable of. And therefore if any ſee a command for Baptizing of Infants in that place, it is but a parallax, or *deceptio viſus*, a miſtake of ſight, as in him that thinks he ſees two Suns or two Moons at once. The *Minor* alſo in his Argument is to be proved.

SECT. IV.

The Covenant, Geneſis 17. 4,5,6,7,8. *was a mixt Covenant.*

BUt afore he comes to prove it, he brings in an objection, *Gods Covenant with* Abraham, *was not a pure Goſpel-Covenant, as appears, ſay they, by his promiſing* Abraham *temporal things*, Gen. 17. 8. *therefore we may not argue from thence to the Covenant of Grace.*

It is true, both in my *Exercitation*, and in my *Examen*, Part 3. Sect. 2. and elſe where, I deny the Covenant made with *Abraham*, Gen. 17. to be a pure

Goſpel-

Gospel-Covenant, and aver it to be mixt, and shew how it is mixt, to wit, of promises not belonging to every one with whom the New Covenant of the Gospel is made, but respecting peculiarly *Abrahams* house, and the policy of Israel, and that the promises Evangelical are delivered, *Gen.*17. in words expressing proper benefits to *Abraham* and his natural seed, though in the more inward sense of the Holy Ghost, Evangelical promises were meant, and therefore it may be well doubted, whether that Covenant may be termed simply Evangelical: Yea the Scripture where it speaks of this Covenant, often mentions no other promise, but of the Land of *Canaan*, as *Exod.*6.4. *Psal.*105.8,9,10,11. 1*Chron.* 16.17,18. *Act.*7.5. Where *Stephen* mentions Gods promise to *Abraham*, he mentions that of the land of *Canaan*; and *vers.*8. calls the promise of *Canaan*, *the Covenant of Circumsion*. Wherefore *Cameron* in his *Theses of the threefold Covenant of God*, Thes.78. saith, *That Circumcision did primarily separate* Abrahams *seed from other Nations, sealed the earthly promise, it signified sanctification secondarily*. Whence I inferre, that when Pædobaptists speak of Circumcision as if it were a Seal of the Covenant of Grace onely, and from it gather Rules and Conclusions concerning the Ordinance of Baptism, in the New Testament, as if the Reason of Circumcising Infants were from nothing proper to the policy or Nation of Israel, but onely out of the respect it had to the promise of Evangelical grace, they do but mislead the people, and speak their own conceits, and not the Language and minde of the Scripture.

Mr. Gatakers *Annot. on* Jer. 31. 30. *The former Covenant comprehended, together with those spiritual promises, which yet were the principal part of it, many temporal blessings, as the possession of the land of Canaan, and multiplicity of issue, and outward prosperity*, Gen. 15.5,7,18. & 17.2, 7, 8. Psal. 105. 8. Deut. 28. 1, 19. *Whereas this later runneth wholly upon the Spiritual and Celestial blessings*, Rom.3.24,25. & 5.1,2. Eph.1.3. Heb. 8.6.

To this Matter *Drew* saith, *I answer, The Scripture no where calls that Covenant a mixt Covenant, but on the contrary, notwithstanding any civil promises of temporal things, it is held forth as pure a Covenant of Grace as may be; the Apostle tells us plainly that this Covenant was confirmed of God in Christ*, Gal.3.17. *which I think is enough to make it a pure Gospel-Covenant. Christ was never the Testator of any Covenant, but that of Grace: outward things as appurtenances altered not the Covenant, nor made it mixt at all, unless that Covenant we live under be mixt too, for outward things are promised to believers under the Gospel*, Rom.8.32. 1*Cor.* 3.22,23. 1*Tim.*4.8. *Besides, this Covenant with* Abraham *is called a Covenant of justification*, Rom.4.2,3. *of Grace*, vers.4. *of Faith*, vers. 13. *and I am perswaded, that* Abraham *had not been called the Father of the Faithful, if Believers had stood in a different Covenant towards God, with that in which he stood; as for differences in the manner of administring and dispensing that Covenant, they matter nothing, if there be no difference in those Evangelical promises, which make it a Covenant of Grace; but no man is able to make this appear; therefore this exception weakens not our proposition, nor the Argument at all.*

I reply, if it be true which I allege, that the Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, was a mixt Covenant, as I shew in the places forecited, and that Circumcision injoyned, *vers.*9,10,11,12. had reference as a signe or token not onely to that promise

ſpiritual father, and his ſpiritual ſeed, he neither brings a word, nor do I think can, why the reaſon of the Command, *verſ.* 9, 10, 11, 12. ſhould be from the promiſe made to *Abraham* as a ſpiritual father, and to his ſpiritual ſeed (which alone is for his purpoſe to bring Gentile-believers children to be in the promiſe) rather than to *Abraham* as a natural Father and to his natural ſeed, eſpecially thoſe of them that were to inherit the land of *Canaan*: yea it is manifeſt, that if the dependence were, as he ſaith, it is to be interpreted of *Abrahams* ſeed by nature, ſith the command there was given to the natural ſeed of *Abraham* only, and them that joyned to them. 3. Nor doth Mr. *Drew* ſhew what dependence one upon another they are knit into, whether contingent or neceſſary, or if neceſſary, in what degree of neceſſity, Whether, *de omni per ſe* or *quatenus ipſum*. This laſt ſeems to be moſt likely, and the dependence this, To whomſoever that promiſe is made, that perſon is to have the firſt ſeal; and whoſoever is to have the firſt ſeal, to that perſon the promiſe is made. But this were evidently falſe. For it appears from *v.* 19. that the promiſe was not made to *Iſhmael*, and yet he was to have the firſt ſeal, & others of *Abrahams* houſe had not the promiſe who were to be ſigned with Circumciſion, and the females had the promiſe made to them, and yet were not to be ſigned. If it be ſaid they were vertually ſigned, it ſerves not Maſter *Drew*'s turn, who aſſerts a dependence of the promiſe and actual ſigning in the perſon federate. 4. Nor doth he ſhew from what term or words his imagined dependence is evident. The onely term I know, he or any other gathers the ſuppoſed dependence from, is *verſ.* 9. (*thereſore*) But in the Hebrew it is ואתה which in the moſt uſual ſenſe is, *And thou*, noting a further addition to his ſpeech, not an illation of one thing from another. And ſo the Tigurines read *& tu*, *And thou*, *Parens Tu autem*, *But thou*, *Piſcator*, *Tu vero*, *Thou verily*. So that the evidence is very ſmall, which is from ſo uncertain a light. 5. Nor doth he nor can he ſhew from the comparing *Gen.* 17. 7, 8. with 9, 10, 11. any dependence of application of any other firſt ſigne, than Circumciſion upon the promiſe there. The Command of an indfinite firſt ſeal, there or elſwhere to believers Infants, is a meer figment. 6. That dependence which is implyed by the term (*therfore*) is not at all ſuch as intimates a right competent to Infants, but a duty enjoyned to parents, which Infants are nor capable of. And therefore if any ſee a command for Baptizing of Infants in that place, it is but a parallax, or *deceptio viſus*, a miſtake of ſight, as in him that thinks he ſees two Suns or two Moons at once. The *Minor* alſo in his Argument is to be proved.

SECT. IV.

The Covenant, Geneſis 17. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. *was a mixt Covenant.*

BUt afore he comes to prove it, he brings in an objection, *Gods Covenant with* Abraham, *was not a pure Goſpel-Covenant, as appears, ſay they, by his promiſing* Abraham *temporal things*, Gen. 17. 8. *therefore we may not argue from thence to the Covenant of Grace.*

It is true, both in my *Exercitation*, and in my *Examen*, Part 3. Sect. 2. and elſe where, I deny the Covenant made with *Abraham*, Gen. 17. to be a pure

Goſpel-

Gospel-Covenant, and aver it to be mixt, and shew how it is mixt, to wit, of promises not belonging to every one with whom the New Covenant of the Gospel is made, but respecting peculiarly *Abrahams* house, and the policy of Israel, and that the promises Evangelical are delivered, *Gen.*17. in words expressing proper benefits to *Abraham* and his natural seed, though in the more inward sense of the Holy Ghost, Evangelical promises were meant, and therefore it may be well doubted, whether that Covenant may be termed simply Evangelical: Yea the Scripture where it speaks of this Covenant, often mentions no other promise, but of the Land of *Canaan*, as *Exod.*6.4. *Psal.*105.8,9,10,11. 1*Chron.* 16.17,18. *Act.*7.5. Where *Stephen* mentions Gods promise to *Abraham*, he mentions that of the land of *Canaan*; and *vers.*8. calls the promise of *Canaan*, *the Covenant of Circumsion*. Wherefore *Cameron* in his *Theses of the threefold Covenant of God*, Thesi.78. saith, *That Circumcision did primarily separate* Abrahams *seed from other Nations, sealed the earthly promise, it signified sanctification secondarily*. Whence I inferre, that when Pædobaptists speak of Circumcision as if it were a Seal of the Covenant of Grace onely, and from it gather Rules and Conclusions concerning the Ordinance of Baptism, in the New Testament, as if the Reason of Circumcising Infants were from nothing proper to the policy or Nation of Israel, but onely out of the respect it had to the promise of Evangelical grace, they do but mislead the people, and speak their own conceits, and not the Language and minde of the Scripture.

Mr. Gatakers *Annot. on* Jer. 31. 30. *The former Covenant comprehended, together with those spiritual promises, which yet were the principal part of it, many temporal blessings, as the possession of the land of Canaan, and multiplicity of issue, and outward prosperity*, Gen. 15.5,7,18. & 17.2, 7, 8. Psal. 105. 8. Deut. 28. 1, 19. *Whereas this later runneth wholly upon the Spiritual and Celestial blessings*, Rom.3.24,25. & 5.1,2. Eph.1.3. Heb. 8.6.

To this Matter *Drew* saith, *I answer, The Scripture no where calls that Covenant a mixt Covenant, but on the contrary, notwithstanding any civil promises of temporal things, it is held forth as pure a Covenant of Grace as may be; the Apostle tells us plainly that this Covenant was confirmed of God in Christ*, Gal.3.17. *which I think is enough to make it a pure Gospel-Covenant. Christ was never the Testator of any Covenant, but that of Grace: outward things as appurtenances altered not the Covenant, nor made it mixt at all, unless that Covenant we live under be mixt too, for outward things are promised to believers under the Gospel*, Rom.8.32. 1*Cor.* 3. 22,23. 1*Tim.*4.8. *Besides, this Covenant with* Abraham *is called a Covenant of justification*, Rom.4.2,3. *of Grace*, vers.4. *of Faith*, vers. 13. *and I am perswaded, that* Abraham *had not been called the Father of the Faithful, if Believers had stood in a different Covenant towards God, with that in which he stood; as for differences in the manner of administring and dispensing that Covenant, they matter nothing, if there be no difference in those Evangelical promises, which make it a Covenant of Grace; but no man is able to make this appear; therefore this exception weakens not our proposition, nor the Argument at all.*

I reply, if it be true which I allege, that the Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, was a mixt Covenant, as I shew in the places forecited, and that Circumcision injoyned, *vers.*9,10,11,12. had reference as a signe or token not onely to that promise

promise (*I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed*:) but also to the promises which peculiarly respect the house of *Abraham*, and policy of *Israel*, which cannot be understood to belong to every believer, as *vers.7. to be the father of many Nations, to be exceeding fruitful, that God would make Nations of him, and Kings should come out of him*; *that he would give unto him and his seed after him the Land wherein he was a stranger, all the Land of Canaan for an everlasting possession*; Then it follows, that the reason of the command, *vers.9,10,11,12.* is not onely from the promise *vers.7.* but those other promises, and the application of the first seal are knit into a dependence one upon another, as well as that *vers.7.* and then if the argument be good, *The Infants of those to whom the promise is, I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed, are to have the first seal, because of the dependence there*, it will follow, he to whom God gives the Land of *Canaan* for a possession, he out of whom God brings Nations and Kings, he is likewise to be sealed with the first seal, sith there is as much dependence in the text, of Circumcision on the promises *vers.* 4,5,6,8. as on the promise *vers.* 7. so that if this reasoning of Master *Drew*'s be good; for my part I see not but that the Turk, possessour now of *Canaan*, may be intitled to Baptism by the same reason he produceth for Infant-baptism of Believers children.

Now whereas he saith, *That the Scripture no where calls that Covenant mixt*, I grant it, and it is true also, that it no where calls it a pure Gospel-covenant, nor Circumcision a seal of the Covenant of Grace, or the first seal; yet, the thing I mean by it being proved out of those texts forenamed, there is no reason to except against the expression.

Nor can it be true, that *the Covenant Gen.* 17.4,5,6,7,8. *is held forth as pure a Covenant of Grace as may be*, if the promises are of sundry things not assured to Believers in the Covenant of the New Testament. Which is most evident: for no Believer hath now a promise of the possession of the Land of *Canaan*, but rather an assurance of persecution, no promise of such greatness, as to be the progenitor of Kings and Nations, but rather of obscurity and debasement.

A pure Gospel Covenant containing many promises, is rare in the Old Testament, except where he foretells us he would make a new Covenant. God made a Covenant with *David*, *Psal.*89.3,&c. Nor do I deny it was a Gospel-covenant, yet therein are promises peculiar to his house, as *vers.* 30, 31,32,33. yea the promises which were Evangelical in the furthest intent and aim, were domestical in the first place, and the most open expressions. Nor is it a whit against the mixture of *Abrahams* Covenant which I avouch, *That the Apostle tells us plainly that this Covenant was confirmed of God in Christ*, Gal.3.17. *And that Christ was never the Testator of any Covenant but that of Grace.* For the word is in Greek εἰς Χριστὸν rendered *in Christum* by the Tigurines, *into* or *unto Christ*, or as Master *Dickson* renders it, *respectu Christi, in respect of Christ*, That is, as in his paraphrase, *with relation to Christ*, or as *Diodati*, *whose foundation was Christ*, not as the Testator, but as the party concerning whom the Testament was made, or as the executor by whom the things promised were performed. Now in either of these senses it is easie to conceive how *the promise might be in Christ, or unto Christ*, and yet the Covenant not a pure Gospel-covenant. He might be either a Legatee, or an Executor in that Testament which contained

not

not onely Evangelical blessings of justification, &c. which were common to all true Believers, but also outward blessings, which few or no Believers had in the New Testament. I see not any inconvenience in it to say that the Testament was confirmed in Christ, in respect of the promises, so far as they were Evangelical, and yet to say there were promises in the same which were not such, nor they confirmed in Christ, though in the same Covenant.

And whereas he calls outward things *appurtenances*, I conceive the promises of outward things, *Gen.*17.4,5,6,8. are as truely parts of the Covenant as the promise, *vers.*7. Yea in the places foretold, the promise of *Canaan* hath the title of the covenant. And those promises, though *they alter* not *the Covenant*, yet they must needs make a mixture in the covenant, for by reason of them the covenant contains promises of diverse sorts.

And for that which is said, *That now under the Gospel, outward things are promised to Believers:* I grant it, yet it is nothing against the mixture in the covenant, *Gen.*17. which I assert: For those promises are not the promise of *Canaan*, to be progenitor of Kings, which are not made to every Believer, but of a different sort. Whence I infer, that there was a mixture in the covenant, *Gen.*17. which is not in the New Testament, and the reference of circumcision to that covenant, might be and was in respect of those domestick promises, as well or more then of the Gospel promises as such. Nor do I finde *Rom.*4.2,3,4. any mention of the covenant, *Gen,*17. much less is it there, which Master *Drew* saith, *That it is called the covenant of justification and of grace.* It is true *Abraham* is there said to be justified by Grace, yet no mention of the covenant, and the text there cited, is *Gen.*15.6. not *Gen.*17. And theugh *Rom.*4.13. it be said, *The promise to* Abraham *and his seed, that he should be heir of the world, was not by the Law, but by the righteousnes of faith*; yet it neither calls the covenant *the covenant of faith*; nor doth it assert that the covenant, *Gen.* 17. contained no other promise but what was Evangelical or common to all Believers of Jews and Gentiles. Neither do I, nor need I say, that *Believers stood in a different covenant towards God with that in which* Abraham *stood.* I am perswaded as Mr. *Drew, that Believers now are justified by the same covenant that* Abraham *was justified by*, to wit, *that in* Abraham *all Nations of the earth should be blessed*, Gal. 3.8. & Rom.4.13. *A father of many Nations have I made thee.* I onely say, that the covenant *Gen.*17. contained promises which were proper to the Jews, together with the Evangelical promises. And to make those promises no parts of the covenant, but onely the manner of administring and dispensing the covenant, because the Holy Ghost alludes to them as figures aud types of spiritual things, is not right. For even the promise, *vers.* 7. was in the like manner typical, *Abrahams* natural seed inheriting, shadowing the Israel of God, true believers, and then by this reason the promise, *I will be a God to thy seed*, should be no part of the covenant, but belong to the manner of administring and dispensing the Covenant.

The like may be said of the rest of the promises, they all shadowed out spiritual benefits, and so there should be no parts of the covenant, and consequently no covenant at all, but a manner of administring and dispensing of I know not what covenant. But the speeches *vers.* 4, 5, 6, 8. do contain promises, as well as *vers.*7. and either I am uncapable to understand the meaning of terms, or else promises are parts, yea substantial or essential, or integral parts of a covenant.

venant, the description of a covenant, being a collective of promises, and this Scripture, what Gal.3.15. is called *a covenant or testament*, calls *vers.*16. *promises*. And therefore to make the promises Gen.17.4,5,6,8. not to be parts, but appurtenances to the covenant, or the manner of administring and dispensing it, hath in my apprehension, neither truth nor congruous sense. Now if they be part of the covenant, as hath been made appear, and circumcision had its appointment by reason of them, as well as the promise, *vers.* 7. it matters much to weaken Master *Drew*'s proposition and argument, though there be no difference in those Evangelical promises which make it a covenant of grace between *Abrahams* covenant and ours. Master *Drew* proceeds.

SECT. V.

Acts 2. 38, 39. *Proves not either the identity of Covenant now with that to* Abraham, Gen. 17. 7. *as it comprehends his natural seed, nor the connexion between it and Baptizability.*

NOw to go on to the proof of our second proposition in the argument, which is, that the reason of the command for signing, &c. *even this promise I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed, continues in full force under the Gospel, I refer you to that Scripture* Acts 2.39. *to make it good. The promise is unto you and to your children. What promise? Why this must needs relate to a former engagement, yea and too made unto them to whom the Apostle* Peter *spake,* viz. *Jews, and I know not to what engagement this can have reference, if not unto Gods promise made to* Abraham, *of being his God and the God of his seed after him. Certainly he is one of those that are blinde, and yet have eyes, who sees not from this text, that this very promise is in force and appliable to Believers under the Gospel, and if this stand good, then the command for signing our Infants with the first signe of the covenant of grace,* viz. *Baptism, stands good too, for this promise is the reason which God gives of his precept; God will own a Believers children, therefore he will have them markt for his.*

Answ. I grant the promise *I will be thy* God, *and the* God *of thy seed,* doth still continue in force, God is still the God of *Abrahams* seed, that is his spiritual seed, elect persons, and true Believers; and he will be again the God of *Abrahams* natural seed when the natural branches or posterity of *Abraham*, the root, shall be grafted in again.

But I deny that which Master *Drew* means, and in the page before expressed, that God *doth as truely say to every believing* Gentile *now, I am thy* God, *and the* God *of thy seed, as he did to* Abraham *the father of the faithful*; yea or that ever God meant by that promise to assure Spiritual or Evangelical blessings to all and every of *Abrahams* natural posterity, the Apostle determining and proving the contrary, Rom.9.6,7,8, &c. and restraining that promise in the Evangelical sense onely to the children of *Abraham*, which were elect by God. Nor is there a word, *Act.* 2. 39. to make it good in Master *Drew*'s sense. For, 1. Master *Drew* proves not that the promise *Act.*2.39. must needs be the promise Gen.17.7. *I will be thy* God, *and the* God *of thy seed.* His argument is, *It must needs relate*

to a former engagement to the Jews, and therefore to that Gen. 17.7. But this is to argue *a genere ad speciem affirmative*, it relats to a former engagement therfore to this, which Logicians deny to be good proof.

But saith he, *I know not what engagement this can have reference to, if not unto the promise* Gen. 17.7.

I answer, though he know not, and so may be one of *those, that are blind and yet have eyes*, (which he chargeth on his opposits) yet others see other promises, namely that to David *of raising up Christ to sit on his throne* mentioned *Acts* 2.30. or the *promise of the Holy Gost* mentioned *V.*33. or the *promise of blessing* mentioned *Acts* 3.25. Any of which may be *the Promise* meant *Acts* 2.39. more probably then that *Gen.* 17.7. 2. Where it is said (*The promise is to you*) if we either consider the scope of the Apostle or other parrallel texts *Acts* 3.26. *Acts* 13.32,33. (*the promise is*) is as much as to say, the promise made to *David Acts* 2.30. or to *Abarham Acts* 3.25. *is fulfilled in raising up Christ*, or the Promise of the spirit is fulfilled in the shedding forth of its gifts, (of which Promise mentioned *V.*17.18. *Piscator* and others understand it) and that *for you*, that is for your good blessing, and *your children and all that are afarr off as many as the Lord our God shall call*, not as M. *Drew* means, there is a promise of being a God to you and every one of your children continually to be fulfilled as soon as ever they are in being.

3. It is false which M. *Drew* presupposeth as if the meaning were (*the Promise is to you*) that is (the Promise of being your God is to you believers and to your children) that is to all your Infant children, as children of believers whether Jews or Gentiles. For 1. that speech is made to the Jews (as M. *Drews* own words seem to import (onely and their children, and not to Gentiles and their children 2. It is false that when it is said (*the Promise is to you*) the meaning is to you as believers. For neither were they then believers, as I prove in my *Ample disqnisit*: *Sect* 5. nor is it certain whether some of them were ever believers, the occasion and scope seems to intimate rather that they were consdered there as persons who had crucified Christ 3. Neither is it true that the *Promise is to their children*, that is to their infant children as their children, M. *Gataker discept*: *de bapt*: *Infant*: vi. & *Effic.* pag. 12. saith thus, *To the obtaining the promise as well repentance as partaking of baptism at least in this place is exacted*; *so that hence the promise of remission of sins cannot be proved to be made to Infants when they are entered by baptism, unless also they repent.* 4 nor do I know how it can be true, which M. *Drew* sayes, in any sense for his purpose, that God hath promised to every believing Gentile now to be the God of his seed as he did to *Abraham*, by which he would expound the words *Acts* 23.9. *the promise is to your children.* For in respect of spiritual blessings accompanying salvation it is not true, every believers child is not elect, in the Covenant of saving grace, a child of the resurrection, nor in respect of outward Ecclesiastical privileges. Neither did God Promise Circumcision to every child of *Abraham*, not to the males under 8. dayes old nor to the females, nor hath it any colour to interpret *I will be the God of thy seed*, that is they shall be circumcised, much less that God promised to every Gentile believers child he should be Baptized or have right to Baptism, sure not to professed unbelievers, to abortives or still born Infants. For my part with all M. *Drews* light I cannot understand how according to M. *Drews* exposition the promise *Gen.* 17.7. *is*

in force and applyable to believers under the Gospel as he saith.

Nor do I conceive it true which he ads. *If this stand good then the Command for signing our Infants with the first sign of the Covenant of grace viz. Baptism stands good to*; For were it granted that it were true, that *God doth as truly say to every believing Gentile now, I am thy God and the God of thy seed as he did to* Abraham *the Father of believing Gentiles*, yet there is not a word in that text or any other to prove that therefore every believers Infant child is to be baptized, it being false that the Covenant of grace doth of it selfe intitle to Baptism as I have proved in my *Examen part.*3.S.1. in my *letter to M.* Baile *or Additions to my Appology* Sect.3. in the *Ample disquisition* Sect.5. where also it is proved that though the promise *Acts* 2.39. be alleged why they should be baptized *V.*38. yet not as the reason of their right to Baptism as M. *Drew* makes it, but as a motive encouraging them to it as their duty, and in performing of it first to move them to repent and then to be baptized. The reason, is not as M. *Drew* makes it. The promise is to you and and your children therefore it is their and your right to be baptized, and the minister ought to do it to you and your Infants; but this, the promise is to you and your children, therefore you and they ought and may be encouraged to repent and be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus for remission of sins: nor is there a word in the text or elsewhere to prove that dictate of M. *Drew, God will own believers children, therefore he will have them marks for his, even in infancy by baptism*, more truely saith M. *Gataker disceptat. Infant. de bapt: infant.* vi. *& Effic.* pag. 9. Acts 2.38,39. *is nothing found concerning Infants to be baptized, In that they are Commanded to repent and to be baptized unto the remission of sins, it is altogether like to that saying of the Lord Christ, he that believeth and shall be baptized shall attain salvation* Matth.16. 16.

But M. *Drew* thinks to take off the exceptions that are laid against the witness which this place brings to prove the birth priviledge of believers children under the Gospel. *The first exception is that the promise is of extraordinary gifts of the spirit, and beanswers. This doth not suite with the promise made* Gen. 17. 7. *which was to be performed to* Abrahams *children, and yet they had not those gifts.*

But 1. this Answer goes upon his mistake that the promise *Acts* 2.39. must be that *Gen.* 17.7. 2. he supposeth *that the promise* Acts 2.39. *must be understood so as to be made good to* Abrahams *seed afore Christ*: But if so, it were false in his sense, for all *Abrahams* seed had not the birth priviledge of the first seale not the females any of them, nor any of the males till the eight day.

2. He saith, *it cannot be true of extraordinary gifts, sith then all believing Jews must have those gifts, which they had not, and all believers might pray for them.*

To which I say if the promise be so understood, you shall all have such gifts. I acknowledg it were not true *Exam. part.*3. Sect 6. But in this sense it may be true even of those gifts, the promise of sending the spirit in extraordinary gifts is fulfilled *to you and your children and all that are afarr off even as many as the Lord our God shall call*, that is for their and your benefit, in that by those gifts the Apostles were inabled to publish and propagate the Gospel, which is a benefit to all that are called.

The Second exception is that the words (*as many as the Lord our God shall call*) expound the Apostls meaning, which is this, their children should receive

the

the promise if the Lord called them, To it he answers 1. *that this particle* (even) *with that which follows* (*whom the Lord our God shall call*) *has relation to the next foregoing sentence* viz. *those that are afarr off for the explanation of that not unto this sentence* (*to you and your children*) *so that the Apostle speaks thus, The promise is made to you and your children for the present, and when the Lord shall call those that are a far off and strangers to the Covenant of promise, they and their children shall be heirs to the promise as well as you and your children are now.*

To which I reply, M. *Drew* gives no reason, why the limitation should be ment onely of *those afar off*, and not also of *them and their children* 2. nor doth he answer the reason given to the contrary, that the speech were not true, if it be so expounded as that the sense be, that God would be a God to those Jews he then spake to, though they were not called to the knowledge and belief of Christ, and so salvation by another then Christ contrary to the same Apostles words *Acts* 4 12. *To me* saith M. *Gataker discept. debapt. Inf.* viz. *and effic.* pag. 253. *the Covenant of grace* Act. 2.39. *seems onely to be with them that have embraced the Gospel.* Now if the words (*as many as the Lord our God shall call*) must limit the words (*to you and all that are afar off*) it is incongruous to the use of speaking not to apply it to (*your children*) in the middle. Yea without the limitation it would not be true that God hath promised to be a God to their or any others children. For God is not a God to any but those he calls either outwardly or inwardly at least. 3. His Paraphrase (*when the Lord our God shall call those that are afar off, they and their children shall be heirs to the promise as well as your children are now*) is an intolerable abuse of adding that of which there is not a word in the text, which doth not mention at all the children of them that are afar off though called.

2. saith M. *Drew if the Appostle had meant to apply the promise oncly to those who should be called of God to believe, then it had been needless to have made any mention at all of children.*

To which I reply there was great reason why he should mention their children with them, because they had wished *Matth.* 27. 25. Christs blood on them and their children. To take away the horrour of soule, and fear of the curse on them and their children caused by the conscience of their crucifying Christ and imprecation to them and their children, and not to assure them of such a poor empty Ecclesiastical outward priviledge as pædobaptists imagine to belong to believers infants, was that speech of the Apostle intended in like sort as Joseph did in the like *Gen* 45.3,4. &c. *Gen.* 50.20. For this end was sutable to the occasion of their question *Ver.* 36.37. and to the Apostles answer, and it seems probable tthe Apostle saith (*to you and your children*) but not, *to all that are afar off and their children*, because those afar off had not wished Christs blood on them and theirs as the other had done.

3. Saith M. *Drew, it utterly overthrows the Apostles scope which is to shew the Jews shall be bettered rather then worsted by believing in Christ, which they would hardly believe should be have left their children* (*who were always till now reckoned in Covenant with them*) *in as poor a condition as the most barbarous heathens in the world, which had been a bad argument to bring in the Jews, cold comfort to hear that their children should be made as much aliens to the Common-wealth of Israel by their Fathes embracing the Gospel, as the very Pagans. Surely this would stave off the Jews from Christ rather then bring them on.*

To which I reply, The Apoſtles ſcope is plain to direct them what to do being oppreſſed with the horrour of their ſin in crucifying Chriſt and wiſhing his blood on them and their children, and *Ver.* 39. is a notice to them to repent and be baptized in the name of Chriſt. To imagine the Jews then either thought of a priviledge for their children anſwerable to circumciſion, or that *Peters* ſcope was to ſatisfy them about it, is ſuch a toy as is fit for children rather then men of underſtanding. It had been alike comfort unto the Jews at that time to tell them of their Infants right to baptiſm as for a man to tell an arraigned malefactor, expecting to be condemned and hanged, that his little child had a new Coat given him, vain words and bug-bears fit to affright children with, of a childs being out of the Covenant for defect of tittle to baptiſm, of being in worſe caſe then the Jews, in as poor a condition as the moſt barbarous heathens in the world, aliens to the Common-wealth of Iſrael, debarred a priviledge the deprivation of which would have ſtaved off the Jews from Chriſt. Children may be in covenant as much as the Jews, no whit worſted in their condition in a better condition, then barbarious heathen infidels, though title to baptiſm be not aſerted to their infants. If by (*the commonwealth of Iſrael*) the Jewiſh civil or Eccleſiaſtical eſtate, be underſtood thoſe that *Peter* ſpake to, muſt expect to be alienated from it if they would be Chriſtians. They knew Chriſt was caſt out, and might know he had told them it would be ſo with his diſciples. If by (*the Common-wealth of Iſrael*) be meant (the true Chriſtian Church) the defect of Infant-baptiſm neither expreſsly nor by conſequence made them *aliens from the Common-wealth of Iſrael*. Such conceits ariſe from pædobaptiſts miſtaken ſuppoſitions. Nor can I imagine but that had the Jews underſtood that *their children were in that condition, worſted* for want of a priviledge equal to their circumciſion they would have been glad to accept of Chriſt to take away that horrour that then lay on their Spirits.

The third exception is, that it is not ſaid the promiſe is to the Gentiles and their children; now if this be not made good the argument fals, becauſe we are Gentiles by nature. To which he anſwers 1. *If believing Gentils live under the ſame Covenant that* Abraham *and his ſeed did* (*which has been proved*) *then though they were none of his ſeed, tis ſafer to apply the whole promiſe to them, I am thy God and the God of thy ſeed, then to cut off and circumciſe the tenor of the Covenant, and to ſay unto believers now, God onely is your God, not the God of your children; is not this to make a main and ſubſtantial alteration in the Covenant? and to rob believers of one of the moſt precious comforts they have by promiſe, even Gods owning their ſeed. Which they cannot be aſſured of as the Jews were, without the children be admitted to the firſt ſign or ſeal of the Covenant, which is baptiſm now under the Goſpel, as I ſhall prove by its ſucceeding circumciſion by and by.*

To which I reply, The Covenant *Gen.*17.4,5,6,7,8. is mixt and in reſpect of the temporal promiſes believing Gentiles live not under the Covenant made to *Abraham Gen.*17.7. but in reſpect of the ſpiritual part, that is, they are juſtified and ſaved now, or God is a God to them as they are *Abrahams* ſeed *Gal.* 3.29. But neither did God promiſe to be a God in reſpect of Goſpel grace, to *Abrahams* natural ſeed as ſuch, the contrary is delivered *Rom.*9.7,8. nor now to any believers ſeed as ſuch, but the elect whether believers or unbelievers children, as is proved at large by me *Exam.* part.3. Sect. 4. not by denying the Covenant

of

of grace to be made with a believer & his natural seed do we *cut off or circumcise the tenor of the Covenant*, or *make any alteration*, much less *a main and substantial alteration in the Covenant*, the Apostle expressly determining, and whole Juries of the ablest Protestant writers even pædobaptists expounding *Rom.*9.8. as resolving, that the Covenant *Gen.*17.7. to be a God to *Abraham* and his seed, was not made to all *Abrahams* natural seed, no not to the circumcised, not to *Ishmael* and *Esau*, but to the elect onely, and therefore there is *no safety to apply the whole promise, I am thy God and the God of thy seed*, to every sincere believer and his child, it being expressly contradictory to *Rom.*9.8. which determines some onely to be *children of the promise*. And yet we need not say as M. *Drew* injuriously makes us say, *God onely is your God, not the God of your children*, but onely this: you may assure your selves that he is your God, for ye are believers and so *Abrahams* seed; and ye may hope by reason of general indefinite promises and frequent experiences that God will be a God to your children. But God hath not promised that he will be certainly a God to every, or any one of your children definitely, but is at liberty to shew mercy to your children, or to an infidels, as it shall please him. And this you must be contented with, sith God afforded no more to *Abraham* himself, when he had made *Isaac* the child of the promise and not *Ishmael*, nor to *Isaac* when he loved *Iacob* and hated *Esau*. It is fit you should remember God to be no debtor to you, that he is the potter, ye and yours are the clay, and accordingly acquiess in his will blessing him for his love to you which is the most precious comfort you have by promise, and not being anxious concerning your children. Nor is there any truth in it that either *the Jews were assured that God would own their seed*, that is, be their God, nor that by being admitted to circumcision they had that assurance, nor that without admission to baptism we cannot be assured of our children that GOD owns them, nor that baptism succeeds circumcision, or if it did, such assurance as Mr. *Drew* speaks of cannot be inferred thence. So that all this passage is but a fardel of mistakes. Lets consider the next. 2. saith M. *Drew*, *Are not Gentiles the seed of* Abraham? *Then I would fain be resolved in this whether Christ took upon him onely the nature of the Jews, or of the Jews and Gentiles both? If only of Jews, how must the* Gentiles *be saved? If of both, then how you will construe this text* Heb.2.16. *He took upon him the seed of* Abraham, *if you will not allow the* Gentiles *by any means to be* Abrahams *seed.*

Answer. I grant believing Gentils are *Abrahams* spiritual seed descending from him as the Father of the faithfull by imitating his faith. And as for M. *Drews* frivolus or captious question, which goes upon a supposition as if Christ might take on him the nature of the Jews only, & that the nature of the Jews were one and the Gentils another, I tell him (though I think such a Dr. might have resolved himself) for his resolution that Christ took on him the nature of both, that is the same specifical essence or kinde of being, that both had, to wit the being of a man common a like to Jews and Gentiles, meaning by nature his individual, and numerical Existence, which is all one with that, *our Lord sprang out of Judah* Heb. 7.14. not from *Levi*, or from *Lot*, and yet the Gentils are saved by his name, he dying and arising again both for Jews and Gentils. And for the Construction of *Heb.*2.16. thought there are learned men that expound

pound σπέρματος Ἀβραὰμ ἐπιλαμβάνεται thus, *he takes hold or helpeth the* seed of Abraham, that is believers of Gentils as well as Jews, yet I think the meaning there to be no more but this, that he took on him or received the nature of man by a natural descent from *Abraham* 1. because *the* seed *of* Abraham is opposed to Angels, and therefore *Abrahams* seed signifies the nature of man contradistinct to Angels. 2. because the author saith *ver.*17. *thence he ought to be like to his brethren, to be a mercifull high Priest*, which comes not from his helping believers, but his assumption of the humane nature, whith fits him to be like to men and to be a mercifull high Priest. And therefore I like best the reading of our translators in the text, not that in margin. And thus have I answered M. *Drews* doury question in which he would so fain be resolved. But what is this to prove that *Acts* 2.39. the promise is not yet to the Gentils, that are called but also to their children I see not, it being neither proved that *Acts* 2. 39. the promise is the promise *Gen.* 17.7. I will be a God to thee and thy seed, or that the children of Gentils called, are in that respect *Abrahams* seed.

M. *Drew* adds, *But yet further* 3. *Tis plain in the Gospel that faith maketh a believer the child of* Abraham; *yea and a surer heir to the promise, I will be thy God and the God of thy seed, then carnal descent from* Abrahams *Loyns doth.* Abraham *had* 2. *seeds one descending from* Ishmael *and another from* Isaac; *all that came from* Abraham *were not children* Rom.9.7. *But in* Isaac *shall thy seed be called.* Isaac *was his special seed, and typed out his believing seed under the Gospel, for* ver. 8. *they which are the children of the flesh, these are not (that is not in so peculiar a manner) the children of God as the believing seed, for the children of the promise are the seed, the seed by way of eminencie, that is the prime seed. and Mark I pray you how the same Apostle explaines and applyes this to our purpose* Gal.4.28,29. *The Galatians were Gentils, but being believers, we saith the Apostle, as* Isaac *was, are the children of promise, and so the special seed of* Abraham: *the Galatians were no more of* Abrahams *natural seed then we are, but by faith they became his prime seed, and heirs apparent to all the promises as* Isaac *was, who is said in the next* ver. *to be born after the spirit as well as Gospel believers are. And, sirs, shall we make the Covenant entail and narrow to* Abrahams *prime seed and halve the promises to them when they are full and large to his worser seed? The Apostle will not suffer this* Gal.3. 29. *If ye be Christs then are ye* Abrahams *seed, and heirs according to the promise, which surely must needs be according to the full extent of that promise made unto our Father* Abraham; *for if it be not ours so fully as it was his, then we are not heirs according to the promise; if our seed be exempted it fals much short of what was said to him, I will be thy God and the God of thy seed. And mark, friends, I beseech you, that was Gospel which was preached to* Abraham Gal. 3.8. *In thee shall all Nations be blessed; not onely his natural seed, that was but one Nation; but all that were of the faith shall be blessed, as children of what nation soever* ver.7. *For faith was imputed to* Abraham *in uncircumcision* Rom.4.10,11. *to this end that he might be the Father of all them that believe though not circumcised. And truely I wonder since the Gospel is so clear that believers are* Abrahams *children that any man dare rob them of any comfort or priviledge wherewithall he was invested by that promise to which they are more sure heirs then any of his natural seed, as I think is made plain to the easiest of your capacities.*

Answer. the thing to be proved is that to the natural seed of Gentile beli-

brought

evers God hath promised to be a God. To prove which divers places are brought which do manifestly refute it. That of *Ro.*9.7,8. determines that all the natural children of *Abraham* were not the seed to whom God had promised to be God, but that *in Isaac his seed should be called*. And the same is determined *Gal.* 4.28. that *Isaac* was the child of the promise and not the son of the bondwoman, and that no child of any man is a child of the promise but he that is born after the Spirit. And *Gal.* 3.29. is meant of those onely that are *the sons of God by faith in Christ* ver.26. and from the Gospel mentioned *Gal.*3.8. *in thee shall all nations be blessed*, he infers *ver.*9. onely of believers, so *then they that are of faith are blessed with faithfull* Abraham. And *Rom.* 4.10.11. *Abraham* is said to be *the Father of believers*, or as it is *ver.* 12. *those that walk in the steps of the faith of our Father* Abraham *which he had yet being uncircumcised*. Wherefore I may much more justly wonder that learned Protestants who so commonly say, that elect persons onely are in the Covenant of grace from *Rom.*9.7,8. when they dispute against Arminians, should yet have the face to avouch that every believers yea though but by profession a believers natural child whether elect or a believer or not, is in the Covenant of grace made to *Abraham* *Gen.*17.7. when they dispute for pædobaptism, though by such doctrine they make the word of God to fall, it being not true of *Ishmael*, *Esau*, and thousands of others of both of *Abrahams* and other believers seed, God hath not nor will be a God to them.

Tis true believing Gentils are heirs of the promise made to *Abraham* of blessing or justification by faith as he had, but it is false, *every believer is heir of every priviledge* Abraham *had*; none besides him is *Father of the faithfull* as *Abraham*, or hath Gods promise to his natural seed as *Abraham* had to his spiritual, yea or to his natural. None hath the promise that *in his seed all nations of the earth should be blessed* Acts 3.25. nor any that his posterity should be graffed in again as it is assured to *Abrahams* seed *Rom.*11.28,29.

The imagined priviledge that God would be the God of his naturall seed was never promised to *Abrahams* natural posterity, as such. Yet it is false, that a believers child is *a more sure heir of the promise then any of* Abrahams *natural seed*.

For though God hath not promised to be a God to all *Abrahams* posterity, yet he hath to some, which I know not that he hath done to any believing Gentils natural child. M.*D.* doth but Calumniate by insinuating as if we *curtaild the promise, robbed believing parents of any comfort or privilege wherewith Abraham was invested by that promise* Gen. 17.7. perverting the text as if when God said he *would be a God to* Abrahams, by *Abraham* were meant *every believer*, and when he saith he *will be a God to* Abrahams *seed*, it were meant *of every belivers natural seed* whether believers or not.

About which he and other pædobaptists, particularly the *Assembly at Westminster in the Directory about baptism* do but a buse people, and lead fond parents, who swallow down Preachers sayings without Scripture proof into a fools paradise, by telling them that *the promise is made to a believer and his seed, that God will be a God to a believer, and his child, and that Infants of believers dying in their Infancy, are saved by the parents faith, and by this there is assurance of their salvation.*

But

But Master *Drew* once more urgheth *Rom.*11,17. *that the term graffing, shews believing Gentils come in with their seed, or twigs that grow from them, else surely they cannot be said to be graffed in as the Jews were cut off,*

But I have so fully proved the ingraffing to be by giving faith according to election, and that none but elect persons are ingraffed according to the Apostles meaning, and that ingraffing is into the invisible Church in my *Ample disquisition*, being the first part of this *Review* in the ten first Sections, that I think it unnecessary to say any more to what Master *Drew* here speaks. And for what he saith, *If believers Infants were taken in under the legal administration, and left out in the Gospel-administration, the covenant dispensation under the Gospel is more uncomfortable then that under the Law*, it is but a vain speech, as if the circumcision of Infants were such a matter of comfort, that the having of no priveledge under the Gospel did recompense the loss of it without Infant-baptism, as if Infant-baptism were of so great comfort to parents, that without it other comfort concerning their children were nullified, whereas these things arise upon mistakes, as if Baptism were administred according to a persons interest in the covenant, and circumcision was so, and that the denying Infants Baptism, is putting them out of Covenant, which is but ungrounded talk, as shall be further shewed in that which follows.

Yea when the Pædobaptists answer the Papists, who would have the work of outward Baptism to take away original sin from the Infant-baptized, they say onely that it seals the covenant, but doth not seal the fruit of the covenant, but upon condition of Faith and Repentance; so that the Infant hath no benefit by the covenant, or the seal without Faith or Election; and so much benefit hath any unbeliever or his Infant; yea the unbeliever hath more advantage then the Infant, for the unbeliever hath the moral use of the sealing of any baptized person, which the Infant hath not. When they talk of the covenant to Infants of believers they say it is but condicionally that they do believe that God will be their God, and in the same manner the covenant belongs to all men in the world, to unbelievers and their Infants, and when they speak of the benefit of Baptism, they say it onely seals the covenant, not the persons partaking the fruit of it (excepting he be an elect person dying in Infancy) which yet he may have without the seal) till he believe, yet he hath not the moral use and comfort of it till he understand and believe, at which time the Baptism in Infancy is altogether unknown to him. So that indeed the comfort which Pædobaptists give to parents, is either the same I give, without Infant-baptism, or, if parents did examin it, it would be found delusory. What Master *Drew* speaks about Baptisms succession to circumsion, and his imagined full proof from thence for Infant-baptism, I shall put off till I review the Dispute about Master *Ms.* third *Concl.* This is enough to satisfie that Master *Drew*'s reasons are blunt and not sharp as was supposed.

SECT.

SECT. VI.

The Arguments of Master Josias Church *in his* Divine warrant for Infant-baptism, *from their being judged in the promise, is answered.*

THere is another writing of Master *Josiah Church*, intituled, *The Divine warrant of Infant-baptism*, of which I passed a censure in the first part of this *Review Sect.* 21. and I might let it pass, being as the commanders of it say, *Dogmatical rather then Polemical*, and leave it to those that affect such superficial writings. Yet because Master *Roberts* and Master *Geree* have commended it, and Master *Baxter* pag. 6. of his *Plain Scripture proof*, puts it among *the chief books*, of which he saith, *If any of the men of* Bewdly *have taken up the notion of Antipædobaptism, and have not read and studied him with others, and been able to confute them, he hath discovered a scared conscience* (which is a most unreasonable and uncharitable censure) to shew the folly and vanity of Master *Baxters* and others conceit, I shall give the Reader some taste of his overly handling the point.

His first Argument is thus, *The Infants of Christians are rightly judged in the promise of propriety in* God, *therefore they may be Baptized.*

To it I answer, 1. The antecedent is ambiguous, not expressing what propriety in God he means, whether of justification, regeneration, and salvation, or of outward protection & prosperity among men or Ecclesiastical privilege, nor where that promise is which he calls *promise of propriety in God*, nor whether he means it of all Infants of Christians, or some, and if of some of which he means it, and of which not; nor of what sort of Christians, whether such as are Christians onely by profession, or really such in Gods account; nor with what judgement he means, whether of charity or verity, probably or certainty; nor upon what evidence they are with any of these sorts of judgement rightly judged in the promise of propriety in God. So that I finde nothing but Sophistry in this dispensation, the antecedent being perhaps true in some sense, in some false: and therefore it is but wast labour to refute it, or answer his proofs, till that he distinctly set down what he asserts, and how his proofs suite with his assertion. Yet I shall cast away some animadversions on this writing, least my silence be disadvantage to the cause I maintain.

That which I conceive he means, is this, *All the Infants of Christians by visible profession, are rightly judged by a judgement of charity, though not of certainty to be included in the promise of propriety in* God, *in regard of eternal adoption and priviledge expressed in those words*, Gen. 17. 7. *I will be thy* God, *and the* God *of thy seed, therefore they may be Baptized.* Of which Argument, I deny both the antecedent and the consequence. The antecedent he takes upon him to prove by ten Arguments.

1. *The Infants of the Jews (so long as they continued visible professors) were rightly judged to be in the promise of propriety in* God, *for it was sealed to them by the initial Sacrament no less then to actual professors*, Gen. 17. 7, 12. *Ergo*

Answ. Did not Master *Church* affect new phrasifying, which serves onely to puzzle, in plain words he had said, *To the Jews Infants the promise was made of being* God *to them, therfore the Infants of Christians are rightly judged to be in that promise:* Of which, neither is the antecedent true universally taken, but contradicted by *Paul, Rom.* 9.7,8. where he expressly denies the promise (*I will be the* God *of thy seed*) to be true of *Abrahams* natural seed universally taken: Nor if it had been true, doth it follow that what was promised to *Abrahams* seed, is true of every true Believers, muchless of the seed of every meer visible professor of Christian faith, who are neither themselves, nor their children in any Scripture sense *Abrahams* seed: nor is the proof of any weight, *That the promise of propriety in* God *was sealed to the Jews Infants by the initial Sacrament, no less then to actual professors, therefore the Jews Infant were rightly judged to be in the promise of propriety in* God.

For this reason in plain terms is no more then this, the Jews Infants were to be circumcised, *Ergo* they were rightly judged to be in the promise of propriety in God, that is that God would be their God; which rests upon these false suppositions, that God had promised to be God to those whom he commanded to be circumcised, and that the promise of being their God was the formal reason of their being circumcised; that when God promised to be a God to Gentiles, he meant it of external adoption and priviledges.

The consequence he would prove by four Argument. 2. *The promise of propriety in* God *was not a specialty, therefore the Infants of Christians being certainly no less in the promise then were the Infants of Jews aforetime, they are rightly* judged *to be in it as they were.* Where the conclusion is altered, which was to be proved (*therefore if the Infants of the Jews were rightly judged to be in the promise of propriety in* God, *then the Infants of Christians are rightly judged to be in that promise*) and instead thereof, that which should have been the antecedent (*the Infants of Christians are certainly no less in the promise then were the Jews Infants aforetime*) is made the chief part of the conclusion, and in stead of the right antecedent, this ambiguous antecedent is put (*that promise of propriety in* God *was not a specialty*) which he says *he would prove by seven arguments*, but sets not down which branch of the promise was not a specialty, whether that (*I will be thy* God) or that (*I will be the* God *of thy seed*) nor in what sense it was not a specialty, nor doth his speech (*that it was not a specialty*) appear equipollent to that he should have proved (*The Infants of Christians are certainly no less in the promise then were the Jews Infants aforetime*) but he dictates so ambiguously and indistinctly, that more labour will be necessary to understand him then to refute him. He tells us, *the promise of propriety in* God, *was not peculiar to Abraham, and visible professors, and* Abrahams *natural seed*; where he supposeth, that the promise (*I will be thy* God, *and the* God *of thy seed*) was true of meer visible professors, and *Abrahams* natural seed; which is most false and contrary to *Rom.* 9.6,7,8. *Luk.* 20.36,37,38. He brings the words *Exod.* 12.48,49. *the stranger was as one home-born, and there was one law for both* (which are spoken meerly of allowance for them to eat the Passeover with them) to prove a like propriety of the Infants of visible professors of the Gentiles in the promise of propriety in God, *Gen.* 17.7. He brings *Gal.* 4.28. which was spoken onely of true Believers born after the Spirit, to prove visible professors and their Infants to be judged in the promise of propriety in God. He saith, *Isaac was in the promise*

as

as an Infant of Believing parents, whereas *Paul* saith no, for then *Ishmael* and *Esau* had been in the promise, but by special calling or election, *Rom.*9.6,7,8,9. He applies those texts *Gal.*3.14. *Rom.*11.17. *Rom.*15.8,9. *Gen.* 17 5,7. to prove a promise to every Gentile visible professour of faith and their Infants, which are onely verified in the sense the Apostle useth them, of true Believers as *Abraham* was, who are justified as he was. He allegeth that which the Apostle *Rom.*11.28. saith, *The children are beloved for the Fathers*, as if it were meant of Infants of every Gentile visible professor, which is spoken onely of the elect Israelites, and the ancient Patriarchs *Abraham*, &c. That which is said, *Psal.* 128.1,3. of *children of him that fears* God, *sitting round about his table like Olive plants*, to prove visible professors and their partaking in the promise of propriety in God.

He saith, *The former part of that promise* (*I will be a* God *to thee*, Gen 17.7.) *is undeniably common to all Believers*, which in truth is undeniably proper to *Abraham*, not simply as a Believer, but either as a natural Father, or Father of Believers according to the spiritual part of the promise.

He saith, *Christians are in this dispensation as Jews were in the former, they are called as they were, an holy Nation, a peculiar people, a royal priesthood*, 1 Pet. 2 9. Tit, 2.14. *And every Nation receiving the faith as the Nation of the Jews did, and in which there is a national agreement in doctrine, worship, and discipline, as was in the Nation of the Jews, is to be accounted to the Lord in every age*, Psal. 22.30. *even Egypt and Assyria with Israel*, Isa. 19. 21. *and may call* Abraham *Father* (*who obtained the Fatherhood of many Nations*, Gen. 17. 5.) *and may be accounted a national Church no less then that Nation was*, whereby those speeches 1 *Pet.* 2.9. *Tit.* 2. 14. *Gen.*17.5. as expounded, *Rom.* 4. 17. which are meant onely of the elect and true Believers of every Nation, are applied to a national Church like the Jews, consisting of a great part of either ignorant persons, that know little or nothing of Christianity, or persecutors of godliness, profanely despising the word, and hating the godly.

He applies that *Mat.*18.10. *little ones*, who are said *vers.*6. *to believe in Christ*, and the offending of whom hath so great a penalty, to little ones in age. He applies *Jer.*30.20. which is spoken of the Jews upon their return from captivity, as appears *vers.*18.21. concerning their prosperity in *Canaan to the restitution of their Infants to an initial seal at the calling of them to the Christian faith*, whereas if it were so meant, the Prophet should foretell that the Jews *children* at their calling to Christ *should be as a foretime*, that is, should be circumcised as they were before the Prophets time, not baptized. More things there are liable to exception in his arguments whereof what pertains to the text, *Act.*2.39. *Rom.* 11.17. 1. *Cor.*7.14. is sufficiently discussed in my *Ample disquisition* of those texts. That which concerns the reasons that *God promiseth mercy to thousands*, and such like arguments, being urged more fully by Master *B.* I shall answer when I meet with them in his book.

His arguments *pag.* 18. to prove his Consequence, *The Infants of Chaistians are rightly judged in the promise of propriety in* God, *therefore they are to be baptized*, are insufficient. The first is *from circumcision of Infants*, to which hath been often answered, That was done by vertue of the Command, not by vertue of the promise, and therefore without the like Command the like promise (if it were granted) would not prove the like practice. What is said *of* John

Baptists, *and the Apostles, not denying baptism to any whom they judged to be in the promise*, seems to intimate, that they baptized men because they judged them to be in the promise: But there is not a word thereof in any of the Evangelists, but *their comming to* John *confessing their sins, glorifying God in embracing his Counsel, professing faith*, as the reason of their admission to baptism.

To his second reason, *Being in the promise, is the reason rendered by the Apostles for the receiving of baptism*, Acts 2.38,39. *Therefore they that are rightly judged in it may be baptized*, I answer 1. He says not truely, that being in the promise is the onely reason mentioned by the Apostle for baptism; for repentance is put as a prerequisite. 2. The Apostle doth not speak of the promise as Master *Church* means that he judged that they and their children were rightly judged as visible professors in the promise of propriety in God, for they were not then such: But that the promise of raising up Christ was fulfilled for them upon their repentance and baptism, or their calling, and this is made not the reason of right to receive, or warrant to the Minister to baptize them, but as a motive to their duty of repenting and being baptized, and encouragement to hope for remission notwithstanding their crucifying Christ and imprecation on themselvs, and theirs, *Matth.*27.25.

SECT. VII.

Bare judgement of charity concerning a persons interest in the promise is not a warrant to baptize.

PAg. 19. Mr. *Church* brings in an objection thus, The judgement of charity that any are in promise is not a sufficient reason for administring baptism to them: there must be shews of grace for more certainty, To which he thus answers: *shews of grace and actual profession are a reason for baptizing only as they are ground for the judgment of charity, that the parties to be baptized are in the promise; for else if the Devil should take a humane shape, and make a verbal profession (though he were known to be a Devil) he must be baptized.*

I reply, Mr. *Church* here starts a question, by what judgment a Minister is to proceed in admitting a person to baptism. Concerning which I suppose it will not be denied. 1. That a Minister being but as an officer under Christ in baptizing, is to baptize according to his Lords will. For that is the property of a servant. 2. That the will of the Lord is most manifest in the institution or appointment of Christ; which is without question declared by the words of Christ, *Matth.*28.19. *Mark.*16.15,16. explained by the Apostles and other approved Ministers thereof, command and practice mentioned in the *Acts* of the Apostles. 3. That true believers and disciples of Christ are appointed to be baptized, and that they have true right before God. 4. That such believers and disciples as are appointed to be baptized, are *Disciples of all nations*, not of Angelical but humane nature; and therefore we have no warrant to baptize either good Angels or Devils taking humane shape and making shews of repentance or faith if known to be Divils or Angels. All the difference is, with what judg-

ment

ment and upon what evidence a Minister is to baptize, I conceive 1. upon extraordinary revelation from God a Minister is to baptize an Infant declared to be a Disciple, as I say in my *Examen p.*4.S.3.2. According to ordinary rule he ought to baptize none but Disciples by profession, which profession ought to be free, sober, serious and intelligent. For discerning of which he is to use ministerial prudence, though he be not able to search the heart, and after the use of ministeral prudence therein, he is prudently to judge of the truth of his faith and discipleship. Wherein he ought to judge according to the rule of charity 1 *Cor.*3. 17. *which believeth all things, hopeth all things*, and yet heed what *Solomon* saith *Prov.*14.15. *The simple believeth every word: but the prudent man looketh well to his going.* And our Lord Christ *Luke* 12.43. having said as it was conceived of a Minister, *Who then is that faithfull and wise steward, whom his Lord shall make ruler over his houshold, to give them their portion of meat in due season?* it is requisite that the judgment of a Minister upon which he baptizeth should have both ingredients, prudents & charity, charity alone is not sufficient. For 1. If Charity be used without prudence, there may be a mockery of the Ordinance, and it profaned. 2. If the rule be a judgment of charity alone, then supposing the Minister be defective in his charity the person is to be debarred, who is otherwise fit to be baptized. But about this I conceive there is little or no difference between me and the pædobaptists. Mr. *M.* in one place, to wit, in his *defence pag.* 78. intimates that *I am conceived to incline to the looser way of baptizing any that would make a profession of faith in Jesus Christ.* And in another place *pag.* 233. *he makes it all my pleading that because we cannot know that all Infants of believers have the inward grace, we may not therefore baptize them.* From the former I vindicated my self in my *Apology* Sect. 17. and from the latter Sect. 10. But the difference is what qualification it is that may be evidence to a Minister, whereby to judge prudently a person to be capable of baptism. They that hold all Infants are to be baptized that are offered, they make no scruple, nor do they make much scruple that hold all Infants that are in a chosen nation, which I have refuted *Exam.* part.3. Sect.13. others baptize onely the children of inchurched members, of which I shall speake in Examining Mr. *Cobbets* conclusions. There are, that from the Generality of promises and election running through the Loyns of believers, will have all the children of believers to be in Covenant and elect in the parcels though not in the lump, and Mr. *Church* his opinion comes near it, that we have ground from a judgment of charity that the parties to be baptized are in the promise to baptize them. But against this I argue.

1. That is to be the rule of judging a persons baptizability which is made the condition of a person to be baptized in the holy Scripture. But no where in it is this made the condition of being baptized, that he be elect and in the Covenant. 2. The Scripture doth no where say that the election of God runs for the most part through the Loyns of believers. And though there are promise of blessing to the righteous and their seed, yet these are indefinite both for the kinde of blessing, and the person, and these promises are made onely to the truly righteous, and not to them, who are only such in appearance. Wherefore there can be no certainty for a judgment of prudence to rest upon, to determin of any whether they are elect or not, in the Covenant of grace or not, spiritually considering that God hath declared *Rom.*9.6,7,8,18,24. That he ties not himself to believers children. Now all judgment is to be suspended of that which is not revealed, *The secret things belong to the Lord our God, Deut.* 29.29.

3. For Infants of believers there is no ground for a judgment of charity, because they do nothing to shew whether they are in the Covenant or no. And if it be revealed by God that they are all or some in Covenant then we know it by a judgment of faith believing Gods revelation, and so it is not a probable judgment of charity, but a certain judgment of verity, which directs in this. 4. If a probable judgmenr of charity that a person is elect and in covenant be the rule to direct in baptizing, then suppose a salvage in new England or elsewhere seeming to be affected in the time of preaching should be judged in charity to be an elect person in covenant, he ought to be baptized by the Minister so judging, afore he owns Christ by profession. It is promised that the Israelits shall *be grafted in again, and all Israel saved*, Rom. 11. 24, 25, 26, 27, 28. and we may charitably judg it will be shortly, shall we baptize any of them or their Infants upon this charitable judgment of their election and being in Covenant afore profession? 5. If a charitable judgement of election and being in covenant had been the rule to baptize, then sure *John* the *Baptist*, and the baptizers appointed, had somewhere propounded that question, or made inquiry into that thing, but it was not so, they required repentance *Acts* 2. 38. inquired into the faith of the baptized. 6. If this had been the direction (baptize those that are elect or in Covenant) it had been a blind direction unfit for men to follow, and so our Lord should have imperfectly instructed his Apostles and others, or rather have mocked them, putting them to do a business not feasible by them. But this is not to be said of Christ, especially the rule being so plain to baptize believers and Disciples by profession.

As for Mr. *Church* his conceit, *that shews of grace and actual profession are a reason for baptizing onely as they are a ground for the judgment of charity that the parties to be baptized are in the promise*, I deny it. For the rule is not (baptize persons in the Covenant) but (Disciples or believers of all nations.) To that *of the Devils making a verbal profession*, I have answered before. That which he saith *that the judgment of charity* (meaning that they were in Covenant) *was the rule by which* John Baptist *and the Apostles walked in baptizing*, is not true, for they baptized upon their profession which they certainly knew. And though *they had no infallible knowledge of the individuals election or being in Covenant, but baptized hypocrits not a few*, yet they had an infallible knowledge of individuals confessing sins, professing repentance and faith, for they heard them, and this was their rule, not the conjectural knowledg of a persons interest in the Covenant or election of grace.

SECT. VIII.

Acts 2. 38, 39. proves that interest in the promise intitles not to baptism without repentance.

MR. *Church* brings in a Second objection, which is in effect what I allege Exon. pag. 62. a right to Evangelical promises is not the adequat reason of baptism, for the Jews were in the promise *Acts* 2. 38, 39. yet not baptized without preceding repentance. To which he answers thus, *A visible right to the promise either*

either by shews of grace (as in those of riper years) or by the naming a species in the promise without restriction, of which the parties to be baptized are individuals (as the Infants of visible professors are) is a sufficient reason for baptism.

To which I reply. If visible right to the promise by shews of grace be a sufficient reason for baptism, then the rule I set down for admitting to baptism is yeilded to be aright. But for the new made rule of Mr. *Church* it is but an humane ivention without Scripture warrant. He supposeth *the Infants of visible professors to be in the promise without restriction*, and the promise I conceive he means is (*I will be thy God and the God of thy seed* Gen.17.7.) But it is most false that that promise is made to any meer visible professors, but to *Abraham*, nor to any true believers natural seed, much less to any meer visible professors natural seed, but onely to *Abrahams* seed, who are onely elect and true believers of the Gentils according to the spiritual part of it, as is proved before. Yet were it granted that not onely the *Species*, but also the individuals were named expresly in the Covenant, I should deny they were to be baptized according to ordinary rule till they were known Disciples and believers. The Jewish people are in covenant *Rom.* 11.24,25,26,27,28. and yet not to be baptized till they believe, and *Peter* Acts 2.38,39. requires repentance for baptism, of whom he sayth, *the promise is to you.* But he tels me, *The most learned and rational of the Anabaptists confess that if it could appear to them that an Infant is in the Covenant they would not doubt of the baptism of it*, I answer, whatever others do, yet I disclaim that confession. I have granted sundry times as *Exam* part.3. Sect 15. *part.* 4. Sect.3. that regenerate, justified, adopted persons born into the world who have the inward grace are not to be debarred baptism, if it be known by special revelation, for they are then known Disciples and believers. But I never said this of an Infant in Covenant. For an Infant may be in Covenant even then when he is unregenerate (being in covenant) noting no more then having the promise made to him, which may be afore he is born, and therefore I should not yeild that of being in covenant, which I would do of actual regeneration.

But Mr. *Church* makes some shew of answering the argument from *Acts* 2. 38,39. *He tels us those Jews rejecting and crucifying Christ and Atheistically mocking at Gospel truths, ceased to have a visible right to the promise, untill they regained it by repentance.*

Answer Mr. *Church* pag.18. saith *being in the promise is the reason rendred by the apostle for the receiving of baptism* Acts 2.38,39. *therefore they that are rightly judged in it may be baptized.* pag. 20. *Being in the promise is the onely reason mentioned by the Apostles for baptism.* Doth not this plainly assert that the Jews then were righly judged by *Peter* to be in the promise, and their right thereby to batism? How then is it true which here he saith *they ceased to have a visible right to the promise till they regained repentance*? But it is not once onely that this Author is off and on, saying and unsaying at a little distance. Here he requires *a visible right in the promise regained by repentance*, a little before he saith *the species being named without restriction in the promise is a sufficient reason of baptism.* However I take his confession that notwithstanding what he said *pag.* 5,6,7. from *Acts* 2.38.39. of the promise to them and their children, and thence inferring their Infants tittle to baptism, as being the

chil-

children of visible professors, to whom God had promised to be a God and to their seed, yet here he saith *they ceased to have a visible right to the promise until they regained it by repentance*, which the Apostle supposeth they then had not, even then when he said, *The promise is to you and your children*: For he exhorteth to it as a thing to be done.

But Mr. *Church* flutters like a bird in a net, seeking some evation from this objection, though all in vain. He tels us *they were a mixt company to whom the Apostles spake* Acts 2.8,11. *and not all Jews, for they were of divers languages; and that they were adulti.*

But what is this to the avoyding the objection, that notwithstanding it is said the promise is to you, yet they were not intitled to baptism without repentance.

He then discourseth, *that repentance was in them onely* in fieri *before their baptism, and that the Apostle accepted of probabilities of it and baptized them; For in that distance from his preaching, and their baptizing, so many could not have repentance visible by its fruits and discernable*, and thence would gather, *if such hainous sinners were baptized upon probability of repentance, therefore Infants of Christians guilty of no actual sin may be baptized unto repentance.*

To which I reply, 1. It is expresly said *ver.*41. *they that gladly received the word were baptized*, therefore there were visible fruits of repentance and faith discerned by the Apostles and other Disciples, who were many and could confer with them in that space of time, and baptize them in that day, though their conversion was easily discernable without distinct conference with each.

2. His argument is not worth a rush, notwithstanding *Cyprians* words to back it, to prove Infant-baptism. For it goes upon this frivolous supposition, that Infants because they have no actual sin may be baptized, though they shew no repentance, much rather then hainous and great transgressors upon probability of repentance. As if lesser sinners might be baptized upon no testimony of repentance, because greater sinners are baptized upon probability of repentance, which if true, the more civil and orderly persons, though pharisaically minded, as if they needed no repentance, have much more right to baptism, then publicans confessing their sins because but probably penitent. 3. All this is nothing to answer the objection, but to strengthen it, that notwithstanding the promise was to them, yet they were not to be baptized till their repentance, either in *facto esse*, or *in fieri*, either visible in fruits or at least probably conceived, of which neither is to be said of Infants. Yet Mr. *Church* is not ashamed to conclude thus.

Being in the promise is the onely reason mentioned by the Appostle for baptism, (whereas repentance is undeniably prerequired) and that *if any disable the reason he imputes not a little weakness to the Apostles and their converts*; whereas he that disables the inference *from being rightly judged in the promise to right of baptism*, doth vindicate the Apostle from weakness, which pædobaptists do by their exposition and inference thence blemish him with, and cast the blame of weakness onely on Mr. *Church* and such inconsiderate expounders and disputers as he is. I had not thought to have said so much of so poor a piece as that book is; yet lest any say it is not answered I add.

SECT.

SECT. IX.

Infants are not proved by Mr. Church, *to be of the visible Church Christian.*

HIs second Argument is, *Infants of Christians are rightly judged to be of the Church with Christians of riper years, therefore they may be baptized.*

To which I say, His words are ambiguous, it being uncertain whether he means the Antecedent of the visible or invisible Church, of all infants of Christians, or some; but conceiving it meant of all, and of the visible Church of Christians, I deny the Antecedent. And for his ten Arguments, not one proveth it.

The *Medium* of the first is the Antecedent of the former Argument, to which I have answered before, denying that *all the infants of Christians are rightly judged to be in the promise of propriety in God, expressed* Gen.17.7. *in those words, I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed.*

But I deny the consequence also, that if it were true, that all the infants of Christians are rightly judged in the Promise of Propriety in God, therefore they are rightly judged to be of the visible Church: nor is it proved by that which he allegeth, (*For they onely are aliens from the Common-wealth of* Israel, *which are strangers from the covenant,* Ephes.2.12.) For if it did prove, that all that are strangers from the covenant of Promise are aliens from the visible Church of Christians, yet it proves not, that all who are in the covenant are in the visible Church; but the very truth is, neither the one nor the other is proved from that place; for this only is asserted there, that the Ephesians *who were* Gentiles *in the flesh, who are called uncircumcision, by that which is called the circumcision in the flesh made with hands,* no Proselytes were in the time of their infidelity & Idol-service, then *without the policy of* Israel *and the covenants of Promise:* but it doth not follow that every one that was then uncircumcised in the flesh, and out of the policy of *Israel,* meaning the outward policy, was stranger from the Promise of Propriety in God, meaning of it of saving Propriety; for *Cornelius,* Acts 10. was a stranger from the policy of *Israel,* being no citizen, but unclean, as being a *Gentile,* uncircumcised, yet then *he feared God, God heard his prayers, accepted his alms, &c.* much less now that every one that is rightly judged to be in the Promise of Propriety in God is of the visible Church, or every one that is rightly judged of the visible Church, is rightly judged to have the Promise of Propriety in God.

His next Argument is, *Infants of Christians are rightly called the Lords children, for his manner hath been to call the children of his people his children. In the old world some were called the sons of God, as children of his people,* Gen.6.2,3. *And the infants of the* Israelites *were called by him, his children born to him,* Ezek.16.20,21. *and their lawfull seed, a seed of God. And the* Jews *were accounted to him great and small in every age untill the breaking off; and the same was propheſied of the* Gentiles, *when they shall be converted, and of the* Jews *when they shall be grafted in again: and the* Psalmist *calls himself the Lords servant, as he was the son of his handmaid: therefore such infants are rightly judged to be of the Church, which is the House of God.*

Answ. Not one of these Texts proves the Church-membership of Christians infants. The term *Sons of God,* Gen.6.2,3. is attributed to persons before

the Floud, and those not infants, but such as *took them wives of all that they chose*, which could not be said of infants; nor are they said to be *Sons of God*, because children of believers, but because they professed the true worship of God, *Dei filios professione Christi. Cartwright Eborac. Annot. in locum, Such as descending from* Seth *and* Enoch *professed the true worship of the true God, New Annot.* I omit the opinions of *Josephus, Aquila*, and many of the Ancients, recited by Mr. *Gataker* against *Pfochenius, cap.*13. and the other of the *Chaldee Paraphrase, R. Solomon, Symmachus*, that they are called Sons of God, because *Sons of Potentates or Judges*, of which Mr. *Cartwright ubi supra*, and that of others *Sons of God*, that is, *eminent men*, because I think the other is more right: however they are not called *Sons of God*, that is, visible Church-members by their descent, but by their profession, which is not to be said of infants.

It is true *Ezek.*16.28,21. the children of *Israel* are said to be *born to God*, that is, of right as their Land was the *Lords Land, Hos.*9.3. and this did aggravate their sin, that those that were of right his were sacrificed to Idols: now this was by reason of that peculiar interest which God had in that people, *vers.*8. But that what is said of the sons of the *Jews* is true of all the infants of believers, or that this is enough to entitle the infants of Christians to visible Church-membership, and the initial seal, as they call it, is yet to be proved.

Of *Mal.*2.14,15. I have spoken sufficiently in the first part of this *Review, Sect.*13.26. of the *Ample Disquisition*: to which I add that in the second Edition of the *New Annot.* these words are added suitable to my Exposition of a legitimate seed; *All other seed is spurious, not a lawfull seed; nor such fathers are lawfull fathers, who so pervert the order and Ordinance of Matrimony, God puts his mark of infamy upon the seed it self, Deut.*23.2. which shews that with *Calvin* that Authour understood, by *a Seed of God*, a legitimate seed.

That which is said *Psalm* 22.30. *A seed shall serve him, it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation*, hath no shew of any thing for infants visible Church-membership: it cannot be expounded of infants while such: for how can it be said, *They shall serve the Lord?* But it notes onely a continuance of the Church promised in a people, who should when some decease, stand up after them to serve the Lord. The impertinency of that *Jer.*30.20. is shewed before. As little to the purpose is that *Psalm* 116.16. He doth not say, he was the Lords Servant as he was the *son of his handmaid*; and it was to express his mean condition or humility, as *Mary, Luke* 1.48. not his privilege, and his subjection to God, not his right he could clame from God; yet if there were any privilege imported in this title *(son of thine hand-maid)* Mr. *Church* must prove it to be Church-membership, and that not proper to him as a *Jew*, but common to all Christians ere it will serve his turn, which he cannot do.

Enough is said before in the *Ample Disquition*, to prove that 1 *Cor.*7.14. children are not denominated holy, because they appertain to the Church.

The remnant to be called holy, Isai 4.3. are either such *Jews* as in the captivity escaped alive, who should be holy in respect of their worship, not serving Idols, but the living God, or such converted believers in the Christian Church as should be written in the Book of Life, which makes nothing to infants Church-membership.

The

The *Church* is not called the *circumcision*, Rom. 3.30. & 15.8. but the *Jewish* people.

The Christians infants are not rightly judged to be of the Church Christian, because the *Hebrews* children were of the Church *Jewish*, God now not taking one whole Nation for his Church, but Disciples of Christ in all Nations.

Abraham is said, *Rom.*4.11. *to have received the sign of circumsion a seal of the righteousness of faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised*; but that any other mans circumcision was so to him, much less that every infants circumcision was such to them, I reade not: sure the tenour of the words imports no more than this, that *Abrahams* circumcision in his own person was an assurance to all believers though themselves uncircumcised of righteousness by faith to be imputed to them also. What Divines though of never so great esteem thence infer of the nature of circumcision, *that it is a seal of the righteousness of faith*, of all Sacraments, *that it is their nature to be seals of the covenant of grace, that to whom the covenant belongs to them the seal belongs, and consequently to infants*, are but their mistakes, not the Doctrine of the Text.

Of *Mark* 10.14 enough is said before. *Of infants may be the Kingdom of God*, yet they not in the visible Church.

The speech *(out of the Church is no salvation)* is true of the invisible Church of the elect, and is so expounded by Dr. *Morton Apol. Cath.* and others; of the visible it is not true; *Rahab* had been saved though she had never been joyned to the visible Church of the *Jews*.

What I said, that it is uncertain whether the infants brought to Christ, *Mark* 10.14. were the infants of Christian disciples or believers, is true; for it is not said, their Parents brought them, and though it be probable they that brought them believed on Christ, yet it is uncertain whether they believed him to be the Christ, or some eminent Prophet, as *Matth.*16.14. *Luke* 7.16.

The Daughter of the *Syrophœnician* was called a *Dog*, Matth.15.26. not because she was not a believers childe, but because a *Gentiles* childe, not an *Israelites*.

Though *Deut.*30.6. *Isai* 44.3. *Circumcision of the heart* and *the spirit* be promised to the *seed* of the godly, yet it is not promised to any but the elect, as the fuller promise, *Isai.*54.13. is expounded by Christ himself, *John* 6.45. and therefore not as Mr. *Church* saith, *to children, as they are the children of Gods People*, if *(as)* be taken reduplicatively; for then all the children of Gods People should have the spirit promised. Nor is the spirit promised to them in their infancy, and yet if it were, till they shew it, we have no warrant to take them for visible Church-members, or to baptize them without special revelation.

It is largely proved above that *Acts* 15.10. no infant is called a *Disciple*.

There may be hope of infants salvation, they may be of the body of Christ, though they be not of the visible Church.

Our infants and our selves though believers are yet Heathens, that is, of the Nations by birth, and had been reputed Dogs as well as the Woman of *Canaans* childe, *Matth.*15.26. if we had then lived: but in the sense as it is now used, and as it was a Title of infamy and rejection, *Matth.*18.17 we are not to be called Heathens, that is, infidels, and whose society is to be shunned; nor our infants, who are neither infidels nor believers, they being not capable of

faith in that ſtate ordinarily: as in Logick they ſay, a Whelp till the ninth day is neither blinde nor ſeeing, there being a middle of abnegation of either extreme, by reaſon of the incapacity of the ſubjects, ſo we may ſay, our infants are neither infidels nor believers.

What Mr. *Church* allegeth out of *Rev.*22.15. ſerves onely to beget hatred towards Antipædobaptiſts: for (*without*) there is meant of being *without the city or heavenly Jeruſalem*, *verſ.*14. and *Dogs*, there are ranked with *Sorcerers*, and *whoremongers*, and *murderers*, and *idolaters*, and ſuch like; neither of which needs be ſaid of infants; though we ſay, they are not viſible members in the Chriſtian Church, and that they are not yet believers.

Chriſt an infant was head of the Church, yet viſibly he appeared not the head of the Church, till he was manifeſted to be ſo. *Infants may be members of Chriſt the head* inviſibly, but not viſibly till they ſhew faith.

SECT. X.

Infants capacity of ſome reſpects different from diſcipleſhip, entitles them not to Baptiſm.

IN the third Argument is not much more than was ſaid before, and is anſwered. Jews *infants were meet for circumciſion*, becauſe of the command to them; ours not meet for Baptiſm, becauſe we have no command or example: it is true *Matth.*18.22. *A little childe is made a Pattern to thoſe that are ſaved*, in reſpect of humility or freedom from ambition: but it doth not thence follow that this meer negation of ambition doth qualifie them for Baptiſm, unto which, actual Diſcipleſhip or Profeſſion is ordinarily neceſſary. Chriſt *admitted to him, and bleſſed little children*, Mark 10.13. but did not appoint to baptize them, which it is likely he would, if he had judged them meet for it. *If Parents may enter into covenant for their childrem, and dedicate them by ſolemn vow, as* Hannah *did*, (of which there is cauſe of doubt whether now it is to be done as then) yet it follows not they are to be baptized, ſith Baptiſm is to be the perſons own engagement, not anothers for him: yea if this reaſon be good each Parent may baptize its own childe, though a woman, ſith *Hannah* could dedicate her childe by vow to God: If *Iſrael be holineſs to the Lord*, Jer.2.3. yet it follows not believing *Gentiles* infants are meet for Baptiſm, *Joel* 2.16. *the children that ſuck the breaſt are required to faſt*: if this prove them meet for Baptiſm, by like reaſon ſhould the *Ninivites* children and cattle be meet too, *Jonah* 3.5,7,8. The *Pſalmiſt was caſt on God from his mothers belly*, Pſal.22.10. not by dedication to God, but by ſpecial providence, as *verſ.*9. ſhews. *Infants of Chriſtians, it is rightly judged may have in them the principal things ſignified by Baptiſm*, but not that they have them till they ſhew it. If Mr. *Church* could make it good that God *undertakes for what is wanting in the infants of his people through infancy*, as he doth for what is wanting in his people through infirmity, he ſhould ſay ſomewhat to purpoſe: but I am out of hope to finde any good proofs from him, but trifling dictates and impertinent allegations, *Pſalm* 119.122. is a Prayer, wherein the *Pſalmiſt* prays God, *to be ſurety for him for good*, that is, ſays the *New*

Annot.

Annot. to put himself between him and his enemies, as if he were his Pledg: it is no undertaking he will, and if it be, it is nothing for his infants, surely not to supply what is wanting in them by reason of infancy for Baptism. *He will circumcise the hearts of his peoples children*, Deut.30.6. but this is meant of their elect children onely, and not necessarily to be performed in infancy. *Christs* promise *Matth.*18.19. is upon condition *of agreement by two or three to ask in his Name*, nor is it said for them and theirs, however not without subordination to his secret purpose, and other limitations.

That of *Isai* 22.24, is rightly expounded in the *New Annot.* by learned Mr. *Gataker*, *All his kindred and allies with their issue as well small as great shall partake of* Eliakims *honour, in one imployment or other*: so that this with the other Texts, might as well prove a man in the Moon, as that which Mr. *Church* infers, *Therefore such infants are judged meet for Baptism.*

His next, that *Christians infants have righteousness by imputation*, Rom.5.19. *as they have guilt by imputation*, is true onely of the elect, but makes them not meet for Baptism till they are called. What he says, *Shews of grace are not necessary to the judging infants of Christians meet for Baptism*, is said without proof; the contrary is proved before. All his Reasons he brings to prove it, serve as well to prove them not necessary that a person be judged meet for the Lords Supper.

Infants may be rightly judged to have original sin in them without shews, because the Scripture says so, but tells us of none meet for Baptism, but disciples and believers. *The* Israelites *infants did as much eat the Lords Supper, as were baptized*, 1 Cor.10.1,2,3,4. If the Text proves the one, it proves the other.

Baptism is called Baptism unto repentance, Matth.3.11. *as well as Baptism of repentance*, It is well it is confessed that *Johns* Baptism was called the *Baptism of repentance*; but it is true also that it is often so called *Mark* 1.4. *Luke* 3.3. *Acts* 13.24. *&* 19.4. and but once *unto repentance*: and it might have been observed which *Beza* notes on *Matth.*3.11. that it might be there read *(at repentance,* or *when they repent)* as εἰς κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ, *Matth.*12.41. is rendered, *(at the preaching of* Jonah) however if it be read *(unto repentance)* the meaning is to the same effect, that when he baptized them they professed repentance for the present, and for the future.

In answer to the Objection, infants by like reason should have the Lords Supper, he tells us, *that the ceremonies are different, in the one the person is to be active, in the other passive*: but the Scripture says not so, but requires Baptism as a duty, and thereto profession of faith as a prerequisite. He saith, *Baptism is the Sacrament of entrance into the church, the other of progress*; but this proves the rather that infants should have the Lords Supper, sith they are to grow and make progress after their entrance. What he saith, *it cannot be given to infants*, is false: for they can take Bread and Wine, and it was given them six hundred years together, as many both Protestants and Papists confess.

What he saith Argument 4. *pag.*30. *Sealing the covenant by an initial Sacrament to infants of Gods people aforetime was not peculiar to that church-state*, is manifestly false: for that sealing was no other than circumcision, which if it were not proper to the *Jewish* Church-state, nothing was.

It is frivolous which Mr. *Church* says, *The commission to baptize must be expounded by the command to circumcise.*

What

What is said about the antiquity of infant-baptism is elsewhere answered, *Exam. part.1. Apol. Sect.15,16. Præcursor Sect.3. Dionysius Areopagita* is a spurious Authour, as whole Juries of Protestants and Papists confess. *Salmasius* saith in his *Letter to Colvius, pag.179. that he is no elder than the fifth age, pag.* 441. *It is certain that he wrote about the fifth age.* There's plainer proof for Episcopacy being in use nearer the Apostles days than for Pædobaptism: it is no intolerable presumption but a certain truth in them that assert, that infant-baptism is not so ancient as is pretended, as now taught is a late innovation.

In his fifth Arg. he undertakes to shew, *Infants have great profit by Baptism*, but either asserts a meer Title, or a Profit which they have not by their Baptism, or that which they may have without it. It is not true, *that there is the like profit to infants by baptism as by circumcision*; for the one is appointed and not the other, and there is no penalty for omitting infant-baptism as for neglecting infant-circumcision, nor any promise or privilege assigned to infant-baptism as to infant-circumcision.

SECT. XI.

The Agreements between Circumcision and Baptism, do not justifie Infant-baptism, and the validity of sealing Infants with an initial seal now, is shewed to be null.

His sixth and last Argument runs thus, *The promise was sealed by the initial Sacrament aforetime to infants of visible Professors, seeking it for them both Jews and Gentiles, therefore it may be sealed to the infants of Christians by the initial Sacrament.*

The Antecedent he proves not, it is in effect no more than the infants of *Jews* and Proselytes were circumcised, onely Mr. *Church* useth the affected Phraseology of Pædobaptists to call that sealing the Promise by the initial Sacrament, which is no more than circumcision, which it is false did seal, or assure to every circumcised person the Promise of propriety in God, or any other Promise made in the covenant with *Abraham*, Gen.17. And he says, *It was sealed to infants of visible Professors*; intimating it was done to them by reason of their Profession, and not to others; whereas the infants of any in his house, *whether born in* Abrahams *house, or bought with his money, who were not of his seed, but* strangers *children, were by command to be circumcised.* He puts in his conclusion *(our Baptism)* for *(sealing by the initial Sacrament)* But to let pass these stale Paralogisms; he takes on him to prove the consequence by six Arguments.

The first is, *The principal Promise is not made void.* He means that Gen.17.7. but gives no reason why that should be the principal Promise, and not that *v.*4. But I grant that Promise Gen.17.7. meant of *Abrahams* seed by faith is not made void. He thence concludes, *Therefore it may be sealed to the infants of Christians by the initial Sacrament in this dispensation*; which is not a proof of the consequence, but of the conclusion of the former Argument; nor is there any force in this inference: for though the Promise were still in force as then, yet it is not a sufficient reason to baptize an infant, the command being not to baptise persons in covenant, but disciples of Christ.

In

In his second he tells us, *Sealing that Promise by an initial Sacrament to infants of Gods people (which was the substance of circumcision, and a distinct thing from it) did not of right cease with the* Jewish *church-state; for it was not peculiar to that church as a national church; for that Promise was sealed to infants by the initial Sacrament long before the existence of a national church, and to Infants of strangers which were not of that nation* Gen.27. 2. *Sealing the promise by an initial Sacrament is principally in reference to the Catholik church. For shews of grace are sufficient to it, though the parties have not joyned themselves to any particular church* Acts 18.36,37. and 10 47. *and one that cannot be rightly judged to be of the catholick church cannot have the promise sealed to him by an initial Sacrament, though he be a member of a particular church.*

Answer. That which Mr. *church* saith (*sealing that promise by an initial Sacrament to Infants of Gods people was the substance of circumcision and a distinct thing from it*) is many waies faulty in respect of falsehood, and obscurity. For 1. the substance of circumcision as a type or shadow is Christ exhibited, as the Apostle *Col.*3.7. not the promise of God to every Infant of a believer by profession 2. as circumcision was a sign or taken of the covenant made with *Abraham*; and it is true the promise *Gen.*17.7. was the thing signified by it, but not onely that part, *I will be the God of thy seed*, but also the other, *I will be thy God*, yea and all the rest of the promises as *ver.*4. *thou shalt be a father of many nations, fruitfulness, descent of Kings* ver.6. *inheritance of Canaan* ver.8. yet how the promises or the sealing of them should be the substance of circumcision I do not understand. Circumcision was a ceremony consisting of an action and a relation. Circumcision as an action hath no other substance or essence but the cutting off the little skin, as a relation, the signifying, or sealing is the very relation, but it is a trifling speech to say, paternity is the substance of paternity, if the promises sealed be meant to be the substance yet no Logicians I know so speak, to call the object of sight the substance of sight, the thing signified the substance of the sign. *Faith is Heb.*11.1. said to be *the substance of things hoped for*, but there the act is said to be the substance of the object, not the object the substance of the act, & so the covenant should not be the substance of circumcision, but circumcision, the substance of the covenant. 3. It is more unintelligible to me, how *sealing the promise by an initial Sacrament to Infants of Gods people was the substance of circumcision and yet a distinct thing.*

For, first, if he mean that it was the substance of circumcision as a relation, that is the essence of it (in which sense only I know how to understand his speech) then sure it was the very same and no distinct thing, the essence being not a distinct thing from the essentiate, the thing defined and definition are not two distinct things, though the notion be formally distinct; if he mean that sealing that promise by an initial Sacrament should be the *Genus* to circumcision, yet so it should not be a distinct thing, the *Genus* and *species* are not distinct really but formally, *Quæ formaliter distinguuntur non habent se ut res et. res Kick. sist. log. lib.* 1. *part.* 2. *cap.* 5. nor was there any other sealing that promise by an initial Sacrament then by circumcision, and therefore no real distinction, all the distinction was meerly notional or verbal, circumcision being one word, and sealing with the initial seal at that time another, yet both expressing the same thing. If any imagine a sealing with an initial seal then that was not circumcision let him shew what it is and were com-

manded: Mr. *Church* himself pag. 41. calls *circumcision the initial Sacrament aforetime.* 2. *Sealing the promise by an initial Sacrament* is said to be *the substance of circumcision*, yet pag. 41. he saith *it was a distinct thing from sealing the promise, and only a ceremony for that time.* Wherin sundry inconsistences seem to be 1. that *sealing the promise by an initial seal should be the substance of circumcision*, & yet *circumcision a distinct thing from it.* Is the substance of a being a distinct thing from it? the substance of a man a distinct thing from a man? 2. that *Sealing the promise should be the substance of circumcision*, and yet *circumcision onely a ceremony for that time.* Is that a ceremony to a thing which is the substance of it? 3. that *circumcision doth cease* yet not *that sealing the promise by that initial Sacrament which was no other then circumcision.* Let him that can read these riddles, I am no such *Oedipus* as to unfold them. But let Mr. *Church* use what gibberish he please I know no other initial Sacrament then that of circumcision mentioned in the old Testament, nor any sealing then commanded but it, and if it cease, then all the ruls about it cease to bind, and so are no rule to us now. But saith he pag. 41. *The sealing of promise is not ceased, far seals are added in dispensation to the covenant.* To which I reply. A thing is said to cease either of right or of fact which was of right to be or had being before but not now. There was no sealing by an initial seal aforetime that had being of right or of fact aforetime but circumcision, which Mr. *Church* saith *was the initial seal aforetime*, therefore circumcision ceasing, sealing with the initial seal aforetime ceased, there being no other foretime. But saith Mr. *Church it is not ceased, for seals are added in this dispensation to the covenant*, he means doubtless baptism and the Lords Supper, and by seals other seals, and so his reason is sealing of the promise by an initial Sacrament which was aforetime is not ceased, because other seals are added, which is as if one should say, the night is not past because the sun is risen, the reason is good to the contrary, there are other seals added, therefore the sealing with the initial seal, aforetime is ceased. But, saith he, *it did not of right cease with the Jewish church state: For it was not peculiar to that church as a national church.*

Answer. If circumcision were not perticular to the Jewish Church-state I know nothing peculiar to it. And if it were not peculiar to that church as a national church why was the nation peculiarly called *the circumcision*, and other people *the uncircumcision* Rom. 3. 30. And for that which is alledged, *that promise was sealed to Infants by the initial Sacrament long before the existence of a national church and to Infants of strangers which were not of that nation*, I conceive neither is true. For circumcision was not till Abrahams nation were a Church. For he had before that time *taught them the way of the Lord* Gen. 18. 19. and they worshipped the true God, as appears by the many altars he built to Jehovah. And though *Abrahams* house was but a small nation, yet it was a nation. And though Infants of strangers were circumcised, yet it was not without incorporation into that nation, so that they were of that nation if not by birth, yet as proselytes added thereto; nevertheless if it had been before the existence of the national church of the Jews, it might cease with that church-state, as the distinction of clean and unclean beasts was before *Abrahams* dayes, as appears by *Gen.* 17. 2. and yet that distinction ceased with the Jewish Church state.

As for his second reason it is of no force. For when he saith, *Sealing the promise*

promiſe by an initial Sacrament is principally in reference to the Catholike Church he means it, I conceive, of baptiſm, elſe *Acts* 8. 36, 37. & 10. 47. are cited to no purpoſe. But there is no colour of conſequence in Mr. *Churches* reaſon, thus framed, Baptiſm joined men to the Univerſal Church, therefore Circumciſion was not peculiar to the Jewiſh Church-ſtate, or that it ceaſed not with the Jewiſh Church-ſtate. As for his other aſſertion, That [one that cannot be rightly judged to be of the Catholick Church, cannot have the promiſe rightly ſealed to him by an initial Sacrament, though he be a Member of a particular Church,] it being of no weight to the preſent Argument, I ſhall not ſo fitly meddle with it till I come to anſwer the 20.ch. of Mr. *Bs.* firſt part of *Plain Scripture proof*, &c.

As for his third Argument, it proves not the Conſequence. [For though faith and repentance be required of ſome afore circumciſion] yet it was not required of infants afore circumciſion. But afore baptiſm it is required of all *Mat.* 28.19. *Mark* 16.16. *Acts* 2. 38. & 8. 36, 37, 38.

To the fourth, I ſay though [infants now are capable of the promiſe as the Jews infants were,] and that [they could bear baptiſm as well as the Jews infants could circumciſion, ye: without a like command (which cannot be found) they are not to be baptized as the other were to be circumciſed.

As for the fifth Argument, it is falſe, That [baptiſm is as appliable to infants as circumciſion was; for there is not the like command, without which though it were, that no more action were required in the ſubject to be baptized then in the ſubject to be circumciſed (which is falſe, as appears from *Matt.* 28.19. *Mark* 16.16. *Acts* 2.38. *Acts* 8. 36,37,38.) and though it were that the parities were more between them then they are, yet they make no rule for baptiſm without a command or inſtitution. But it is falſe which he ſaith, that baptiſm is the ſame Sacrament with Circumciſion And as for the twelve parities, brought by Mr. *Church*, ſome are doubtful, as the firſt [that they are both initial Sacraments of the Covenant of grace] in ſome ſenſe with ſome limitations it may be true, but in other, even in that ſenſe it is commonly taken, it is not true; to wit, that the eſſence of them conſiſts therein, and that they are ſo to all rightly circumciſed or baptized.

The ſecond is likewiſe ambiguous, in ſome ſenſe true, in ſome falſe. Thoſe that might not be rightly judged to be in the promiſe might be circumciſed, however it be concerning baptiſm. And thoſe that may be rightly accounted to be of the Church, meaning the inviſible, yet are not therefore to be baptized.

The third likewiſe is doubtful by reaſon of the different waies of being accounted to the Church, and the doubt whether a perſon be to be accounted of the Church afore baptiſm or after. The Words *Acts* 2. 41.47. ſeem to prove that they are added to the Church after baptiſm.

Neither is the fourth or fifth certain. For women ordinarily entred into the Church aforetime without circumciſion, and did eat the Paſſeover.

The eighth is not true of every circumciſed perſons circumciſion, nor of every baptized perſons baptiſm, that it is an external ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith.

In the tenth ſomething is untrue. For in the new Diſpenſation (as the phraſe is) are not both temporal and ſpiritual promiſes ſealed as well as in the former,

if he mean it of the ſame temporal promiſes, we have better promiſes *Heb.* 8.6 but not the ſame, not the promiſe of the land of *Canaan*, of greatneſs, proſperity, &c. but rather a prediction of perſecution, if we will live Godly in Chriſt Jeſus. Chriſtians have Chriſt, and all other things by that part of the Covenant made with *Abraham*, which is ſpiritual, but not by that part which is proper to the *Iſraelites*.

In the eleventh Mr. *Church* ſeems to be out in his computation about the beginning of baptiſm, and end of Circumciſion. He ſaith [Circumciſion of right ended when baptiſm began to be an initial Sacrament, and that was not ſurely till *Iohn* began to baptize, which was not till the fifteenth year of *Tiberius*, as is plain from *Luke* 3. 1,2. now mark his reaſon, *For Chriſts Circumciſion was the period of it.* Now if Chriſts circumciſion was the period of it, then it did ceaſe almoſt thirty years before baptiſm began to be an initial Sacrament, Chriſt being circumciſed in the Reign of *Auguſtus*. But whence doth he gather that *Circumciſion of right ended, when Baptiſm began to be an initial Sacrament?*

For my part I find no ſuch thing in Scripture. If our Lords words *Iohn* 7. 22,23. do not prove it was then in force, yet thoſe ſpeeches of the Apoſtle *Epheſ.* 2.14,15,16. of aboliſhing the Law of Commandments in Ordinances, and ſlaying the enmity by his Croſs, and *Col.* 2.14. of blotting out the hand-writing of Ordinances, which was againſt us, and took it away nailing it to his Croſs, do determine that Circumciſion did of right continue until Chriſts death, and ſo ſo ne years after, baptiſm began to be a Sacrament initial. The uſual Doctrine is, that the Ceremonies of the Law became dead with Chriſt, deadly after the open promulgation of the Goſpel, and calling of the *Gentiles*, *Diodati annot. on Matth.* 27. 51. *And this breach was a ſign that by the death of Chriſt all Moſaical Ceremonies were annihilated.* But Mr. *Church* tells us, *Circumciſion ceaſed to be needful when* Iohn *began to baptize, for the Law is ſaid to continue but untill* John, Luke 16.16. To which I anſwer, I know not why Circumciſion ſhould not be as needful as the Paſſ over, which our Saviour himſelf obſerved *Luke* 22. 15. and offering the gift to the Prieſt that *Moſes* commanded, *Matth.* 8. 4. I preſume the command of Circumciſion was in force till after Chriſts death as well as the command of the Paſſeover, ſeventh day Sabbath and other things. As for Mr. *Church* his reaſon if it were good, That circumciſion was needleſs when *Iohn* began to baptiſe, becauſe it is ſaid the law was untill *Iohn*, by the ſame reaſon he might ſay all the reſt of the Law, yea and the Prophets were needleſs, when *Iohn* began to baptize. But the meaning is, the Miniſtery of the Law and Prophets continued, till *Iohn*, or as it is *Matth.* 11. 13. all the Prophets and the Law prophecied until *Iohn*, that is, declared Chriſts comming as future, and when *Iohn* began then the Kingdom of God began to be preached, and therefore *Mark* 1. 1,2. The beginning of the Goſpel of *Ieſus Chriſt the Son of God* is ſaid to be upon *Iohns* preaching; for then the Meſſiah was named as preſent, *Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the ſin of the World*, John. 1. 29.

Laſtly ſaith Mr. *Church* [the Apoſtle plainly teacheth that Baptiſm is the ſame Sacrament to Chriſtians that Circumciſion was to Gods people aforetime *Col.* 2. 11. 12. arguing againſt the continuance of Circumciſion: in this Diſpenſation he uſes two Arguments, which argue no leſs. For 1. Chriſt being

come

come (who was the body of the old ſhadows) they of right ceaſed. 2. That baptiſm was now the ſign of our Mortification, for which circumciſion ſerved aforetime.]

To which I anſwer, neither doth the Apoſtle plainly, that is, in expreſs terms, teach *Col.*2.11,12. what ever Mr.*Church*, or Mr. *Calvin* ſay, That baptiſm is the ſame Sacrament to Chriſtians that circumciſion was to Gods people aforetime, nordo his reaſons prove it. For by the ſame reaſon we might ſay it of putting away of leaven out of their houſes, and keeping the Paſſeover with unleavened bread: baptiſm is the ſame Sacrament to Chriſtians that the feaſt of unleavened bread was to Gods people aforetime. For 1. Chriſt being come (who was the body of the old ſhadows) they of right ceaſed. 2. That baptiſm is now the ſign of Mortification, for which keeping the feaſt with unleavened bread ſerved aforetime, 1 *Cor.*5.7,8.

But were all theſe parities between circumciſion and baptiſm, which Maſter *Church* mentions, right, yet they prove not his Concluſion, *That the initial ſacrament in this diſpenſation is as appliable to infants of Chriſtians as the initial ſacrament aforetime was to infants of Gods people.* For if not all theſe, yet as many other parities may be reckoned, at leaſt according to Pædobaptiſts *Hypotheſes*, between baptiſm and the Paſſeover, as, that they are both Sacraments of the Covenant of grace, both ceremonies to be uſed about thoſe that might rightly be judged in the promiſe, and accounted of the Church, the ordinary way of communion in the Church, not allowed to thoſe without, engaging to obſervancy of the Covenant according to the ſeveral adminiſtrations, ſigns of mortification, external ſeals of the righteouſneſs of faith, diſtinguiſhing Gods people from infidels, to ceaſe at Chriſts comming, &c. and yet I ſuppoſe Mr. *Church* will not have them the ſame Sacrament. Yea as many diſparities between circumciſion and baptiſm may be reckoned as Mr.*Church* reckons parities, as that the one was a ſhadow of Chriſt to come, not the other; the one a token of the mixt covenant made to *Abraham*, which was of promiſes peculiar to the Jews, not the other; the one a domeſtick action to be done in the houſe, the other an Eccleſiaſtick belonging to the Church; the one to be done by the parents in that reſpect, not ſo the other; the one with cutting off a part, not the other; the one with drawing blood, not the other; the one to males onely, the other to females alſo; the one to be on the eighth day whatever it were, the other not limitted to any preciſe day; the one made a viſible impreſſion on the body, and that permanent, not ſo the other; the one to be done with an artificial and ſharp, the other with a natural and not wounding inſtrument; the one to all males belonging to the houſe of *Abraham* even infants, but not to others though Godly, except they joined themſelves to that family: the other to believers or diſciples of all nations; the one engaging to keep *Moſes* his Law, not ſo the other. But be the diſparities or parities what they will, the only rule in theſe meer poſitive rites is the inſtitution or command: ſo that were the Sacraments (as they are called) the ſame in kind, uſe, analogy, or what other way they may be deemed the ſame, yet without a rule of command or example intimating ſuch a command, we are not bound to do the like in the one, as we do in the other.

As for the ſixth Argument, *That nothing can be ſoundly collected from the ſcriptures againſt infant-baptiſm*; the contrary hath appeared above in the ſecond

part of this Review Sect 5. &c. what he grants that it may be soundly gathered that all of riper years should be discipled before baptism from the commission *Matth.* 28. 19. doth also prove, that they had no Commission to baptize any but discipled persons, and so none but those of riper years, not infants unless there be shewed some other Commission: which is not to be found in the Scripture, but only in corrupt tradition of antiquity, and the Jewish arguings of latter Divines, and is not yet found any other then will-worship.

To all which Mr. *Church* further brings answer is made before, the vindicating of my objections will most fitly come in the reply to Masters *Marshalls* Defence, to which I shall hasten after the dispatch of some few other Authors.

SECT. XII.

Doctor Featley his argument for Infant-baptism from the Covenant, is examined.

MR. *Rutherford* is another of the Authors, whose writing Mr. *Baxter* tells, *yet remains to be answered.* But I know not any writing of his in which he doth directly dispute against Anti-pædobaptists.

I confess I have met with a dispute against those of the Congregational way of Discipline in his *Peaceable and temperate Plea*, c. 12. q. 12. for denying baptism to those infants whose next parent is not a known believer in some gathered Church, who yet do hold and practise baptism of such infants, whose next parent is a Church-member. But that dispute going only against them, and upon his grounds denied and refuted by me elsewhere, it were out of my way to answer what he saith there. If there be any other writing of his, I presume some one or other of the Antagonists I refute, have the strength of it: yet I intend if such a one do occurre to me, to give account of it as I shall find meet.

Mr. *Robert Baillee* is another to whose writing Mr. *B.* points me. But his first Argument I have already enervated in the Addition to my Apology in my letter to him, and answering his three first criminations, especially the third, and have shewed, sect. 1. that he doth but calumniate, when he charges us to affirm, That *no infants have any place in the Covenant of grace, or any Gospel promises till they be called by the word, and by an actual faith have embraced the Gospel.* What other arguments he brings are answered either in answering Others that bring the same, or its intended shall be answered in fit place.

There are many others who have written of this argument in the English tongue, each of which forms his Argument from the Covenant to the initial seal, from infant circumcision to infant-baptism, with some difference in terms, or phrasifying, though in effect all of them are reduced into the three forms in the 1, 2, 3. sect. of my *Exercitation*, and rest on these false principles, that interest in the Covenant of grace was the adequate reason of a persons title to circumcision, and is the adequate reason of a persons title to baptism, and that there is the like reason of baptizing infants of believers, as of circumcising in-

infants of *Abraham* by virtue of the like interest in the Covenant, though there be not the like command for the one as for the other, nevertheless that it may not be said I have neglected any thing conceived worth answering, or to have slighted any of their labours, I shall briefly answer the Arguments of such as have come to my hands, and then more largely answer Mr. *Geree*, Mr. *Marshall*, Mr. *Cobbet*, Mr. *Blake*, Mr. *Baxter*, who have opposed my writings, taking in others by the way, as I see fit.

Dr. *Featley* is one that hath been a Leader of the Prelatical party, and is judged by them to have proved Pædobaptism learnedly. His dispute is in his *Dipper dipt*, p. 46. arg. 5. thus.

[All they who are comprized within the Covenant, and are no where prohibited to receive the seal thereof, may and ought to receive it: But children are comprized within the Covenant of faith, whereof circumcision was a seal, *Rom.* 4. 11. and now baptism is, *Ergo* children may and ought to receive Baptism.

Of the Major or first Proposition there can be no doubt; for it is unjust to deprive a Man of the confirmation of that to which he hath a true right or title. And for the Minor or Assumption, it is as cleer, for so are the words of the Covenant *Gen.* 17. 17. I will establish my Covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee.]

Against which I except, first, That the Syllogism is many waies faulty; 1. That he puts in the Conclusion [children] as all one with infants. 2. That in the Conclusion there is this term not expresst in the Major [may and ought to receive baptism] for that which is in the Major [may and ought to receive the seal of the Covenant] is not all one with [may and ought to receive baptism] baptism and seal of the Covenant being not equipollent, besides Circumcision, passeover, Lords Supper, the *Ephesians* are said to be sealed with the holy spirit of promise *Ephes.* 1. 13. nor is the term [seal of the Covenant] applyed to Sacraments any other than a novel expression, neither used in Scripture, nor the Antients. *Rom.* 4. 11. doth not term circumcision (much less other Sacraments as they are called) a seal of the Covenant of faith, as the Doctor misallegeth it, but a seal of the Righteousness of faith, which he had being yet uncircumcised. Whence it appears that it was a Seal of what he had, not of a covenant concerning what he was to have: and this is said onely of *Abrahams* circumcision, with such an observing of particularizing circumstances, as shew it to be appropriated to *Abrahams* circumcision, what ever is said of circumcisions being a seal of the righteousness of faith, however Divines dictate to the contrary, and therefore what the Doctor addes in the Minor (which multiplies the terms in the Syllogism) [and now baptism is] asserting thereby baptism to be a Seal of the Covenant of faith, is said without proof, though I should not stick to grant it in this sense, that to the true believer his baptism assures righteousness according to Gods Covenant, and the true believer by baptism gives testimony or assurance of his faith according to his Covenant, as being unwilling to wrangle about terms if we agree in the meaning. But in the sense Pædobaptists use it, as containing the nature of a Sacrament, I shall reject it in that which followes. 3. Against the Doctors omission of some words in the Minor, [and are no where prohibited to receive the seal thereof] which were in the Major. 4. That the term [and are no where prohi-

bited

bited to receive the seal thereof] is ambiguous. For it may be understood either of an expres prohibition in forbidding terms, or a prohibition by consequence. It is granted in so many expres words, infants are not prohibited to receive baptism, no nor the Lords Supper, yet they are by good consequence to be denied both, in as much as both are disagreeing from the institution and practice of those rites in the new Testament. Wherefore to the Doctors argument, I except against the form of it, as containing more then three terms, the predicate in the conclusion not being in the *Major*, part of the *medium* in the major being left out in the Minor. And if it be thus formed [all they who are comprized within the covenant of faith, and are no where prohibited to receive the seal thereof, may and ought to be baptized: But infants of believers are comprized, &c. *Ergo.*] I deny the Major if meant of Gods covenant to us, or promise either of faith or righteousnes to infants by it, as the alleging *Gen.* 17. 7. imports the Doctor meant. But grant it of those who are comprized within the Covenant of faith by their covenanting to be believers, in which sense I deny the Minor, that children, that is infant-children are comprized in the Covenant of faith by their covenanting to be believers; yea and if the proposition be universal, all children, or all infant-children of believers are comprized in Gods covenant of faith or promise that he will give them faith or righteousnes by faith, I deny it. Nor is the Major proved by the Doctor. For it is no unjust thing to deny baptism to a person to whom it is not appointed; now baptism is appointed to disciples or believers, not to whom God promiseth to give faith or righteousnes by faith. Besides were it true that God had so promised it and confirmation of it were due; yet without institution confirmation by baptism were not due; God hath other waies to confirm it, as by his Oath *Heb.* 6. 17. the blood of his Son, 1 *Cor.* 11. 25. his Spirit, 2 *Cor.* 1. 22. A man that is bound to pass an estate, and to seal it, may not be bound to a further Confirmation by fine and recovery. Besides its no injustice not to confirm ones right who doth not claim and prove it. But this infants do not. And for the Minor, the words *Gen.* 17 7. have nothing about the second part of the proposition, nor do indeed prove any to be comprized in that promise, but *Abraham* and his seed, of which sort none of Gentile-believers children are, but those that are true believers as he was, or elect by God to adoption of children. The objection the Doctor brings in is not rightly framed, nor do I deny the answer the Doctor gives is sufficient to overthrow it as so formed. But what the Doctor dictates, That all true believers and their children are to be reckoned among children of the promise, is contradictory to the Apostles determination *Rom.* 9. 7, 8. as the Apostle is expounded by Dr. *Featly* himself in the *New Annot.* on *Rom.* 9. 8. in which he thus speaks, not all they who are carnally born of *Abraham* by the course of nature are the children of God to whom the promise of grace was made; but the children of promise, that is, those who were born by vertue of the promise, those who by Gods special grace were adopted (as *Isaac* by a special, and singular promise was begot by *Abraham*) they only are accounted for that seed mentioned in the Covenant, I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed.

SECT.

SECT. XIII.

The Arguments of Mr. William Lyford, *from the Covenant for infant-baptism are examined.*

MR. *William Lyford* in his *Apology for Infant-baptism* page 33. thus disputes. All that are taken into the Covenant of grace ought to receive the initial sign [what ever the sign be that God shall chuse] and that according to the commandment of God, and our Lord Jesus Christ. But infants are taken into Covenant with their parents, as is proved; therefore by the Commandment of the Lord they ought to receive the sign which God hath enjoined to be used, and that sign is baptism.

To which I answer, by denying the Major, and for his proof out of *Gen.* 17.7,12. I deny,

1. That there is any command for any other initial sign but Circumcision.

2. That circumcision is there appointed to all who are taken into the Covenant of grace, not to *Lot*, *Melchisedeck*, *Job* or their children, not to the females of *Abrahams* house, not to the males under eight daies old, not to the Proselytes of the gate as *Cornelius* was.

3. That the adequate reason why any was to be circumcised was interest in the Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 7. but the command only. For both *Ishmael* who was not in the covenant was to be circumcised because of the command, and as hath been shewed, others in the covenant were not to be circumcised through defect of the command. Nor is the *Minor* true, if understood of all the infants of believers, or any of them as their infants, nor is there a word to prove it *Gen.* 17.7. which is onely a promise to *Abrahams* seed, and they of the Gentiles are only true believers or elect persons. But perhaps Mr. *Lyford* mends the matter in the next form, which is this pag. 34.

If infants have a right to the covenant and the initial sign therof, then it is a wrong to deny it to them. But infants have a right to the Covenant and the initial sign thereof, both by Gods original grant, *Gen.* 17. 11. 14. and by Christs confirmation of that Covenant made to their Fathers, *Rom.* 15 8. therefore it is a wrong to deny it them. The Covenant under which we are, is the Gospel Covenant, made long since with us *Englishmen* and our infant-seed, with a command of giving them the sign, which at first was circumcision, and now baptism by the same Divine authority enjoined and commanded to be given without any exception of any within the Covenant.

I answer by denying the *Minor*, and to the proof by denying that *Gen.* 17. 11,14. there is command of any other initial sign than Circumcision, or that circumcision is commanded to all that had a right to the Covenant, or that the Gospel Covenant was made long since with us *Englishmen*, and our seed as our seed, or that there was in that of circumcision any command to us to baptize infants, or that Divine authority hath commanded baptism to be given without any exception of any within the Covenant. But I affirm he hath commanded only to baptize those in the Covenant who are disciples or believers. But Mr. *Lyford* adds further p. 37.

All thoſe to whom the bleſſings and promiſes in the Covenant do belong, t them alſo belongs baptiſm, the ſign thereof (by the doctrine of *St. Peter*, and of *Jeſus Chriſt* himſelf) But to infants of believing parents, the bleſſings and promiſes of the Covenant do belong before actual faith, therefore by the Doctrine of the Holy Ghoſt in Scripture, ſuch infants ought to be baptized before actual faith.

The Major or firſt part of this Argument is the very reaſon of the Text. The Minor propoſition, *viz.* that the bleſſings and promiſes of the Covenant do belong to infants before actual faith is proved by theſe reaſons. 1. By the expreſs words of *Peter*, which ſay, the promiſe is to your children. 2. By the expreſs words of our Saviour, of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven. 3. By example of *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, they were children of the promiſe before actuall faith, and had applied unto them the ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith. 4. Some infants dying are ſaved, they are members of Chriſts Kingdom, therefore the bleſſing of the covenant, *viz.* regeneration and remiſſion of ſins through the blood of Chriſt do alſo belong to them.

To which I anſwer, bleſſings of the covenant are of ſundry ſorts, ſuch as certainly accompanie ſalvation, regeneration, juſtification, adoption, or ſuch as are common to reprobates, as to have teachers, example, and acquaintance with the godly, &c. Both theſe may belong to them in preſent poſſeſſion or aſſurance for the future: when they belong to them in preſent poſſeſſion, it is either diſcernibly or indiſcernibly. Actual faith may be in the exerciſe or habit. Infants of believers are elect or non-elect. It is true all thoſe to whom the bleſſings of the Covenant which accompany ſalvation belong in preſent poſſeſſion diſcernibly, to them alſo belongs baptiſm: but ſo the Minor is falſe, underſtood of all infants of believers: they belong not to all, but only to the elect, nor them certainly in preſent poſſeſſion, much leſs diſcernibly during infancy: or if it be diſcernible, then they have actual faith, and ſo the Minor is not true, that to infants of believing parents the ſaving bleſſings of the covenant do belong in poſſeſſion diſcernibly before actual faith. If it be meant of the bleſſings of the Covenant in future aſſurance only the Major is falſe. Nor is it true that the Major is the very reaſon of the text *Act.* 2.38,39. It is falſe that this is *Peters* reaſoning, therefore does the ſign belong to Peters hearers becauſe the promiſe did firſt belong to them. For the term [γὰρ *for*] does not intera right which they might claim, but imports a motive to duties, and of theſe duties firſt to repentance, and then baptiſm: ſo that if from thence a right be concluded, they muſt conclude as well a right to repentance in the firſt place, and then to baptiſm. Nor is it true that *Acts* 10.47, 48. the Apoſtles diſcourſe is reduced to Mr. *Lyfords* form of argument, or ſaies as he ſaies, They that receive the ſame grace are capable, yea have right to the ſame ſign, but infants are capable of the ſame grace, therefore of right they are to have the ſame ſign, i. e. the Sacrament of baptiſm. For although the Major be granted of actual poſſeſſion of the ſpirit and magnifying God, yet it is not true only of the promiſe thereof. But the Minor [infants are capable of the ſame grace] alters the term, which is in the Major thus [they have received the ſame grace] and ſo Mr. *Lyford* ſyllogiſm hath four terms. Nor doth the Apoſtle ſay, they that are capable of the ſame grace are to be baptized as well as we, but, none can forbid water to baptize them that had received the Holy Ghoſt, and ſo were ma-

ni-

nifestly actual believers as well as themselves, though they were of the Gentiles: which when it appears in infants I should yield they are to be baptized, but not meerly because of the promise or capacity of grace, for the promise agrees to Jews children elect, and capacity of grace to Turks children, and therefore if either or both these did intitle to baptism, the infant-children of such might be baptized. And for his proofs of the Minor, it is false, that to infants of believing parents the blessings and promises of the covenant do belong before actual faith, is proved by the expres words of *Peter*. For though he say, the promise is to your children, yet he doth not say, to you as believers, or to your children in infancy as the children of believers, nor before actual faith, Yea the words [as many as the Lord our God shall call] do require actual faith afore the possession of the blessings of the promise: Nor is this any miserable shift: nor is it true, that those words are quite a new thing clearly relating to another sort of people, than his present hearers, and not to them, for that expression limits all the Subjects, and is put after all joined by copulative particles, and therefore is to be conceived to limit all of them. Nor is the speech true of any of them without that limitation. Nor is it true which Mr. *Lyford* saies, That the words do not exegetically expound to which of his hearers children the promise did belong. For they are a manifest limitation excluding some and including others.

And what he saith, that *Peter* saies [this promise does belong to them that are afar off, and their children, as well as to you and your children] is manifestly false. But of this text I have spoken in the first part of this Review, sect. 5. more fully.

To his second proof, I say it is false, that the expres words of our Saviour (of such is the Kingdome of Heaven) prove his Minor. For [of such] is not all one with [infants of believing parents] nor when it is said [of such is the Kingdome of heaven] is it all one with this [the blessings and promises of the Covenant do belong to them afore actual faith] the Kingdom of heaven is not said to be of them, because their parents were believers, its uncertain whether they were so or no; and if they were, another reason may and ought to be conceived of their interest in the Kingdome of heaven, to wit Christs special and effectual blessing: nor is it said the Kingdom of heaven belongs to them in actual possession; and if it were so meant, and yet they were not appointed to be baptized (as it appears by the Evangelists they were not) it is a good presumption, Christ would not have infants, notwithstanding their interest in the Kingdom of heaven, to be baptized till they became believers by profession, and knew what their engagement is thereby.

To his third, it is true, *Isaac* and *Jacob* were children of the promise before actual faith, yea before they were born, and therefore if the interest in the Covenant had been a sufficient reason of Circumcision, they should have been circumcised afore the eighth day, which because they were not, it is an argument, that not the Covenant, but the Command intitled them to Circumcision.

To the fourth, I never denied, that to some infants the covenant belongs, nor that they are saved, regenerated in infancy, but I deny, that this is true of all infants of believers. For the very instances brought prove the contrary, that though *Isaac* and *Jacob* were children of the promise, yet *Ishmael* and *E-*

ſan begotten by believing parents were not, who yet were to be circumciſed: nor is any a childe of the promiſe becauſe he is the child of a believer, but becauſe he is elect of God.

As for Mr. *Lyfords* anſwer to the Objection in conference with him, it is indeed no anſwer. For he that objects that the bleſſings of the Covenant, belong to elect infants, not to all, and therefore under that pretence all in general are not to be baptized, doth not by that ſpeech grant, that baptiſm belongs to one infant, or to any becauſe elect, but only ſhews the inſufficiency of the adverſaries proof for that practice: As for thoſe who deny baptiſm to all becauſe they are infants, I know not who they be, the reaſon why it is denyed them is not becauſe they are infants, but becauſe in infancy they appear not to be diſciples, or believers in Chriſt, who only by the command are appointed to be baptized; and I agree with Mr. *Lyford*, That the Sacraments do belong to the elect not as elect, but as viſible members and Profeſſors (and that upon this account *Simon Magus* was baptized, though Mr. *Lyford* is miſtaken in ſaying *Peter* baptized *Simon Magus*, which was done by *Philip*) whereby Mr. *Lyford* doth indeed overthrow his diſpute. For if the Sacraments belong to the Elect as viſible Members and Profeſſors, then to all and onely viſible members and Profeſſours. For what belongs to any *quatenus ipſum* as ſuch, belongs to all and onely ſuch univerſally and reciprocally, and ſo if he will ſtand to his own words, though children be in the Covenant or elect, yet till they be viſible members and Profeſſors they are not to be baptized, which doth plainly refute his own Argument, *viz.* the Major of his own ſyllogiſm: nor need we by our reaſon know whether a perſon be elected that we may baptize him, but whether he be a viſible member and Profeſſor.

SECT. XIV.

The Arguments of Mr. Stalham, *Mr.* Brinſley, *Mr.* Hall, *and a nameleſs Author, from the Covenant for infant-baptiſm, are examined.*

MR. *Stalham* in the Conference at *Terling* page 4. argued thus, They who are included in the ſubſtance of the Goſpel covenant are not to be excluded from the ſeal of the Covenant. But infants are included in the ſubſtance of the Goſpel covenant, and therefore not to be excluded from the ſeal of the Goſpel Covenant.

But in this Argument the Concluſion is not of baptiſm in particular, and ſo concludes not what was to be concluded, and ſith circumciſion according to him was a ſeal of the Goſpel covenant, it might be true of it and ſo granted. Yet the Major if univerſal is not true, no not of circumciſion. For women and infant-males afore the eigth day were excluded from the ſeal of the Covenant, though they were included in the ſubſtance of the Goſpel covenant, as his phraſiology is, nor hath he a word in all the conference to prove his Major; and for his Minor, ſetting aſide his phraſifying, if this be his meaning: All the infants of believers, or the infants of believers, in as much as they are their children, have the ſubſtance of the Goſpel-Covenant, that is the pro-

miſe, *Gen.*17.7. as it is a Goſpel promiſe made to them, it is falſe and contrary to *Romans* 9. 7,8. nor is there any thing in the conference there brought that proves it.

Mr. *John Brinſley* of *Pædobapt.* page 11 32. makes this his firſt and grand argument for the baptiſm of infants.

If children of believing parents be within the Covenant, then they may be baptized, But they are within the covenant, *Ergo.*

The Major he takes as granted, though I deny it as being moſt falſe.

The Minor he would prove, 1. From *Act.* 2 39. where he makes the promiſe to be of remiſſion of ſins, but that belongs only to the penitent believer, and therefore proves not that it belongs to the infant of a believer, without repentance and faith.

2. In that they were in the old Teſtament in the Covenant. But he himſelf page 33. ſaith, All infants of believing parents are in the outward viſible covenant. As for the covenant it ſelf, to ſpeak properly and ſtrictly, it depends upon Gods election. Neither doth it belong to any but thoſe who are elected. What juggling then doth he uſe to tell us that they are in covenant, and that the promiſe belongeth to them without any difference of elect and non-elect; and p. 11. he ſaith, To whomſoever the covenant it ſelf belongeth, to them belongeth this ſeal of the Covenant. And ſo his Minor muſt be, but the Covenant it ſelf belongs to infants of believers: and yet to ſay, the covenant it ſelf, doth not belong to any but thoſe who are elected, but the outward viſible covenant to all. But what this outward viſible covenant is, he tells us not. I cannot underſtand any other than Circumciſion, for that was the outward viſible covenant in the old Teſtament, and then his Minor aſſerts infants are in Covenant as they were in covenant in the old Teſtament, that is, they are to be circumciſed. Beſides what interfering is there in Pædobaptiſts? Mr. *Stalham* ſaith, they are included in the ſubſtance of the Goſpel covenant, Mr. *Brinſley* ſaith, the Covenant it ſelf (and then ſurely not the ſubſtance of the Goſpel covenant) belongs not to any but elect, but the outward viſible covenant; that is a new nothing, belongs to them all. And thus people are cheated by theſe Doctors.

3. In that they are federally holy, 1. *Cor.*7.14. but of it enough already in the firſt part of the *Review.* So much for Mr. *Brinſley*, one of Mr. *Halls* Champions.

Let us ſee what Maſter *Thomas Hall* himſelf in his *Font Guarded* page 9. argues;

To whomſoever the covenant it ſelf belongs, to them alſo belongs the ſeal of the Covenant; But the covenant belongs to Believers and their children: *Ergo* the ſeal of the Covenant belongs to them alſo.

Anſw. If Mr. *Hall* mean in the Minor, that the Covenant it ſelf belongs to all the children of believers, then he contradicts Mr. *Brinſley* (out of whom he ſaith in his Epiſtle to him and Mr. *Blake* he gathered his weeds) who ſaith, it belongs only to the Elect, and if he mean it only of the elect, then he can conclude onely concerning the elect; if he mean the outward viſible covenant, than it is either circumciſion, and then he aſſerts circumciſion to belong ſtill to infants; or he means baptiſm, and then his Minor and Concluſion is all one, and his Argument a meer inept tautology, unleſs he mean ſome other

new nothing. And indeed this Argument of Mr. *Hall* is like the reſt concluding of the ſeal of the covenant indefinitely when he ſhould conclude of baptiſm, uſing in the Major and Minor the term [the covenant belongs] but not explaining what covenant, to whom or how it belongs, uſing children for infants, ſo that there is nothing but equivocation in his Speeches.

And for his propoſitions in the ſenſe they are commonly taken, neither Major nor Minor is true, nor is the Major proved though he ſay it is clear. For though he that hath right to a temporal inheritance hath right likewiſe to the ſeals and deeds that do convey that inheritance to him, yet in Law it is not neceſſary that there be a ſealing to each inheritour by himſelf. A man may have a deed ſealed for him to another as a Feoffee in truſt, as is uſual in the Caſe of young Orphans, to one man is conveyed the eſtate of many. So that beſides the frivolouſneſs of this conceit to make the term [ſeal of the Covenant] of the Eſſence of baptiſm, though it be but a metaphor not found in Scripture, and thence, and the uſe in civil Negotiations, to make a rule for the ſervice of God, yet were this kind of proof allowed, the Major is not true, that to whomſoever the covenant it ſelf belongs to them alſo belongs the ſeal of the Covenant, meaning it in their own perſons. For a Feoffee in truſt may have the Eſtates of many conveyed to him, and ſo the parent by this reaſon may be baptized for the child. And for the other reaſon it is alſo inſufficient, *Abrahams* poſterity being in covenant receive the ſign of Circumciſion the ſeal of the Covenant, for the ſeal of the Covenant is as large as the Covenant it ſelf. But neither is it true that the Seal of the Covenant in *Abrahams* poſterity was as large as the Covenant it ſelf, the women being in Covenant and yet not to be ſealed in their own perſons: nor if it were true doth it prove the Propoſition. For if it were ſo by vertue of a particular command, then it follows not that if it were ſo then it muſt be ſo now without the like command. Nor is the Minor proved from Gen. 17.7,10,11. *Acts* 2. 38,39. For in the one is affirmed only that God will be a God to *Abraham* and his ſeed, which is not all one with every believer and his ſeed; in the other, whatever the promiſe be and howſoever *Peter* meant it was to them and their children, yet it is not ſaid to you believers, and to your children as the children of believers, for then he had ſpoken falſe they being not then believers, and therefore it proves not that the covenant belongs to Believers and their children. This is enough to ſhew the vanity of Mr. *Halls* diſputing. For the reſt of his Book, he being a gatherer out of others, as he ſaith, and in moſt things he ſhould argue, referring us as an Index to their writings, I think it beſt to rid my hands of him, and to deal with his Authors he points to.

There were ſent to me by ſome friends theſe two following Arguments in manuſcript, as judged by ſome unanſwerable.

The firſt thus. What privilege the proſelyted Gentiles had who joined themſelves to *Abrahams* Family in reference to their infant ſeed in the Ordinance of Circumciſion, the like privilege the Chriſtian Gentiles in the New Teſtament have in reference to their infant-ſeed in the Ordinance of baptiſm. But the Proſelyted Gentiles had this privilege, that when they were circumciſed their children were circumciſed in their infancy. *Ergo* the Chriſtian Gentiles have the ſame privilege that their children ſhould be baptized in their infancy.

To which I anſwer, letting paſs the exception to the quaternity of terms,

and

and conceiving [what privilege] is put for [whatsoever privilege universally] without which the argument would be all of particulars, and so the Syllogism naught; I deny the Major, and my reason is, because were it a privilege or not, what was done in the use of circumcision by vertue of an expreis command, is not to be done in the use of baptism, without the like command. If it were, the Apostles did ill in not baptizing a whole Nation old and young together, and we do ill in keeping away the young ones of believers baptized from the Lords supper, when being circumcised they were not debarred from the Passover. The other argument is in these words.

To whom the outward visible covenant of God manifestly belongs, to them in the daies of the Gospel, the initiating ordinance, *viz.* baptism belongs: But unto the infant-seed of believers the external visible Covenant of God doth manifestly belong. *Ergo* to the infant-seed of believers in the daies of the Gospel the initiating Ordinance, *viz.* baptism belongs.

To which I answer, what outward visible covenant he means, except baptism, I know not. If he speak as Mr. *M.* speaks, and some others, I have shewed in my *Apology* sect. 10. that by it is meant the outward administration of the Covenant, which is no other now but baptism. Now if this be the meaning of the Author, the Major contains a trifling tautology, in effect this, They that are to be baptized, are to be baptized, and the Minor and Conclusion being all one, the Minor is to be denied, and the argument hissed out of Schools as a ridiculous foppery.

SECT. XV.

The dispute of Mr. John Geree *about the extent of the Gospel covenant to prove thence infant-baptism, is examined, and it is shewed, that interest in the Covenant did not intitle to circumcision, nor is it proved it doth now to Baptism.*

But Mr. *John Geree Vindic. Pædobap.* p. 6. would seem to dispute more accurately and after a syllogism which doth but repeat the conclusion in a new phrase, he disputes thus.

To whom the Gospel covenant is extended in the Churches of Christians to them the Sacrament of initiation appointed for that administration of the Covenant doth belong. To children of believing Christians, the Gospel covenant is extended in the Christian Churches, *Ergo*, to them the Sacrament of initiation doth belong.

To which I answer, Mr. *Geree* in this syllogism hath altered the term in his prosyllogism, it was in that [the sacrament of initiation instituted for Christian Churches] here it is [the Sacrament of initiation appointed for that administration of the Covenant] and wherein he supposeth; 1. The sacrament appointed for that administration of the Covenant. 2. The Sacrament of initiation appointed for the administration of the Covenant all one with the Sacrament of initiation instituted for the Christian Churches, and from thence would derive a rule for baptism. But that being a phrase not used in

Scripture,

Scripture, nor perhaps deducible from it, and at beſt ambiguous, it ſerves for no proof, and therefore ſerves only to miſlead thoſe underſtandings which are apt to be caught with ſuch chaff.

That the phraſe is not uſed in Scripture, will not I ſuppoſe be denied, no where is baptiſm called either a Sacrament or a Sacrament of initiation, or ſaid to be appointed for that adminiſtration of the Covenant, nor is it deducible from thence. For there is no place that I find, that makes this the proper and immediate uſe of baptiſm to be the adminiſtration of the Covenant, ſo that whereby either the making of the Covenant, or the conferring or aſſuring to the baptized the benefits of the covenant ſhould be the next end of it ſelf intended therein. The immediate and proper uſe of it is to be a ſign that the perſon baptized repents of his ſins, and renounceth ſpecially his Gentile defilements, communion with Satan, and engageth himſelf to be Chriſts diſciple; Yet I deny not but that by conſequent in the manner of doing it by dipping or plunging under water, it minds us of Chriſts death, burial and riſing again, and teſtifyeth our ſalvation by him, and ſo in a remote manner aſſures to us the benefits of the Covenant of grace. But in this manner it is the adminiſtration of election as well as the Covenant, and is an adminiſtration of the Covenant only to elect perſons, and true believers, for it aſſures ſalvation onely to them, not to all that are baptized, and therefore in this reſpect none but they can have title to it. So that if from hence, that baptiſm is the adminiſtration of the Covenant, a title be derived for infants to be baptized, it can intitle none but thoſe to whom it adminiſters the Covenant, which are only the elect or true believers. But the ambiguity of the expreſſion is much more fallacious. For 1. when it is ſaid, it is appointed for the adminiſtration of the Covenant, the expreſſions ſometimes are, as if it were the adminiſtration it ſelf, calling it the new adminiſtration, as I ſhew in my *Apology*, ſect. 10. Mr. *Gerce* here p. 10. baptiſm is a ſeal of a new adminiſtration, and then it is all one as to ſay the adminiſtration of the Covenant is appointed for the adminiſtration of the Covenant, which is either non-ſenſe, or at leaſt inepely ſpoken. 2. When they ſay [it is the adminiſtration of the Covenant] do they mean the outward or inward Covenant? The latter I preſume they will not ſay, for then baptiſm ſhould be an adminiſtration of the things promiſed therein, regeneration, remiſſion of ſins, and if ſo, then it adminiſters them in a natural way, and ſo it ſhould in manner of a natural agent regenerate, &c. which is to confer grace *ex opere operato*, or in a moral way; but baptiſm can adminiſter regeneration, remiſſion of ſins, &c. no other moral way but by aſſuring, or perſwading, or the like, what ever way it be conceived it adminiſters not the covenant to an infant in infancy, nor to any but the elect: now if it do not adminiſter the covenant to any but ſuch, then it is not baptiſm but to ſuch, if baptiſm be in its nature the adminiſtration of the Covenant of Grace. If they mean baptiſm is the adminiſtration of the outward covenant, I am yet to learn what the outward covenant is, except they mean the outward adminiſtration, which is no other then baptiſm, as I ſhew *Apology* ſ. 10. and what is this then but to ſay, that baptiſm is the adminiſtration, or appointed for the adminiſtration of baptiſm?

3. When they ſay, it is the adminiſtration of the Covenant, do they mean the Covenant or promiſe of the baptized to God, or Gods promiſe to the bap-

tized?

tized? If the former, then it is no more but this, that baptism is the administration, that is the signification of the baptized his engagement to be Christs disciple, which is indeed the best sense of it, but then it will not fit them, for so it is not in infants, for they signifie no profession or engagement of theirs by it. If the later, then by baptism God doth promise mans but thats not true, his promise is in the Word before baptism, or he signifies his promise formerly made, & this can derive no title to the persons to whom the promise is made, for the signifying that promise as past is as useful for others, either baptized or unbaptized, as the then baptized, and not at all of use or avail to infants, who cannot apprehend the signification; or he assures the benefits of the Covenant, and that can be only to elect or true believers; or that he contains them by it, and so it gives grace, *ex opere operato*.

4. The Covenant of grace is, I take it the Covenant of saving grace, opposite to the Covenant of works, the promise of justification by faith in contradistinction to the Law, *Gal* 3. 18. This covenant was made mixtly, *Gen.* 17. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. purely *Heb.*8.10,11,12. They should tell us whether they mean the one, or the other, or both. The former they seem to mean when they make baptism to succeed Circumcision, and to seal the same Covenant that it did. But then baptism should not be the new administration but belong to the old. And if it seal that Covenant then it assures the Land of *Canaan*, and greatness in it. But it seems they mean that it seals only the promise, I will be thy God and the God of thy seed, so Mr. *Geree* here, we find in the administration of the Gospel covenant to *Abraham* and his seed.

But if so, 1. Then it seals only a part of the Covenant that circumcision did, and so succeeds not in it's use, nor is there a reason given, but their own conceit, why it should seal one part, and not another.

2. If it seal or administer the Gospel-covenant, then it administers not this promise [that God will be a God to a believer, and his natural seed as such] For that is neither Gospel nor at all to be found, *Gen.*17.7.

3. In that promise was foretold Christ to come of *Abraham*, and this was Gospel *Gal.*3.16. But this is not administred by baptism, which signifies Christ already come.

4. In the spiritual sense it was made to *Abrahams* seed by faith, *Gal.* 3. 29. *Rom.*4.11,12. But they are only the elect; *Rom.*9.7,8. and then it is an administration of that Gospel covenant onely to elect persons, and true Believers.

5. There's ambiguity also in the term [the Gospel covenant is extended] The Gospel covenant is, The just shall live by faith, that God will be a God to *Abrahams* seed by faith. But Mr. *Geree* imagines a Gospel covenant, which is but a fiction, that God hath promised to be a God to the natural posterity of every believing Gentile.

6. For the extent of it how it is extended is ambiguous. For he cannot say it is extended in respect of the Gospel promise of righteousness and life to all the children of believers, it was not extended *Ishmael* to and *Esau*. Therefore he acknowledgeth it to be extended in the reality of it onely to the Elect, onely it is to be charitably presumed that they are elect, and therefore they are to be taken for persons in covenant till they discover the contrary. But he shews no rule of Scripture for such a Construction of the promise: sure such a construction

ction was unknown to *Paul*, *Rom.*9.6,7,8. when he expounded that very promise, *Gen.*17.7. nor doth such a construction agree with the words, sith when God saith, I will be a God to thee and thy seed, the meaning according to Mr. *Geree* should then be [I will be a God to thee, that is, every believer, and to thy seed, that is every believers natural seed which are elect in reality, and to those that are not elect in charitable presumption of the Minister of baptism, till comming to years they discover the contrary] now what a non-sence exposition is this, to expound [thee] meant of *Abraham* by [every believing Gentile] and by [thy seed] which is meant of *Abrahams* seed onely either natural or spiritual by faith to understand [every believers natural seed] and when it is said, God will be a God to them, that he will be a God only to some in reality, which is to make God to promise what he doth not perform, and to others, that men shall think he will be a God to them, which would be too poor a matter to be meant in that expression, and therein God should not promise what he will be or do, but what men shall think, which would be false, for it is not made good, or that they may charitably so presume of them, but in this sense it is not a promise at all, but a meer permission to men to think charitably of them, which I suppose they are as well bound to do of unbelievers children till they discover the contrary, and so no privilege to the believers children. And yet this too must be limitted to a certain time till they come to years and discover the contrary, and therefore by seed must be understood onely the infant-seed, when they came to years, there's neither promise nor permission for men to think so charitably of them. And yet herein there is nothing but abuse of terms. For charitable presumption must have some ground, which is to be from some thing we perceive done to judge well of what we see not according to the rule 1 *Cor.*13.7. Charity believeth all things, but in infants acts there's nothing that may be such a ground, but to the contrary they opposing their baptism by their crying, &c. If it be said, the promise is a ground, I answer, Mr. *Geree* confesseth the promise is not in reality but to the elect, nor to the elect till they believe, and therefore there is no ground from the promise till it be known the persons be elect or believers. But it will be said, we know nothing to the contrary. To which I reply, nor do we know any thing to the contrary, but that unbelieving Jews children are elect, and in the Covenant, and yet its not charitably presumed of them, so as to count them in the Covenant, and to judge them admissible to baptism. I think sith we perceive nothing of believers infants acts that may distinguish them from unbelievers, that we should rather suspend our thoughts of Gods election and covenant to them till they shew of what spirit they are, which is meet for an administrator of baptism, who as a wise Steward should give to every one his portion in due season, *Luke* 12.42. rather then have such a fond imagination of what God hath concealed.

And if it be true which Mr. *Geree* saith in his *Vindic. Vindic.* p. 42. That many of the Assembly intended the words in the Directory for baptism [The promise is made to believers and their seed] in Master *Gerees* sense, they have reason to be ashamed that they have so much abused the World with such a toy.

Yea but have they not a promise on which to ground this charitable presumption? I answer, surely the Jews have a more expres promise, *Rom.*11.26,27. for their po-

posterity then any believer now living hath for his children, and therefore if that be all the ground of baptizing believers infants, there's a like ground for baptizing Jews infants though parents be unbelieving, and they have wrong that it is not done, where it may.

But shall we make no difference between the children of believers and unbelievers? I answer, we are to conceive with a judgement of probability for the present that they are elect, and with a quieting hope for the future that they will be believers.

1. Because of Gods general indefinite promises.

2. Because by reason of the means of the knowledge of the Gospel which they have in their education, and living where the Gospel is taught, they are in a nearer possibility then others to be believers.

3. Because experience shews that God often doth continue godliness in religious families, though it often fall out otherwise. But that such an extension of the Gospel-covenant as Mr. *Geree* makes to the children of believing Christians, should entitle to baptism, is without all rule. And to his Syllogism, though it might be denied in respect of the form, by reason of the ambiguity of terms; yet I answer, by denying the Major in his sense, which I conceive is this, They to whom the Gospel Covenant is extended according to the charitable presumption of the Minister without the persons shewing by any act that he is in Covenant, to them the Sacrament of initiation to wit baptism doth belong, and shall examine his proof both of Major and Minor.

The Major, saith he, I prove by that of *Peter Acts* 10.47. when they had received the Holy Ghost, which was but an evidence of Gods receiving them into the Gospel covenant, *Peter* saith, can any forbid water that these should not be baptized, who are in covenant with God as well as we? They have the word or promise, which is the greater; who can inhibite the sign which is the less?

To this I answer, the proof rests on this, That the allegation of *Peter* that they had received the Holy Ghost, was brought for an evidence that God had received them into the Gospel Covenant, and so it may be said to the same purpose, who can forbid water that these should not be baptized who are in covenant with God as well as we?

But this is false. For their receiving the Holy Ghost is brought not to prove only that God had made his covenant of grace to them, but to prove that they were actual believers, as their works did shew upon hearing the word of faith, for saith he v.46. they heard them speak with tongues and magnify God, & ch. 11.17. if God hath given them the like gift as unto us that believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I that I could forbid God? And v.18. it is said, when they heard these things they held their peace and glorifyed God, saying, then hath God also granted to the Gentiles repentance unto life.

Whence it appears that they were penitent believers, and this is proved by their acts; and therefore to be admitted to baptism, and not barely because the Gospel covenant was extended to them, much less because the Gospel covenant was extended to some of that sort, and to those particular persons onely upon a charitable presumption, that Gods promise did belong to them for the future without any shew of repentance or faith at the present. It is false that we may say, that when by any other principle in Scripture any are demonstrated to be

in the Gospel covenant, who can forbid water that these should not be baptized, who are in covenant with God as well as we? For though God should reveal that this or that person were elect, and that his Covenant did belong to him for the future, yet he were not to be baptized, till God revealed that he were a believer or disciple. For if so, than if God did reveal concerning any, as he did of *Isaac* and *Jacob*, that he were a child of the promise, though yet unborn in the Mothers womb, he were to be baptized, which is absurd. None are to be baptized afore born, therefore any principle whatsoever in Scripture demonstrating a person to be in the Gospel covenant is not sufficient to intitle to baptism, much less such an uncertain doubtful guess, called charitable presumption, that he is in the Covenant, as is without any particular declaration of Scripture, or other revelation from God concerning the person, or any shew of his that he is Gods child, which yet Mr *Geree* makes a sufficient warrant to baptize, nor is his reason of any force, for we might in like manner say, They have the election of God, which is the greater, who can inhibit the sign which is the less? It is not whether that which they have is greater, much less that which is conjectured, or hoped they have, which is the rule to baptize, but the manifest having of that qualification of faith or discipleship, which is prerequired to baptism according to the institution and primitive practice of it. But Mr. *Geree* hath more to prove his Major.

Besides, saith he, we find in the administration of the Gospel covenant to *Abraham* and his seed, whom God had thereby separated then to be his church, and evidenced it by an outward seal: there was so near a relation between the Covenant and Circumcision the Sacrament of initiation, whereby men were externally separated from the world, that circumcision was called the covenant, and the token of the Covenant, *Gen.*17. 10,11. to shew us how the seal did follow the Covenant; and therefore when any were aggregated into the Jewish Church and taken into the Communion of the Covenant made with *Abraham*, they were initiated into that administration of the Covenant by the Sacrament of Circumcision.

To which I answer, letting pass his Phraseology, this reason goes upon these suppositions.

1. That by Circumcision God had administred his Covenant to *Abraham* and his seed, and separated them to be his Church, and evidenced it by Circumcision, and that the seal did follow the Covenant, when any were taken into Covenant they were circumcised, and therefore it must be so in baptism. But if he mean that to as many as God appointed to be circumcised he administred the covenant of grace (which sense alone serves his turn) it is not true. *Ishmael* was circumcised, yet the Covenant not administred to him, nor he separated to be of his Church, nor this evidenced by an outward seal, but the contrary declared concerning him afore his Circumcision, *Gen.*17. 18, 19, 20, 21. and he in the event cast out, and so the seal did not follow to the Covenant, but that it was imparted to them to whom the Covenant was not made, and not imparted to them to whom it did belong, as *e.g.* to the females, nor were the Proselytes all taken into Communion of the Covenant made with *Abraham*, though they were taken into the Communion of the policy of *Israel*: nor do the calling circumcision the covenant or a token of the Covenant (which are all one) *Gen.*17.10,11. prove that all that were circumcised had

the Covenant made to them: but this that Circumcision was a memorial that such a covenant was made with *Abraham*, and God would perform it. 2. That it must be in baptism as it was in circumcision. But for proof of that there's not a word brought by Mr. *G.* and what others bring is examined in its place. M. *G.* goes on thus.

Now for your exceptions against the connexion which we put between the Gospel-covenant, and the Sacrament of initiation annext to it, in any administration they will clearly be wiped away; for what though (as you say) the Covenant made with *Abraham* were not a pure Gospel covenant, but had some external additaments? yet a Gospel covenant it was, and for substance the same with ours *Gal.* 3. 8. The Gospel was preached before to *Abraham*; and as circumcision was the seal of initiation under that administration; so is baptism under the Christian administration; neither is the Gospel covenant now so pure as to exclude all temporal promises. For godliness even under the Gospel, hath the promises of this life, and that which is to come, 1 *Tim.* 4. 8.

Answ. The distinction of a pure and a mixt covenant was brought in by me to shew that Pædobaptists do but mislead people when in their writings and sermons they express themselves as if they would have men conceive that the Covenant with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. is all one with the Covenant of grace, and so that there is the same reason of baptizing infants because of the Gospel covenant, as there was of circumcising infants, because of the Covenant made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. Now how doth Mr. *Geree* wipe this away? He tells his Reader, That I say, the covenant made with *Abraham* was not a pure Gospel Covenant, but had some external additaments. But neither do I so speak in my *Exercit.* pag. 2. nor *Exam.* part. 3. s. 2. nor any where else I know. I say the promises were mixt *Exercit.* pag. 2. *Exam.* part. 3. s. 2. now promises are not external additaments to the covenant, but integral parts, the covenant being nothing but a promise, or an aggregate of promises: yea I prove that the peculiar promise to *Abrahams* natural posterity inheriting of the Land of *Canaan*, &c. is frequently called by the name of the Covenant, *Psal.* 105. 8, 9, 10, 11. *Nehem.* 9. 8, &c. And for what he saith, That the covenant made with *Abraham* was a Gospel covenant; this is true according to the more infolded and hidden sense of the spirit, but not according to the outward face and obvious construction of the words, which in the first meaning spake of things proper to *Abrahams* natural posterity, though the Holy Ghost had a further aim in those expressions.

And whereas, he saith, The covenant made with *Abraham* was for substance the same with ours, *Gal.* 3. 8. Though that promise mentioned *Gal.* 3. 8. be no in the Covenant *Gen.* 17. to which Circumcision was annexed, but that *Gen.* 12. 3. and the term [substance] be ambiguous, yet I grant the Covenant made with *Abraham* according to those Gospel promises, which in the hidden meaning declared justification by faith, as the new covenant sealed with Christs blood doth, is the same in substance, meaning by it, the intent, purport and meaning of the Holy Ghost, though not in words or expressions; yet I deny that it was every way or in every respect in substance the same. For the promise, according to that sense in which they contain domestique or civil promises proper to *Abrahams* natural posterity were of the substance of the covenant,

and for the confirming of them, circumcision was instituted of God, as well as for them in priority of order before the assuring of those Evangelical benefits. And for what Mr. *Geree* saith, That the Gospel is not so pure now as to exclude all temporal promises, it is true; yet the Gospel doth not promise as the Covenant *Gen.*17. the inheritance of the land of *Canaan* with rest, plenty, prosperity and greatness therein, but on the contrary such temporal blessings as are with persecution *Mark* 10.30. and do rather consist in inward comfort and content than in outward enjoyment of any earthly commodity: which proves that the Gospel promise for temporal things is clean different from that made to *Abraham Gen.* 17. concerning temporal benefits to his posterity.

Mr. *Geree* addes. Neither are the differences mentioned by you (page 4. of your *Exercit.* or elsewhere) to be between Circumcision and baptism any whit material to put a difference between the parties to be sealed by them in reference to our present controversy; sith notwithstanding these differences they agree in this main general; That the one was the Sacrament of initiation to all that were to be sealed under one administration of the covenant, the other in the other, which is enough to my purpose.

To which I say, the disparities between circumcision and baptism, are brought by me to invalidate the argument made by Pædobaptists to prove the succession of the one, into the place, room and use of the other, from the parities between them, which allegation to that end is made good before against Mr. *Church*, sect. 11. Those differences which I allege *Exercit.* p.4. tend to demonstrate that there is not the same reason of circumcision and baptism in signing the Evangelical covenant, nor may there be an argument drawn from the administration of the one to the like administring of the other: which differences are very material, to that end the different end and use of a thing, being the most apt reason for altering the application of it, As Mr. *Rutherford*, *Divine right of Church Government*, ch 6.q.2. page 276, 277, 278. answering *Erastus*, saith of the Sea, Cloud, Mannah, Water, because they had a mixt use, they were appointed to all, yet it follows not now the Sacrament of the Lords Supper must be given to wicked men. So by the very same reason, sith circumcision had a mixt use to signify political as well as Evangelical promises, to confirm the promise of Christ to come, and did belong to the Church, not œcumenical, but œconomical or national, which baptism did not, therefore circumcision might belong to infants, and yet not baptism. And letting pass his phrase of administration of the Covenant, of which is enough said before, though the agreement, which he calls, The main general, be yielded him; that they are both sacraments of initiation, yet unless the same special rule of command, or example primitive be brought for the one as the other, infant-baptism cannot be proved from infant-circumcision.

Mr. *Geree* further tells me. But you add further p.4. of your *Exercit.* that some were circumcised to whom no promise in the Covenant made with *Abraham* did belong; as *Ishmael*, of whom God had said his Covenant was not to be established with him. I answer, it is said indeed *Gen.*17. 21. my Covenant will I establish with *Isaac*. But by covenant there is not meant that covenant, which we stand in to God, in regard of our persons, for our own personal benefit: but the covenant of special prerogative, that Christ should come of, and the Church should remain in his posterity. Therefore notwithstanding

ſtanding that exception, *Iſhmael* when circumciſed, might be, and was a member of the viſible Church in *Abrahams* family, and in regard of his perſon within the external adminiſtration of the Covenant with *Abraham*, and ſo in the judgement of charity no alien from the covenant of grace, but under it. This I might confirm by the opinion of ſome *Hebrew* Doctors, wherein they are followed by many, that the petition of *Abraham* for *Iſhmael Gen.*17.18. was not onely for natural, but for ſpititual bleſſings, and what he begged God granted, v.20. But I clear it thus; God eſtabliſht his Covenant with *Abraham* and *Iſaac*, not with *Melchiſedeck* nor *Lot*; ſhall we therefore expunge them out of the Covenant of grace? how abſurd were that? we only ſee their poſterity enjoied not that privilege which God vouchſafed *Abraham* in *Iſaac* and his ſeed. And therefore no more can be truly or rationally gathered from that place of *Geneſi* touching *Iſhmael*.

Anſw. That which in my *Exercit.*page 4. I gathered from the inſtances of *Iſhmael*, *Eſau*, the ſtrangers and others of *Abrahams* houſe their circumciſion, and the non-circumciſion of females, males under eight daies old, *Melchiſedeck*, *Lot*, *Job*, the non-admiſſion to baptiſm of circumciſed Jews in covenant till they profeſſed repentance and faith in Chriſt were.

That the right to *Evangelical* promiſes, was not the adequate reaſon of circumciſing theſe or thoſe, but Gods precept, as is expreſt *Gen.* 17.23. *Gen.* 21.4.

2. That thoſe terms are not convertible [federate and to be ſigned] which overthrows the chief *Hypotheſes*, upon which the Pædobaptiſts argument from infant-circumciſion for infant-baptiſm reſts. For they all conclude thus, The reaſon why infants were circumciſed, was that they were in covenant, therefore by like reaſon infants being in covenant ſhould be baptized. Now if the reaſon of infants being circumciſed, were not their being in covenant, but only the command, then there is not a like reaſon for infant-baptiſm, though they were in the Covenant, unleſs there were the like command. Now let us ſee what Mr. *Geree* ſaith to my firſt inſtance of *Iſhmael*. I alleged that *Iſhmael* was circumciſed, though no promiſe in the Covenant made with *Abraham*, did belong to him, and that *Abraham* knew, therefore the reaſon of his circumciſion (and the ſame is the reaſon of others) was not his being in covenant, but only Gods command to *Abraham*.

The antecedent is proved from the words *Gen.* 17.21. which are excluſive. And beſides I alleged *Rom.*9. 6, 7, 8, 9. *Gal.*4.29,30. where expreſly *Iſhmael* is denied to be a child of the promiſe, or to be born after the promiſe. And I might have added *Heb.*11.9. where *Iſaac* and *Jacob* are diſtinguiſhingly reckoned as heirs of the ſame promiſe with *Abraham*, not *Iſhmael* and *Eſau*. Now what ſaith Mr. *Geree* to this? He ſaith, The Covenant there is not meant that Covenant which we ſtand in to God in regard of our perſons for our own perſonal benefit: but the Covenant of ſpecial prerogative to *Iſaac*, that Chriſt ſhould come of, and the Church ſhould remain in his poſterity.

But this is falſe, 1. For it was that covenant that made *Iſaac* heir of the promiſe, which the Apoſtle *Rom.*9. 7, 8, 9. reckons as much as to be an elect perſon, it was the ſame covenant which was mentioned v. 2,4,5,6,7,8. which Mr. *Geree*, and other Pædobaptiſts call the covenant of grace, and uſually make the intereſt in it the reaſon of circumciſion, and was ſealed by it, and

that

That it was the same Covenant is apparent from v.19. now then it was a covenant of personal benefit, if it derive grace to the person, or any other personal benefit. If it were only the Covenant containing the special prerogative mentioned, then it was not the covenant sealed to any but *Isaac*, not to any of the rest of *Abrahams* house that were circumcised.

2. It is insufficient. For it shews not that to *Ishmael* any promise, either *Evangelical* or Political in the Covenant made with *Abraham*, did belong, though he were circumcised, which he should have done, if he would have answered to the objection, and have vindicated his argument from it: As for his inference, Therefore notwithstanding that exception, *Ishmael* when circumcised might be, and was a member of the visible Church in *Abrahams* family and in regard of his person, within the external administration of the Covenant with *Abraham*, and so in the judgement of charity no alien from the covenant of grace, but under it.

I answer. I know not what it is to be under the external administration of the Covenant with *Abraham*, except it be to be circumcised; and therefore I count this speech, that *Ishmael* when circumcised might be within the external administration of the Covenant with *Abraham*, to be an inept tautology, as if he had said, *Ishmael* when circumcised might be circumcised. But were his speaking right, yet it is impertinent. For the thing he should have shewed was not, that *Ishmael* notwithstanding that exception was a visible Church-member, within the external administration of the Covenant with *Abraham*, or in the judgemeut of charity no alien from the covenant of grace, but that any of the promises in the Covenant made with *Abraham Gen.* 17. did belong to him, and so that he was circumcised because of his interest in the covenant. Yet how *Abraham* could in judgement of charity judge him no alien from the Covenant of grace, but under it, whom God so plainly excepted out of that Covenant, which Pædobaptists themselves take to be the Covenant of grace, I see not. It is true that God heard the petition of *Abraham* for *Ishmael Gen.* 17.18. but that God granted him spiritual blessings doth not appear, but the contrary v.20. where the blessings granted upon *Abrahams* Petition for him are recited. However it is clear that he did exempt him from the covenant v. 21. and therefore he was not circumcised by vertue of his interest in the Covenant, nor did his circumcision seal that interest. As for what Mr. *Geree* saith, no more can be truly gathered from thence then what may be said of *Melchisedec*, or *Let*, it is not true. For though its not said expressly that God established his covenant with them, yet they are reckoned among the righteous; and so in the Covenant of grace. But for *Ishmael* when *Abraham* begged for him, God answers how far he would grant for him, and then addes adversatively. But my covenant will I establish with *Isaac*, that is not with *Ishmael*, which can be no other then the covenant before mentioned, v.2,4,5,6,7,8. which thing was further manifested by Gods ratifying *Sarahs* desire of *Ishmaels* election *Gen.* 21. 10,12. where he is excluded from *Abrahams* seed, from which the Apostle argueth *Ishmael* not to have been a child of the promise, nor elect, nor born after the Spirit; but reprobate, a persecutor, born after the flesh. And therefore in my *Exercit.* I cited those texts, which Mr. *Geree* did ill to omit, sith they served for my purpose to prove that

See *Ainsworth* Annotations on *Gen.* 21. 12.

Ishmael

Ishmael had no part in the Covenant made with *Abraham*.

To the instance of *Esau*, Mr. *Geree* tels me, The case of *Esau* was but as that of *Ishmael*, and others that were of *Israel*, but were not *Israel*: they were under the external administration of the Covenant, though not really within the covenant of grace. This distinction you your self acknowledge in the fourscore and sixteenth page of your answer, when you say, it is one thing to be under the outward administration, another thing to be under the covenant of grace. Its true these are distinct, but those that are under the outward administration are to be reputed under the covenant of Grace, and thence were to be sealed; thus was it with *Esau*; for that sentence, the elder shall serve the younger, *Gen.*25.23. could sound no higher in *Isaac's* apprehension then that difference which was put between *Ishmael* and *Isaac*.

To which I reply, If *Ishmael* were not really within the covenant of grace then Mr. *Geree* yields what I proved before, that the promise of the Covenant of grace did not belong to him; and if it were so, then *Ishmael* and *Esau* were circumcised, though no promise in the covenant *Gen.*17. 2,4, 5, 6, 7,8. did belong to them, and because this was revealed to *Abraham* and *Isaac* they were not reputed under the covenant of grace and thence to be sealed as Mr. *Geree* saith. Nor is it likely but *Isaac* did apprehend concerning *Esau* by the Oracle *Gen.*25.23. that none of the promises in the covenant made with *Abraham*, *Gen.*17.2,4,5,6,7,8. did belong to him. However God appointing circumcision to these to whom he intended no interest in the covenant it follows, he made not interest in the covenant the adequate reason of each persons circumcision, but his own institution.

To the instance of strangers in *Abrahams* family, he answers; By Gods own testimony *Abraham* would keep none in his family, but such as were outwardly conformable to the waies of God, *Gen.*18.19. and so were in the state of Proselytes and interessed in the Gospel covenant.

Answ. Whether Abraham did or might keep any infidel in his family was considered by me in the first part of this Review, f. 37. But for the text, Gen. 18.19. it doth not testify, that Abraham would keep none in his family, but such as were outwardly conformable to Gods waies, but that he would command them to keep Gods waies, and shall keep the way of Jehovah; but this being spoken indefinitely is equipollent onely to a particular, as appears in Ishmael and Esau and others. But were this granted they were so conformable and were so proselytes and were in some sort interessed in the benefit of the Gospel covenant, yet it follows not that anypromise in that covenant did belong to them, much less that such interest was the reason of their being circumcised. As for Mr. Gs. useful observation, that circumcision was not annext to the Covenant only because it was a mixt covenant, sith it was appliable to the Proselyte Gentiles, and their seed, that were not onely without, but uncapable of interest in the land of Canaan; I know not what use there is of it for his purpose; it goes upon a mistake that circumcision was to be to none, but who had interest in the covenant Gen.17. which I have refuted. The Gentile proselytes were to be circumcised because of the command, though it were not known that each, or any proselyte, or his seed, had interest in the Covenant. As for Mr. Gs. reason of his obsevation, it should seem by it he meant otherwise than he expressed, to wit, Circumcision was not annext to the Covenant

only

only becauſe of the tempotal promiſes, which I grant, and yet hold the Covenant, Gen. 17. 4,5,6,7,8. a mixt Covenant, and that perſons were to be circumciſed to whom no promiſe in the covenant made with Abraham did belong.

Mr. G. goes on. To the other part of my exception againſt the connexion between the ſeal and covenant, as they ſpeak, that many were not to be circumciſed, to whom all or moſt of the promiſes of the Covenant did belong, as the females comming from Abraham, he ſaith.

For females we anſwer, That God under that adminiſtration was pleaſed (in reference to ſome things pointed at by the ſeal) to appoint a ſign of which women were not capable; ſo were they particulatly excluded from being ſealed with the Sacrament of initiation under that adminiſtration.

To which I reply, 1. That women are not capable of circumciſion is contradicted by thoſe that ſay, that at this day in ſome parts of the world women are circumciſed. *Æthiopes Chriſtiani mares octavo ab ortu die circumcidunt, & feminis etiam aliquid amputatur, ut* Abrahami *et aliorum ſanctorum patrum exemplo ardentius in ſimilis ſanctitatis ſtudium incitentur. Quarto deinde a circumciſione die mares, octavo autem fœminæ ſalutaribus aquis expiantur, & Euchariſtiam eo die infantes initiati in mica panis aſſumunt.* Oſorius *lib. 9. rerum ab Emmanuele geſt. Zuinger. theat. vit.* Hum. *vol. 27. l 3. tit. bapt. pag.* 4172. Oſiander Epit. Hiſt. Eccl. Cent. 12. *l. 4. c. 4. Anno Chriſti* 1187. Jacobitæ *baptiſmo & circumciſione utuntur circumcidentes maſculos & femellas.* Hornbeck. Append. ad diſp. de bap. ve. theſ. 8. *Solebant* Æthiopes *cum baptiſmo etiam circumcidere baptizatum, mas an femina eſſet circumcidebatur.* Doctor Field of the Church 3. book chap. 1. Speaking of the *Jacobites* in *Syria*, *Sixtly, they uſe circumciſion even of both Sexes*, and of the *Habaſſines*, *They are alſo circumciſed both male and female.*

The ſame hath *Heylin* in his Geography, deſcribing *Syria* and *Ethiopia*, and before him (if my memory deceive me not) *Brerewood* in his *Enquiry of Religions.*

So that it is but a jeſt of Mr. *Blake*, that women could no more be circumciſed than barb'd, if theſe authors be of any credit. But were it true that women were not circumciſed becauſe uncapable, yet would God doubtleſs have appointed ſuch a ſign as they were capable of, if it were true that all that were in covenant muſt be ſigned. But if it be true which Mr. G. confeſſeth, That the females, though in covenant were particularly excluded from being ſealed with the ſacrament of initiation under that adminiſtration, then the connexion between the ſeal initial and the covenant, is not proved from circumciſion. And as for that he ſaies, That in reference to ſome things pointed at by the ſeal, God under that adminiſtration was pleaſed to appoint a ſign of which women were not capable; it is a plain conſeſſion, that God appointed circumciſion for an end not common to believers at all times, or to ſuch as were in the covenant of grace, but proper to the poſterity of Abraham; and therefore though the covenant were granted to be the reaſon of circumciſion, yet it follows not all muſt be baptized barely from the covenant of grace, becauſe they were circumciſed by reaſon of intereſt in it, ſith this was not true, and as Mr. *Geree* confeſſeth, Circumciſion was appointed in reference to ſome things proper to that time.

But

But he hopes to salve the matter thus; So, actually they were not circumcised, yet were they reputed as circumcised, as appears both by the place alleged by Mr. *M. Exod.* 12. 48. and where the house of *Israel* is said to be circumcised, and also by that of *Samsons* parents, being displeased that he should take a wife of the uncircumcised *Philistines* Judges 14.3. For unless the *Israelitish* women were reputedly circumcised in the males, circumcision could make no difference between wife and wife; yea our Saviour should be born of the uncircumcised.

To which I answer: To be reputed as circumcised, may be understood thus, they were mentioned as circumcised, and this sense is false; for then it should be an errour, sith they were not circumcised: nor is in the text *Exod.* 12. 48. any thing to that purpose; for the speech, no uncircumcised person shall eat the passeover, is to be limitted by the matter, of them that ought to be circumcised, and that *Judges* 14.3. of taking a wife of or from the *Philistines* uncircumcised, as if thereby were intimated that an *Israelitess* woman was reputed as circumcised, or that our Saviour should be born of the uncircumcised, if women were not reputed as uncircumcised, proves it not. For the terms [circumcised and uncircumcised] are spoken of the people, who are said to be circumcised from the chief part, not from all parts. I remember not where the whole house of *Israel* is said to be circumcised, but to be uncircumcised in heart, *Jeremy* 9.26. yet were there such a place, it must be understood of all that were to be circumcised. Or else the meaning is, they were reputed as circumcised, that is, they were admitted to the passeover if their males were circumcised, notwithstanding they were not in their proper persons circumcised, which sense is true. But then it serves not the turn to avoid the force of the instance brought to shew there is not a necessary connexion between interest in the covenant, and the persons right to the initial Seal, in his own person, which Mr *G:* must prove to make good his Major. For he would have infant-females actually baptized, because in covenant; and his proof is, They that were in covenant were circumcised, which must be meant of all in covenant, and of actual circumcision in their own persons, or else it can prove but a particular of some, and their virtual baptism, to wit, female infants. But Mr. *G.* thinks to prevent this objection.

And whereas you object, that you may as well say, that children are virtually baptized in their parents, I deny it, because you have not the like proof for the one, as we have for the other. Besides women that are said to be virtually and reputatively circumcised in the males, were not actually to be circumcised at all: they were excluded, which you do not, nor cannot say of infants; when they are grown up you confess they may and ought to be baptized.

Answ. That which I said, was only by way of inference upon Pædobaptists suppositions; if virtual circumcision were all that might be claimed by virtue of the covenant it would not help Pædobaptists who would from the covenant prove a right of actual circumcision to infants, whereas by their own confession it onely proves necessarily a virtual; and if so, how can it prove necessarily by their own principles any more than a virtual baptizing of infants? The same *medium* that doth not prove as necessary actual circumcision in the one, cannot prove as necessary actual baptism in the other. Now the force of this objection

is not at all weakned by his reply. For my words were not concerning the fitneſs of the expreſſion, that the one was as fit as the other, but that I might grant a virtual baptiſm to infants without detriment to my cauſe, if they aſſert no more from the covenant, but a virtual circumciſion.

But had I ſaid [you may as well ſay] (which yet I find not in my writings, but, we might grant, we may ſay *Examen* page 37. by like, perhaps greater reaſon it may be ſaid *Exercit.* p. 4.) the ſpeech might have been right notwithſtanding Mr. *Gerees* exceptions, for there is no more proof for the uſe of this ſpeech, that females may be ſaid to be virtually circumciſed in the males, then for this, infants may be ſaid to be virtually baptized in their parents, neither being uſed in Scripture, and reaſon being as much for the one as the other. And though thoſe that were infants when grown, being believers, are to be baptized, yet infants during their infancy are by more full evidence excluded from actual baptiſm, then females were from actual circumciſion.

Mr. G. proceeds thus. For your ſecond inſtance of infants dying afore they were eight daies old; I anſwer that they were particularly tyed to that day, whether for the Theological reaſon *Levit.* 12. 2, 3. or for the Phyſical reaſon, that God would not ſuffer an inciſion to be made on the fleſh of a tender infant; or till the ſeventh, that is, the Critical day was over; or whether to typifie the reſurrection, we cannot determine; but till that day they were expreſly excluded; yet therefore it remains clear that all that were within that adminiſtration of the Covenant, that were not expreſly excluded, were circumciſed, which is enough for my purpoſe. And ſo unleſs you can bring a rule that no infant of Chriſtians ſhall have the Sacrament of initiation till 18 years or ſo, that inſtance of infants not being circumciſed dying before the 8. day, is too ſhort to reach up.

Anſw. It is not enough for Mr. Gs. purpoſe, which was to prove, the ſeal did follow the covenant, and when any were aggregated into the Jewiſh church and taken into the communion of the covenant made with *Abraham* they were initiated into that adminiſtration of the Covenant by the Sacrament of Circumciſion, unleſs he can prove that all that were in covenant, and in the Jewiſh Church were circumciſed. But his own grant, That ſome in the Covenant, and Jewiſh Church, as females and males under eight daies old, were expreſly excluded, overthrows his own poſition, and is enough for my purpoſe to prove, that all in the covenant were not circumciſed. The reaſon why males afore the eighth day were not circumciſed, whatever it were, is nothing for Mr. Gs. advantage, but againſt him, ſith it doth more fully ſhew that God would not have them circumciſed. Nor need I bring a rule that no infant of Chriſtians ſhall have the Sacrament of initiation till eighteen years, or ſo, which goes upon his miſtake, as if the inſtance I gave were as a proof of the time of baptiſm, it being brought only to ſhew a reaſon of my denial of his aſſertion, that the ſeal did follow the covenant. It is enough for me, that I prove (as I have done in the ſecond part of the Review ſ. 5. &c.) that the rule is, that perſons are not to be baptized till they be diſciples or believers, and that infants are not ſuch.

Mr. G. addes. Your third inſtances are of *Adam*, *Abel*, *Noah* page 36. of your anſwer, and *Melchiſedec*, *Lot*, *Job*, pag. 4. *Exercit.* I anſwer either thoſe were before the adminiſtration begun with *Abraham*, and ſo before the inſtitu-

tion

tion of seals, or such of them that were with or after him, either they join not themselves to that administration, and so were not to be sealed no more then the Proselytes of the Gate, or if they did unite to the Church in *Abrahams* family, then it is apparent they might lay claim to circumcision, as other proselytes did. And so indeed it is averred of *Iob*, that he was circumcised, by the Author of the book of true circumcision, which is ascribed to *Hierom*, cited by *Iunius* in his animadversion on *Bellarmine*, *Controv.* 4. l. 3. cap. 16. Not. 13.

Answ. Master *Geree* doth make shew of answering my allegation, but doth indeed confirm my proof, that sith *Abel*, *Noah*, *Melchisedec*, *Lot*, and many Proselytes of the gate were in the Covenant of grace, yet had not any initial sign or seal, as M. *Geree* calls it, to seal the Covenant, and some sealed after an initial seal was instituted though in the Covenant of grace, therefore there is not such a connexion between the Covenant, and the initial seal, that therefore a man must have the seal initial because he is in the covenant of grace, and that it was not from interest in the Covenant of grace, that persons were circumcised, but Gods special command upon such reasons as seemed best to him, but is not a reason for us to imitate in another ordinance without the like command. If one Author conceive *Iob* was circumcised, many do conceive otherwise, and there are more probable reasons he was not; sith there's no mention of his circumcision, or his observing any of the rites of the Law, or of any acquaintance he had with *Israel*, or any thing else that might induce us to believe he had communion with the policy of *Israel*.

Master *Geree* saith further; And wheras you say, Lastly, that the Jews comprehended in covenant and circumcised could not be baptized without faith and repentance. I answer, the reason is evident; because baptism was a seal of a new administration; and therefore they must join to that administration of the covenant as well as be in covenant, before they could be baptized.

Answ. I am beholding to Mr. *Geree*, who as before had given the reason why *Melchisedeck*, *Lot*, *Iob*, were not circumcised, though in Covenant because of their not joining themselves to that administration, or their not uniting to the Church in *Abraham* family: so here again he doth not only grant what I allege, but gives a reason of it also, and such as quite overthrows his dispute. For if it were true that the Jews that were in covenant were not to be baptized without faith and repentance, then being in covenant is not a sufficient reason of an infants being baptized without faith and repentance, and if baptism were a seal of a new administration, then it must have a new rule, and so the old rule of circumcision is no direction to us about baptism, if *Lot*, the Proselytes of the gate, though in covenant, were not to be circumcised without joining to that administration, or the Church in *Abrahams* family, then right to circumcision was not from interest in the covenant common to all believers, but something proper to that Church-state, or administration, which is now voided: if therefore the Jews in covenant and circumcised must profess repentance and faith afore they were baptized, because they must join to the new administration of the covenant, then according to Mr. *Gerees* own confession, according to the new administration of the Covenant, faith and repentance are required of them that join to that administration of the Covenant. And therefore whereas Mr. *Geree* addes, we may therefore conclude, that those

that are under the Gospel-covenant in any administration of it, have right to the seal of initiation under that administration; unless they be particularly excluded by God himself, and so the major is firmly proved; I may truly say, it is firmly proved that they that are under the Gospel-covenant in any administration of it, yet have not right to the seal of initiation under that administration, barely from the Covenant without a command, and that God himself hath excluded infants from baptism by Mr. *Gerees* own concession, without faith and repentance, and that in all this arguing Mr. G. hath dictated much and proved nothing. Let's see whether he speed better about proving the Minor.

SECT. XVI.

That the Gospel-Covenant is not extended to infants of believers, as such.

NOw the Minor, saith he, that children are under the Gospel-Covenant in the Christian administration of it, that we prove by the Scriptures mentioned, as first, *Gen.*17. 7. I will establish my Covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant to be a God unto thee and thy seed after thee. To comprehend the meaning of this place we are to consider. What the privilege is that is here promised: 2. what the extent of it is. First for the privilege it self, as *Calvin* hath well observed by vertue of this promise, the Church was settled in *Abrahams* family, and it was separated from the rest of the World, as light from darkness. And the people of *Israel* (*Abrahams* posterity) was the house and sheepfold of God; And other nations like wild beasts ranging about without in the wilderness of the World. And by this privilege the dignity of adoption belonged to all the Israelites in common, *Rom.*9.4. To whom pertaineth the adoption. And so, though by nature they were no better than others; yet by reason of this promise they had a birth-privilege, whereby they were separated from others, which is apparently held forth, *Gal.*2.15. We who are Jews by nature, not sinners of the Gentiles; as Mr. *Blake* hath truly observed; And sith you grant the Jews a birth-privilege, as p.106. and p.78. of your Answer, you needed not have quarrelled with this plain proof. But now among those that had this outward privilege of common adoption (to be reputed children when the Gentiles were reputed as Dogs, *Matth.*15.26.) there were some that were separated by the secret election of God, and really made partakers of sanctifying and saving grace, and so not only adopted outwardly, and reputatively, but also really; in comparison of whom the other *Israelites* are sometimes spoken of, as no sons of *Abraham*, *Rom.*9.6,7. Though externally they were the children of the Kingdom, and in reference to the Gentiles they are so stiled, *Matthew* 8. 11,12. So then the privilege is, that he would be a God to all in regard of external denomination, and external privileges of a Church, and to the elect in regard of spiritual adoption, grace and glory.

Answ. It is true, I granted page 78. of my *Examen*, that the Jews had a birth-privilege; yet denyed it to be from the Covenant of grace according to the substance of it, as Mr. *M.* speaks, but that special love God bare to *Abra-*

hams

hams posterity. Nor do I deny that the people of *Israel*, till broken off, were in common estimation Gods children, children of the Kingdom, not Dogs, nor unclean as the Gentiles, and that these titles did belong to all by external denomination, really to the elect. Nor do I much gainsay that by vertue of the promise, I will be a God to the seed of *Abraham*, the Church was settled in *Abrahams* family, though it doth not appear to me that the Apostle did so expound this promise, but expressly contradistinguisheth the children of the promise, to the children of the flesh, *Rom.*9.8. And his doctrine there is plain, that the elect are they only to whom the promise, I will be the God of thy seed, *Gen.*17.7. was made: yea *Exercit.* page 2,3. I expound the promise, as in respect of some peculiar blessings, belonging to *Abrahams* natural seed. Nor did I quarrel with Mr. *Blake* for proving from *Gal.*2,15. a birth-privilege belonging to the Jews, but excepted against him for that he contended to have the seed of believing Gentile-parents under the Gospel to be under the first member of the division in the text, to wit, *Jews by nature*: which exception I have made good in my Postscript to my Apology S.9. which I intend to vindicate from Master *Blakes* Reply, *Vindic. fœd.* cha. 35. in that which followes. But then what doth this advantage to prove Mr. Gs. Minor. To children (meaning all or else his conclusion can be but particular) of believing Christians the Gospel-covenant is extended in the Christian Churches? Is this the Gospel-covenant to make a people only reputatively and outwardly, but not really adopted: Is this that which circumcision did seal? Is this the covenant of grace which the seal is to follow? What kind of juggling is there with these men?

They contend the Covenant *Gen.*17.7. to be the same with the Covenant of grace for substance, and that they make to consist in saving graces, the temporal benefits they refer to the administration that then was, they will not have it called a mixt covenant, and this covenant of grace they will have to be sealed by circumcision out of *Rom.* 4. 11. and they say this was made to believers and their seed, and thence they have salvation if they die in infancy, and without this there is no ground of hope of the salvation of any infant deceased; and they argue they are to have the seal, because they are in covenant, which if they understand not of that covenant, of which that ordinance is the seal, what colour is there to derive thence a title unto that seal on them who have interest in another covenant, which it doth not seal? Their argument is, He hath right to the Conveyance, who hath right to the Land: but these men who dare not assert that the covenant of saving grace belongs to all believers natural children, yet will have them all to have right to baptism which seals saving graces, though perhaps a very few, and those all unknown persons have right to that Covenant, onely because a promise of outward and reputative adoption, though not saving graces belongs to all. Besides what ground hath Mr.G. to call this promise the Gospel-covenant? *Rom.*1.16,17. *Gal.*3.8, 9, &c. the Gospel-covenant is, The just shall live by faith: it is that which contains promise of sanctification, remission of sins, &c. *Hebrews* 8 10,11, 12. & 10. 16, 17. *Matthew* 26.28. The everlasting covenant that hath the sure mercies of David, *Isaiah* 55.3 *Acts* 13. 34, 38, 39. *Hebrews* 13. 20. and of which Jesus is the Surety or Mediator, *Hebrews* 7.22. & 12. 24. what a mockage then is this of people to tell them the Covenant of grace is made to

their

their children, and the Coſpel-covenant is extended to them: and that God hath promiſed to be their God, and that they are confederatewith their parents, and yet in fine all that they dare aſſert is, God hath promiſed to the ſeed of believers an external, reputative adoption, though not real: ſuch chaff they catch their auditors with. But is this promiſe that God will ſettle his Church in *Abrahams* family, and ſeparate them from the reſt of the World, as light from darkneſs, as Mr. G. expreſly makes it, indeed the Goſpel-Covenant? I dare freely ſay, it is Jewiſh, Anti-evangelical, directly oppoſite to the Goſpel-covenant. For the Goſpel-covenant is, That God would bleſs all Nations in *Abraham* through faith, Gal. 3. 8, 9. Gentiles as well as Jews, yea the Gentile-believers inſtead of the Jews broken off by unbelief. If then this be the Goſpel covenant, I will be the God of thy ſeed; that is, in Mr. *Gs.* ſenſe, I will ſeparate *Abrahams* family from the reſt of the world to be my Church, then the Church under the Goſpel covenant is not Catholick contrary to the article of the Creed, and ſo the Goſpel-covenant continues the middle wall of partition. But perhaps Maſter *Geree*, helps the matter in that which followeth.

For the ſecond thing, ſaith he, the extent of this privilege (though there were ſomething in it peculiar to *Abraham*) yet was it not limitted to him alone, but thoſe that were of *Abraham* inherited his promiſe to have God their God, and the God of their ſeed. As what was ſaid to *Joſhua*, Joſh. 1. 5 I will not leave thee nor forſake thee, was not bounded to his perſon, but applicable to all conſcientious Iſraelites; yea to all Chriſtians in Gods way and work, as the Apoſtle applieth it *Heb.* 13. 5. So this privilege or the Covenant to have God the God of their ſeed, is to be applyed to all Iſraelites, yea to all of any nation that have his faith and tread in his ſteps: they that do the work of *Abraham* may claim the promiſes of *Abraham*, that be ordinary and eſſential parts of the Covenant.

Anſw. Mr. *G.* Will have the promiſe [I will be a God to thy ſeed] to promiſe the ſettling of the Church in Abrahams family ſeparated from the reſt of the World as light from darkneſs; if this be ſo, how can it be a promiſe to another nation, that their children ſhould be adopted outwardly and reputatively? For, if by this promiſe *Abrahams* natural poſterity have a privilege whereby they are ſeparated from all other nations, ſurely its no better than a contradiction to ſay this promiſe is common to other nations with them. But ſaith he, The promiſe to *Joſhua*, *Joſh.* 1. 5. was not bounded to his perſon, *Heb.* 13. 5. which I grant; nor do I doubt, but promiſes made to Abraham, David, Joſhua, &c. do belong to all true believers, where the holy Ghoſt doth ſo expound them, and where the promiſe is of a thing which other Scriptures do clear to belong to them. But there is no ſuch thing in the promiſe of *Gen.* 17. 7. Maſter *Geree* brings nothing but his own aſſertion to prove it, nor do I know any thing brought by any elſe, but what the Author of the little book, intitled, Infants baptiſm proved lawful by Scripture, printed Anno 1644. hath,

Who thus argued, That which was promiſed to Abraham, as a believer, is promiſed to every believer.

But God promiſed to be a God to Abraham, and his ſeed as a believer: *Ergo:*

To which I anſwered, if [as] be taken reduplicatively ſo as that the meaning be under that formal conſideration, to him being a believer, and

to

to every one being a believer, as to him, I deny the Major; it was not made to him as a believer, ſimply under that conſideration, but though it were made upon his faith, as a motive of making that covenant with him, yet not under that formal conſideration ſimply as a believer, ſo as that the covenant ſhould be ſaid to be made to every believer, as to him. As in like manner, though *Peter* Matthew 16 18 19 had the promiſe of building the Church, and the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and of binding and looſing, conferred on him by reaſon of his confeſſion of Chriſt, verſe 16, yet every one that confeſſeth Chriſt as he did, hath not that that promiſe: If any ask how it was made to Abraham? I anſwer, ſo far as concerns the ſpiritual part, it is cleer from Romans 4 11 12 16 18, that it was made to him as Father of believers, and in that conſtruction, though it belong to Gentiles, yet it belongs onely to believing elect *Gentiles*, Romans 9 7 8 Galatians 3 29, or to Chriſt, whether perſonal or myſtical, verſe 16. But that it belongs not in that ſenſe, no not to all or any, either of Jews or Gentiles, who are not elect, is apparent from Romans 9 7 8, no meer formal profeſſor can lay claim to it. As for the promiſe of outward privileges, as to be of the viſible Church, to have the Ordinances of Gods worſhip, ſo the promiſe is made to Abraham as a natural Father of his inheriting poſterity by Iſaac, and to that ſeed by Iſaac which was to inherit in Abrahams family: and to that natural ſeed which God would bring out of Egypt, and ſettle in Canaan, and this was but unto the time of reformation, as it is termed, Heb. chap. 9. verſ. 10. Now that thoſe words, I will be thy God, and the God of thy ſeed, ſhould be expounded thus, I will be the God of every Gentile believer, either in profeſſion or reality, that his natural poſterity ſhould be Gods viſible Church, or viſible Church-members, hath not the leaſt intimation in Scripture, but much againſt it, nor can be brought by any ſhew of right conſtruction to be the meaning. For I would know under which term of theſe [thee, or thy ſeed] every ſuch natural childe, even an infant ſhauld be meant; under [thy ſeed] they muſt ſay, but the Scripture placeth believers themſelves, and thoſe only reall believers under that term, as is proved before, and other places ſpeak to like purpoſe, John 8. 39. Matth. 3.9. Luke 19.9 therefore without addition to the text, believers natural ſeed are not there placed. Nor were the promiſe true in Mr. *Gerees* ſenſe. For God doth not make good the promiſe in that ſenſe to every believer and his natural ſeed, many Gentile believers have had their children perſecutors, not viſible Church-members, and may have ſtill; yea in that ſenſe which Mr. *Geree* himſelf expounds it, it was only verified of the natural poſterity of Abraham, yet not of every particular child of his, but of the nation till Chriſts comming.

As for the dictate of Mr. G. they that do the works of Abraham, may claim the promiſes of Abraham, that be ordinary and eſſential parts of the covenant, it intimates ſome promiſes of the covenant to be eſſential, ſome not, ſome ordinary, ſome extraordinary parts of the covenant.

But theſe are new diſtinctions, with which I meet not elſewhere, nor know I how to underſtand what promiſes he makes ordinary, nor what extraordinary, what eſſential parts of the covenant, what not. That Covenant being but once made in my conceit, therefore had all the promiſes of the ſame ſort, whether ordinary or extraordinary, and a covenant being an aggregate of promiſes, con-

contains the promiſes as the matter, and the making together as the form, which are the eſſential parts of the Covenant, there's no promiſe but being the matter of the covenant is an eſſential part, or rather all the promiſes together are the matter, and each promiſe is an integral part of the whole number of promiſes. And therfore his ſpeech is not eaſie to be underſtood.

I grant that they who are of the faith of Abraham, may claim the promiſe of Juſtification, and other ſaving bleſſings. But for viſible Church-membership of natural poſterity, or other domeſtique promiſes made to Abraham, neither the natural poſterity of Abraham, nor the trueſt believing Gentile, can lay a juſt claim to them, but that notwithſtanding that promiſe, God is free to make their children or the children of Gentile, or Jew Infidels his people, his viſible church, and to ſettle his worſhip with them.

Mr. Getee writes thus, and that this privilege of having God to be the God of our ſeed, was not perſonal, and peculiar to Abraham, but propagated to his ſeed, may hence appear, becauſe the ſame in effect is promiſed to other godly Jews, which is here promiſed to Abraham, Deut. 30. 6. And the Lord thy God will circumciſe thy heart, and the heart of thy ſeed.

Anſw. The promiſe to Abraham, according to Mr. Gs. expoſition, was, That he would be a God to all in regard of external denomination, and external privilege of a Church, and to the elect in regard of ſpiritual adoption grace and glory. Sure this is not the ſame in effect with that, Deut. 30. 6. which is nothing of external privileges of a Church, but of circumciſing their hearts, and the heart of their ſeed, to love the Lord their God with all their heart, and with all their ſoul, that they might live: which can be true only of the elect. Beſides, it is promiſed to them at their return from captivity, and upon their returning to the Lord, and obeying his voice according to all that he commanded them that day, they and their children, with all their heart, and all their ſoul, v. 2. which ſure cannot be ordinarily applied to them in their infancy, and therefore this text is very impertinently alleged to prove an external privilege to infants of meer reputed believers, even in their infancy. Mr. *Baxter* himſelf in his Friendly accommodation with Mr. *Bedford* p. 361. hath theſe words. The text ſeems plainly to ſpeak of [their ſeed] not in their infant-ſtate, but in their adult, *Deut.* 30. For firſt, verſe 2. the condition of the promiſe is expreſly required, not only of the parent, but of the children themſelves by name.

2. And that condition is the perſonal performance of the ſame acts, which are required of the parents, viz. to return to the Lord, and obey his voice with all their heart and ſoul.

3. The circumciſion of the heart promiſed, is ſo annexed to the act, that it appeareth to be meant only of thoſe that were capable of the act, ver. 6. The Lord thy God will circumciſe thine heart, and the heart of thy ſeed, to love the Lord thy God; ſo that it is not meant of thoſe that are uncapable of ſo loving.

Mr. G. yet adds. And thus much that place, *Act.* 2. 39. doth hold forth and contribute to infant-baptiſm, to ſhew that children are comprehended in the Covenant with their fathers, and both theſe laſt promiſes being of Evangelical privileges they muſt needs be communicable to all under the Goſpel-covenant; ſo then it remains that God ſtill is in covenant with every believer, and his ſeed.

Anſw. That Acts 2. 39. neither ſhews that children (of believers) are com-

comprehended (universally and necessarily) with their parents, nor contribute ought to infant-baptism, is shewed in the forepart of this *Review* s. 5. and notwithstanding any thing said by Mr. *Geree* it yet remains to be proved, that God is in Covenant with every believer and his seed.

The rest of that section of Mr. *Geree*, is about my expounding Mr. *Ms.* second conclusion, which I shall review as far as is meet when I come to it. I have dispatched at last the answering those that argue syllogistically from the covenant, and seal for infant-baptism. But most go another way by laying down conclusions, and framing hypotheses, and I proceed to take a view of their writings.

SECT. XVII.

Mr. Cottons, *The* Assemblies, *and* London Ministers *way of arguing for Infant-baptism from the Covenant and Circumcision, is recited, and the methode of the future progress in the Review, expressed.*

MR. *John Cotton* in his Dialogue, ch. 3. goes this way, and expresseth himself in four things,

That 1. God made a covenant of grace with Abraham, and his seed, *Gen.* 17. 7.

2. Gave him a commandment to receive the sign of circumcision the seal of the covenant of grace, to him and his seed, *Gen.* 17.9,10.

3. The Lord hath given that Covenant of grace which was then to *Abraham* and his seed, now to believers and our seed.

4. And hath given us baptism in the room of circumcision.

The Assembly at *Westminster* in their confession of faith, chap 25. art. 2. assert, That the visible Church consists of all the children of those that profess the true Religion, and cite to prove it, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Acts* 2. 39. *Ezekiel* 16. 20, 21. *Rom.* 11. 16. *Gen.* 3. 15. and 17. 7. of these, one of the Texts, to wit, *Gen.* 3. 15. I meet not with in the writings of the defenders of infant-baptism, to my remembrance, except once in Mr. *Baxter* to prove a conditional covenant made with all *Adams* posterity. I do not imagine what use that Text is of to prove infants of those that profess the true Religion to be visible Church members.

Whether the seed of the woman be meant of all men, or by excellency of Christ, or of true believers (which are all the senses I conceive) yet how from any of these should be gathered that infants of professours of the true Religion, as such, and not as of humane kinde, should be meant by the seed of the woman, or that the bruising of the Serpents head should prove, infants of them that profess the true Religion to be visible Church-members is a riddle, which I cannot yet resolve. Ch. 28. art. 4. they say, Infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized, and in the margin cite, *Gen.* 17. 7. 9. with *Gal.* 3. 9. 14. *Col.* 2. 11, 12. & *Acts* 2. 38, 39. & *Rom.* 4. 11, 12. 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Mat.* 28. 19. *Mark* 10. 13, 14, 15, 16. *Luke* 18. 15. what they would gather from

 these

theſe texts may be gheſſed from the Directory about baptiſm, where they direct the Miniſter to teach the people, That baptiſm is a ſeal of the covenant of grace, of our ingrafting into Chriſt, &c. That the promiſe is made to believers and their ſeed, and that the ſeed and poſterity of the faithful, born within the Church, have by their birth-intereſt in the Covenant, and right to the ſeal of it, and to the outward privileges of the Church under the Goſpel, no leſs then the children of Abraham in the time of the old Teſtament, the covenant of grace for ſubſtance being the ſame, and the grace of God, and conſolation of believers more plentiful then before, that the Son of God admitted little children into his preſence, embracing them, and bleſſing them, ſaying, For of ſuch is the Kingdom of God; that children by baptiſm, are ſolemnly received into the boſome of the viſible Church, that they are Chriſtians, and federally holy before baptiſm, and therefore are they baptized.

Moſt of which propoſitions are ambiguous, few of them true, or have any proof from the texts alleged in the Confeſſion; and if they were all true (ſetting aſide one or two which expreſs the concluſion in a different phraſe) they would not infer the Concluſion.

The firſt propoſition is ambiguous, it being doubtful in what ſenſe baptiſm is ſaid to be a ſeal of the Covenant of grace, whether in a borrowed or proper ſenſe, ſo as it be the definition or *genus* of it, or onely an adjunct of it, or whether it ſeal the making of the Covenant, or the performing of it, or the thing covenanted, what they mean by the covenant of grace, which is that covenant; whether it ſeal all or a part of it, whether it ſeal Gods covenanting to us, or our covenanting to God. Nor is there any proof for it from *Rom.* 4. 11. which neither ſpeaks of baptiſm, nor of any ones Circumciſion but *Abrahams*, nor ſaith of his Circumciſion, that it was the ſeal of the Covenant of grace, as they, it is likely, mean.

The next propoſition is ſo ambignous, that Mr. *M.* and Mr. *G.* are driven to deviſe ſenſes which the words will not bear to make it true, as I ſhew in my Apology, ſ. 9. The words ſeem to bear this ſenſe, That the promiſe of Juſtification, adoption, &c. is made to believers and their ſeed. But ſo it is apparently falſe, contradicted by the Apoſtle *Rom.* 9. 7, 8. and by other texts, nor is it proved from *Gen.* 17. 7. compared with *Gal.* 3. 9. 14. *Acts* 2. 39. or any other of their texts, yea in that ſenſe it is diſclaimed by Maſter *Marſhall*, and Maſter *Gree*.

The next is ambiguous alſo. For how the ſeed of the faithful may be ſaid to be born within the Church, or what intereſt in the covenant, and right to the ſeal of it, and what outward privileges they have by their birth, or what outward privileges they have in like meaſure as the children of *Abraham*, is as uncertain as the reſt, and how any of the texts prove it, is uncertain. Surely *Gal.* 3. 9. 14. ſpeaks only of the privileges of Juſtification and Sanctification, which *Abrahams* children by faith, and no other, not every believers poſterity or natural ſeed have, nor is there a word *Gen.* 17. 7. of any privilege to our natural ſeed as ſuch.

The next too is doubtful, it being uncertain what they mean by the ſubſtance of the Covenant, what they make accidental in it, and what ſubſtantial; nor is it eaſie to conceive what they mean when they ſay, the grace of God and conſolation of believers is more plentiful then before, or how any of the texts

prove

prove it, or what this is to their purpose, that the enlargement of a believers comfort intitles his child to baptism, nor what is meant when it is said, That children by baptism are received into the bosom of the visible Church, and yet after withheld from the Lords Supper without any Ecclesiastical censure, nor do I know how they mean or prove them to be Christians, or federally holy afore baptism.

For my part, in those propositions I deprehend little truth or plain sense; but that the Directory in that part is a meer riddle, fitter for Schollars to study than for teaching of the people.

The *London* Ministers (of whom it is likely a considerable part were of the Assembly) in their *Jus Divinum regim. Eccl.* page 32. speak thus.

So infants of Christian parents under the New Testament are commanded to be baptized by consequence, for that the infants of Gods people in the old Testament were commanded to be circumcised, *Gen.*17. For the privileges of believers under the New Testament, are as large as the privileges of believers under the old Testament, and the children of believers under the New Testament are federally holy, and within the covenant of God as well as the children of believers under the old Testament, *Gen.* 17. compared with *Rom.* 11. 16. 1 *Cor.*7.14. And what objections can be made from infants incapacity now against their baptism, might as well then have been made against their being circumcised. And why children should once be admitted to the like initiating Sacrament (the Lord of the Covenant, and Sacrament no where forbidding them) there can be no just ground. And baptism succeeds in the room of Circumcision, *Col.* 2. 11, 12. concerning which I say, there's no proof from *Gen.*17. compared with *Rom.*11.16. 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. to prove the children of believers federaly holy as they would, nor is there any proof from *Col.*2.11,12. to prove the succession of baptism in the room of circumcision. And though infants have not a natural incapacity to be dipped in water, yet they have a natural incapacity to profess faith in Christ, which is now required to baptism though not required to circumcision. And there is an objection that may be made against infant-baptism, to wit, the want of a command, which could not be objected against infant male circumcision: and this is a just ground to exclude infants from baptism, yea the very same ground they give for excluding them the communion, and the very same ground which Pædobaptists do continually, in books and Sermons urge against Popish and Prelatical ceremonies. But forasmuch as Mr. *M.* did direct his Defence of infant-baptism to the Assembly, and Mr. *Pryn* in his suspension suspended, p. 21. seems to have taken his book to be approved by the Assembly, and he is of any I meet with in print likeliest to have produced their strength, and for other reasons, therefore I conceive my self bound to examine his defence in the third part of it, referring the Reader to what of that or any other is already dispatched, taking in somewhat of Master *Blakes*, and some others by the way, and then to examine such parts of Mr. *Cobbets Just Vindication*, as are not yet examined so far as I find necessary, and at last examine so much of Mr. *Bs.* dispute about his second argument as is not yet dispatched.

SECT.

SECT. XVIII.

Mr. Marſhalls *reply to the firſt ſection of the third part of my* Examen *about the connexion between the Covenant, and ſeal, is reviewed.*

MR. *M.* in his Sermon page 8. thus diſputed, My firſt Argument is this; The infants of believing parents are *fœderati*, therefore they muſt be *ſignati*.

They are within the Covenant of grace;

Therefore are to partake of the ſeal of the Covenant.

To this I anſwered by denying both the antecedent and the conſequence: and firſt I diſputed againſt the conſequence, *Exam.* part. 3. ſ. 1.

Mr. *M.* in his Reply would have the Reader to conſider my advantage from the much ſilence in the Scripture to make my work have a ſpecious probability, that the like ſpecious plea might be made againſt the juſtification of infants, eſpecially if his diſpute ſhould be carried as mine is, altogether in the way of making exceptions againſt arguments, but not poſitively affirming any thing.

Thus what others have counted my vertue, and have commended, beyond what it is fit for me to expreſs, Mr. *M.* unjuſtly ſeeks to draw into ſuſpition, as if there were ſophiſtry and guile in it, as he did in other things, as I ſhew in my Apology.

But me thinks a conſiderate Reader ſhould take this to be the courſe of a diffident man. If there be much ſilence in Scripture about infants, why do Mr. *M.* and others avouch their baptiſm; with ſo much peremptorineſs. If their juſtification could be no better proved then their bapriſm, it would be no article of my faith. My diſputation is carried in that way which is uſed by Diſputants that examine writings Scholaſtically, wherein it is defective Mr. *M.* ſhould ſhew.

That I made exceptions againſt arguments was agreeable to my work, being to anſwer as Mr. *M.* was to prove: no man is to expect regularly any more of a Reſpondent. Yet that I poſitively affirm nothing is an untruth with a witneſs: yea in many points where it was not neceſſary I poſitively ſet down my tenet and my proofs, and anſwer objections to the contrary. The reſolving queſtions about baptiſm how it ſhould be, could not reaſonably be expected in my Examen.

2. Mr. *M.* takes on him to prove his conſequence by mine own principles, to wit, that I yield that ſuch as are regenerate, ſanctified, &c. may be baptized, which he ſaith is in plain Engliſh, that ſuch as are covenanters ought not to be denyed the initial ſeal of the covenant.

But I do not think the ſpeeches the ſame, either in plain Engliſh, or Mr. *M*s. own Engliſh, or mine. Not in plain Engliſh. In plain Engliſh a Covenanter is one that makes a promiſe.

Is a Scottiſh Covenanter any other then one that makes a promiſe or ſubſcribes to the Covenant? But a perſon regenerate or ſanctified may make no pro-

promiſe, nor do I think when Mr. *M.* calls infants federate, or in the Covenant of grace, he means they make a promiſe, but that a promiſe is made to them. Nor in Mr. *Ms.* own Engliſh. For when he ſaith, they are in covenant, he means, infants are in ſome ſenſe under the covenant of grace in reſpect of the outward adminiſtration and Church privileges, which is not all one as to be regenerate, ſanctifyed, &c. nor in my Engliſh. For the being in covenant which I grant, gives a title to baptiſm, is meant of their preſent ſtate, ſo as that not only the promiſe is made to them, what God will do for them afterwards, but for the preſent they are actually ſanctified, regenerate, believers, diſciples, as mine own words, cited by Mr. *M.* ſhew; So that Mr. *M.* doth but abuſe me, and the Reader, endeavouring to poſſeſſe him with this conceit, as if his conſequence were proved by mine own principles.

But Maſter *Marſhall* not truſting to this, anſwers, more particularly:

1. I grant with you that there is no neceſſary dependance between a promiſe and a ſeal, the addition of a ſeal to a promiſe is of free grace as well as the promiſe it ſelf. Which if true, then theres no neceſſary connexion between the Covenant and Seal, and ſo this propoſition is not true. All that have the promiſe are to be ſealed. For if it be true it is in ſome degree of neceſſity, to wit, *de omni*. As for his reaſon, it is frivolous; there is no neceſſary dependance, becauſe both are of free grace. For thoſe things that are of free grace have a neceſſary dependence as, to be predeſtinate, called, juſtified, glorifyed. But he means, the nature of the terms makes not a neceſſary connexion between them.

If that be his meaning, Mr. *Baillee* his Collegue is deſerted, who would infer a neceſſary connexion from the nature of the terms, which I have refuted in my Addition to my Apology, S. 3.

But Mr. *M.* addes. Nor 2. did I ever think, that by Gods revealed will this propoſition was true in all ages of the Church. All Covenanters muſt be ſealed, I carried it no higher than *Abrahams* time, when God firſt added this new mercy to his Church, vouchſafing a ſeal to the Covenant.

Anſw. If this be true, then there is nothing moral and perpetual in ſeals, as they call them, of the Covenaut. For ſuch thing are from the beginning, and belong to Gentiles as well as Jews, and therefore it is in vain to derive infants ſealing barely from the Covenant of grace. For ſith that, as Mr. *Ms.* firſt Concluſion ſpeaks, for ſubſtance hath alwaies been one, and the ſame both to the Jews and Gentiles, if there were a connexion between it, and the ſeal it ſhould have been as well before *Abrahams* time as ſince.

But he thinks in his third anſwer to make good the connexion, when he ſaith,

And 3. from *Abrahams* time, and ſo forward I ſay it was Gods will, that ſuch as are in Covenant ſhould be ſealed with the initial ſeal of the Covenant, ſuppoſing them only capable of the ſeal, and no ſpecial bar put in againſt them by God himſelf.

To which I anſwer. He ſaith after, if you pleaſe to ſtate the general Propoſition as you needs muſt, That all who ſince *Abrahams* time are *fœderati*, or Covenanters with God, muſt by Gods own appointment receive the ſeal of admiſſion into covenant, unleſs they be either uncapable of it, or are exempted by a particular diſpenſation. So that one of theſe two propoſitions is that which makes up his Enthymeme an entire ſyllogiſm, and his ſyllogiſm muſt

ſtand

ſtand in one or other of theſe forms.

From *Abrahams* time all ſuch as are in covenant ſhould be ſealed with the initial ſeal of the covenant, ſuppoſing them onely capable of the ſeal, and no ſpecial bar put in againſt them by God himſelf.

But all the infants of believing parents are in covenant, and they are capable of the ſeal, and there is no ſpecial bar put in againſt them by God himſelf.

Ergo, They ſhould be ſealed.

Or thus; All who ſince *Abrahams* time are *fœderati*, or Covenanters with God, muſt, by Gods own appointment receive the ſeal of admiſſion into covenant, unleſs they be either uncapable of it, or are exempted by a particular diſpenſation. All infants of believers ſince *Abrahams* time, are *fœderati* or covenanters with God, neither uncapable of the ſeal, nor exempted by a particular diſpenſation: *Ergo*, all infants of believers ſince *Abrahams* time, muſt, by Gods own appointment, receive the ſeal of admiſſion into covenant.

To which I anſwer, Mr. *M.* tells me, I muſt needs ſtate thus the general Propoſition. But it is a pretty art he hath, as elſewhere to call that my Minor which was his own not mine; ſo here to ſay, I muſt needs ſtate the general Propoſition thus, which is of his own framing. However, he is not wronged, that it is thus framed. Let us then view it, and try whether (except in that of circumciſion) there be any truth, ſenſe or conſiderateneſſe in it.

As for circumciſion, if it be meant onely of it, then the Concluſion can be of it only, and as the truth is, his argument concludes only that infants of believers are to be circumciſed.

1. I had in my *Examen* noted a fault in his Argument in his Sermon, in that his Concluſion was of a ſign of the Covenant indefinite, and not of baptiſm only, whereas the Lords Supper is alſo a ſign of the Covenant, which he would not have delivered to infants.

And to it he anſwers, That he clearly in his Sermon ſhewed this Propoſition to be only meant of the initial ſign, and not of the other. But this doth not excuſe his fault, who taking upon him to prove infant-baptiſm, concludes another thing in the argument, though he might perhaps, ſome pages of, where the Reader looks not for an explication of his argument, limit his ſpeech to the initial ſeal.

And for what he tells me, he is ſure that I who durſt baptize an infant known to me to be regenerate, durſt not give the other Sacrament to it, there being ſelf examination and ability to diſcern the Lords body prerequired to the one, not to the other; I told him in my *Apology* §. 10. I durſt do the one as I durſt do the other, and that ſelf examination and ability to diſcern the Lords body is as well required to baptiſm, as the Lords Supper, *Acts* 2. 38. & 8. 37. *Rom.* 6. 3, 4. But were it, that I durſt not do the one as the other, yet this would not help Mr. *M.* who would prove the title to the initial ſeal, by that proof of intereſt in the Covenant, which will conclude as well title to the after, as the initial ſeal.

For the proof is uſually the ſeal muſt follow the covenant; which if true, then not only the initial, but alſo the after-ſeal muſt follow it. But waving this, is the fault mended in his *Defence*? doth he conclude definitely of baptiſm here? nay notwithſtanding he was warned, yet *chorda ſemper oberrat eadem*, he ſtill runs into the ſame fault, concluding in both forms of an initial

ſeal

ſeal indefinitely, not definitely of baptiſm, and therefore may be interpreted to conclude of circumciſion as well as of baptiſm, yea rather his aſſertion (if there be any good ſenſe of it) is of the circumciſing then baptizing of infants, ſith all his proof is about the initial ſign of circumciſion, and the limitations he puts into the Major are, that it may be true of circumciſion.

But this is not all the fault in his new forms: notwithſtanding I complained in my *Examen ſect.*3. of his ambiguities, which I ſhewed in my *Apology* ſ. 9,10. and *Poſtſcript* ſ.6. yet as if either he could not, or would not, ſpeak diſtinctly, he retains the ſame fault in his *Defence*. Whereas I conceive the covenant of grace now contains only the promiſe of ſaving grace, he ſaith p 90. The Covenant of grace contains not onely ſaving grace, but the adminiſtration of it alſo in outward ordinances and Church privileges; but ſhews not where, nor in which covenant of grace there are promiſes of the adminiſtration of ſaving grace in outward ordinances and Church privileges. It is true, circumciſion is called the Covenant, *Gen.*17. 13. by a *Metonymia* as Mr. *M.* confeſſeth page 32 but not becauſe it was contained in the Covenant: it is not *Metonymia continentis pro contento*, but *ſignati pro ſigno*: now that the ſign ſhould be ſaid to be contained in the covenant, is ſcarſe good ſenſe; ſure it is not meet to be uſed in diſputes. And therefore whoever uſeth the covenant of grace for any other than the covenant of ſaving grace, or ſaith it contains any other than promiſes of ſaving grace, ſeems to affect ambiguities unmeet for diſpute, as not willing to be underſtood. Again page 92. he expreſſeth the covenant of grace he means to be that *Gen.*17.7. and he cannot but know it to have diverſe meanings; one that God will be a God to *Abraham*, and his ſpiritual ſeed, which he confeſſeth pag. 102. to be the elect, when he ſaith, Secondly by the word [ſeed] was meant the children of the promiſe the elect, *Rom.*9.8. and in this ſenſe it is denyed by him, that God hath made a promiſe of ſaving grace to the natural ſeed of believers, and ſo they are not in this covenant in this ſenſe. Yet the *Directory* when it ſpeaks of baptiſm, as the ſeal of the covenant, means it in this ſenſe, as the words before recited ſhew, for what elſe can be meant when they diſtinguiſh between intereſt in the covenant, and right to the ſeal of it, and the outward privileges of the Church under the Goſpel. And *Rom.*4.11. is alleged in the Confeſſion of Faith, for the proof of this, that it is the ſeal of the Covenant of grace; now that text ſpeaks of being a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith, which is a ſaving grace, and in the Confeſſion of faith, ch.7.art.3. and in the greater Catechiſm, they make the Covenant of grace to offer life and ſalvation by Chriſt, to promiſe faith, and to be made with Chriſt, and in him with all the elect, as his ſeed; and ſo the Argument from the Covenant of grace to the Seal, muſt mean it thus, or elſe it is frivolous. For if the Seal muſt follow the Covenant; it muſt follow the Covenant which is ſealed by it, which is only the promiſe of ſaving grace, there being no ſhew of conſequence in it, infants of believers have not the covenant of ſaving grace, but of outward Ordinances and Church privileges, therefore they are to be ſealed with that ſeal, which ſeals only ſaving graces. And yet methinks they ſhould not have avouched as the *Directory* doth, that the poſterity of the faithful have by their birth intereſt in that Covenant, conſidering how the Apoſtle determines *Rom.*9.8 the children of the fleſh may not be the children of God, nor the ſeed, nor children of the promiſe. Another

ſenſe.

ſenſe of the promiſe, *Gen.*17.7. is, I will be a God to *Abraham*, and his natural ſeed by *Iſaac* and *Jacob*: But in this ſenſe it is proper only to the Jewes, and the argument is as frivolous: God promiſed to be a God to the Jews, therefore infant-Gentiles who have nothing to do with that promiſe, muſt have baptiſm, which is no ſeal or token of that promiſe at all. If Mr. *M.* would have done ſomething to his purpoſe, he ſhould have ſhewed, not as he doth p. 106,107,&c. in many words quite beſides the buſineſs, how the Covenant is taken ſtrictly and largely, and how they may be ſaid to be in covenant in ſome ſenſe, who have a viſible right, without ſaving grace, but have ſhewed in which words there is any promiſe that may infer right to Gentile-believers infants to be baptized, *Gen.* 17.7. or how he can prove what he ſaith, page 103. That baptiſm ſeals that promiſe in which God engageth himſelf to be the God of believing Chriſtians, and their ſeed? I would fain know in what words, in reſpect of what bleſſings and gifts, and in what manner or upon what terms God thus engageth himſelf. The Apoſtle ſaith *Gal.*3.16. To *Abraham* and his ſeed were the promiſes made. I no where find they were made to a Gentile believer and his ſeed.

The like playing with ambiguities is in the uſe of the phraſes, fœderate, in Covenant, being under the Covenant, being in Covenant, Covenanters. When he ſaith, Infants of believers are *fœderati* or Covenanters with God, or enter into Covenant, according to the plain meaning of the word, they ſhould be aſſerted to be ſuch as make a promiſe to God. For what is a Covenanter but one that makes a promiſe? how do men enter into covenant, but by ſome act teſtifying aſſent to a promiſe? now in this ſenſe I ſhould grant his Major, and deny his Minor, which in this ſenſe is againſt ſenſe. For when did any hear or ſee, or otherwiſe perceive an infant of a believer make a promiſe to God, or by any act of his, ſhew his aſſent to own God for his God.

In the other form he ſaith, All ſuch as are in the Covenant ſhould be ſealed, and that expreſſion ſeems to have this ſenſe, That God by his act of promiſe as his words are page 103. engageth himſelf to be the God of believing Chriſtians, and their ſeed, which his words import, page 92. where having ſaid, All ſuch as are in the Covenant ſhould be ſealed, to prove it he allegeth, *Gen.* 17.7,9,10,14. Where the very ground why God would have them ſealed is becauſe of the Covenant, I will eſtabliſh my Covenant between me and thee, and thy ſeed after thee, &c.

So that the ſenſe of his argument ſhould be thus, All they who are in covenant, that is, to whom God hath promiſed to be their God, they ſhould be ſealed, &c. But all infants of believing, even Gentile parents, are in Covenant, that is, God hath promiſed to be their God: *Ergo.*

Of which I would deny both Major and Minor the minor being expreſly contrary to *Ro.*9.8 though it were underſtood of true believers, and moſt certainly falſe of believers only in profeſſion, to whom, eſpecially thoſe of the Gentiles, God never promiſed to be God, much leſs to their natural ſeed; yet the minor muſt be true of them, or elſe this argument proves not they are to be baptized, which is their practiſe.

But ſeeing the Argument for infant-baptiſm will not hold in theſe ſenſes of the promiſe, *Gen.* 17.7. (though the firſt ſenſe be that which they give of that promiſe, when they diſpute againſt *Arminians*, and apply it to the elect only,

as

as the words of many ſhew, cited in my *Examen* part. 3. S. 4. in my *Præcurſor* S. 10. Mr. *M.* himſelf ſo expounds it with Mr. *Bayn* pag. 102. of his *Defence*) therefore Mr. *M.* hath another ſenſe to which he flies. He talks of an outward and an inward Covenant, page 120. and page 112. he tells us, That he means all the infants of believers are in the outward Covenant, that is, they are to be reputed as in the Covenant, in reſpect of the outward adminiſtration, outward Ordinances and Church-privileges, which when it comes to application is meant of no other than baptiſm now, and circumciſion heretofore, and therefore as I ſhew in my *Apology* S. 10. the Major propoſition is meerly nugatory in this ſenſe; All that are in the Covenant, that is, that are to have the initial ſeal ſhould be ſealed with the initial ſeal, which were true, but ridiculous. And in truth I may (how ever it be cenſured) apply to the diſcourſe in this argument, be it Mr. *Ms.* or the Aſſemblies, the Poets words, *Parturiunt montes, naſcetur ridiculus mus.*

And yet there is more ſhuffling in this thing. Mr. *M.* to make ſome ſhew of anſwering my inſtances of women and males under eight daies old, not being circumciſed, though in covenant, limits his Major in the firſt form thus [ſuppoſing them onely capable of the ſeal, and no ſpecial bar put in againſt them] in the other form thus [unleſs they be either uncapable of it, or are exempted by particular diſpenſation] By the Bar, he means Gods prohibition, as theſe words, page 93. ſhew, God forbad them to have the ſeal till they were eight daies old. But a prohibition and a diſpenſation are not all one: a Prohibition is of a thing, that may not be done; a diſpenſation ſuppoſeth the thing is to be done, yet frees the perſon from doing it in ſome caſes for ſome time. But letting paſs this exception againſt the expreſſions, I would know how God put a bar, or forbad infants under eight daies old to be circumciſed. I know no other but this, that God appointed the eighth day for them to be circumciſed. Now if this be a forbidding to circumciſe before (as I acknowledge it is, and ſo do many Proteſtant Divines, as *Pareus Comment. in* Gen. 17.11. *Errant maſculi in fœdere ab utero, &c. anticipare vero ſignum nec licebat, nec opus erat*) then that is forbidden, which is otherwiſe than God appointed: and ſith our Lord Chriſt hath not appointed any to be baptized till they be diſciples, he hath prohibited any to be baptized till they be diſciples, and ſo, what ever the *London Miniſters* ſay in their words above recited, there is juſt ground even a prohibition, againſt baptizing infants. And ſo the Minor of Mr. *Ms.* argument is not true. Upon all this debate I profeſs I find ſo much inconſiderateneſs, or confuſedneſs, or nonſenſe, or untruth, or trifling, if not juggling in Mr. *Ms.* arguing, that I muſt vary my anſwer, as I find his meaning ſometimes denying the Syllogiſm as being tautological, and not having three terms, or which is all one, any *medium* to prove his Concluſion by, but only repeating the Concluſion in different phraſes, and thoſe ſome of them new minted gibberiſh or non-ſenſe, ſometimes the Major, ſometimes the Minor, ſometimes both. However, ſith it is my task, I ſhall view what he ſaith.

Page 92. he ſaith thus, Which is apparent in the very firſt inſtitution of an initial ſeal *Gen.* 17. 7, 9, 10, 14. Where the very ground why God would have them ſealed is becauſe of the Covenant, I will eſtabliſh my Covenant between me and thee, and thy ſeed after thee in their generations for an everlaſting Covenant to be a God unto thee, and thy ſeed after thee: thou ſhalt keep

my Covenant therefore: and this is my Covenant which ye ſhall keep; every man-child among you ſhall be circumciſed, and afterward in the fourteenth, the ſeal is by a metonymia called the Covenant, for that it is apparent, not only that God commanded them who were in covenant to be circumciſed, but that they ſhould therefore be circumciſed becauſe of the Covenant, or in token of the Covenant between God and them; and he that rejected or neglected the ſeal, is ſaid not only to break Gods commandment, but his Covenant. So that becauſe the initial ſeal was added to the Covenant, and ſuch as received it received it as an evidence of the Covenant, or becauſe they were in Covenant; I therefore concluded, that by Gods own will, ſuch as enter into Covenant ought to receive the ſeal, ſuppoſing ſtill they were capable of it. So that to lay circumciſion upon Gods command, and the Covenant of grace too, are well conſiſtent together; for the command is the cauſe of the exiſtence of the duty, but the Covenant of grace is the motive to it.

Anſw. Here is all Mr. Ms. ſtrength to prove his Major, that it was Gods will that ſuch as are in Covenant from *Abrahams* time, and ſo forward, ſhould be ſealed with the initial ſeal of the Covenant, which he after alters thus. Such as enter into Covenant ought to receive the ſeal. But there is nothing but confuſedneſs and impertinency in all this paſſage.

1. He tells us, There is the inſtitution of an initial ſeal *Gen.* 17. 7, 9, 10, 14. which he muſt underſtand of an initial ſeal in general or indefinite, or elſe it reacheth not to baptiſm, and ſo it is impertinently alleged. But it is palpably falſe that there is in thoſe words any other initial ſeal inſtituted then circumciſion, and I dare boldly ſay, it is a meer dotage to maintain that in thoſe words there is any rule about baptiſm or any other ordinance of God then circumciſion. The very words are, thou ſhalt keep my Covenant, and this covenant is demonſtrated to be male-circumciſion and no other, of which the time and part are preciſely ſet down.

2. He ſhould prove that all that were in covenant had title to the initial ſeal or right; but his Concluſion is of their duty, not of their title. Now it cannot be ſaid to be infants duty; the command was not given to them, nor doth M. *M.* I think, aſſert it as their duty, but as their privilege; and yet all that the text inferreth, or Mr. *M.* concludes from it, concerns the connexion between the duty of circumciſing, which belongs not to infants, and the covenant, not between the Privilege of circumciſion paſſively taken, which belongs to infants and the Covenant, which is another impertinency.

3. Be it granted that the propoſition to be proved is of duty in parents or Miniſters, yet he is neceſſitated to grant the command was the cauſe of the exiſtence of the duty, and more plainly page 182. The formal reaſon of their being circumciſed, was the command of God: which if true, there's no duty without the command, whatever intereſt there might be in the Covenant: and therefore the propoſition is true, all that enter into Covenant ought to receive the ſeal if it be commanded, not otherwiſe: and ſo neither infant-circumciſion nor infant baptiſm can be proved from the bare intereſt in the covenant, without a particular command for each of them.

4. He ſaith, the Covenant of grace was the motive, page 182. the Covenant of grace, or their Church-ſtate was the motive to it, and the thing it related to. But he tells us not to whom it was a motive. A motive is an impulſive

cauſe, whereby a perſon is perſwaded or induced to do a thing. But it was not the motive to infants, for they conceived not of it. His words [the very ground why God would have them ſealed, is becauſe of the Covenant] do intimate: that he means the covenant was the motive to God to give the command. But what it makes to his purpoſe I do not conceive. For though that were the motive to God, yet Gods motive is not the rule of the duty, but his command to us; nor the evidence of our privilege, but his declaration of his Will. But be it a motive to *Abraham*, yet it was but a motive for the more full engagement of him to that which without that motive he had been to do by reaſon of the Command, nor any further evidence of privilege then was imported by other Declaration of Gods will.

5. Though Circumciſion did relate to the Covenant, and it was received as an evidence of the Covenant, yet this proves not that it was received by each perſon, becauſe he was in covenant, nor that the being in Covenant was the rule of the uſing that rite, that they which were in Covenant ſhould have it, and they that were not in Covenant, ſhould not have it, which is the thing to be proved, but is certainly falſe, as I have by many inſtances ſhewed.

6. If all this were granted, yet that this rule did reach further then the uſe of circumciſion is not proved here: and what is brought elſewhere ſhall be ſhewed in it's place to be much ſhort of proving any ſuch general rule about an initial ſeal, as is here by Mr. *M.* averred. But let us ſee what his proof amounts to about circumciſion.

1. He urgeth, That circumciſion is called a token of the Covenant; But this proves no more then this, that the uſe of Circumciſion was to be a ſign God made ſuch a Covenant, and would fulfill it: not that every one that was in Covenant was to be circumciſed, or that every one that was to be circumciſed was in covenant.

2. That it is termed the Covenant. But this proves no more than the former, ſith it is acknowledged to be ſo called only by a *metonymia*, of putting the thing ſignifyed for the ſign.

3. The particle [therfore] is thus urged: God not only commanded them who were in covenant, to be circumciſed, but that they ſhould [therfore] be circumciſed becauſe of the covenant, or in token of the Covenant between God & them;

But 1. The particle [therfore] though it be in our laſt tranſlation, yet in the *Hebrew* it is only ואתה, and may be rendered, *And thou*, or, *But thou*, as by the *Tigur*: it is *& tu*, by *Pareus*, *tu autem*, *Piſcator*, *tu verò*.

2. Let it be read [therefore] and the inference be from the Covenant; yet that the inference is from the promiſe in the ſeventh verſe onely, and not from the eighth verſe, which is next, or the reſt of the promiſes, v. 4, 5, 6, cannot be ſhewed.

3. Let theſe things be granted: yet that it imports this rule to be taken from the Covenant, thoſe who are in Covenant are to be circumciſed, not others, hath no colour of proof, nor any ſhew of truth in it, ſith it is clear in the caſe of *Iſhmael* to whom that promiſe did not belong nor any in that covenant, yet he was to be circumciſed, and others were not to be circumciſed, to whom the promiſes were made.

4. He urgeth thus: And he that rejected or neglected the ſeal is ſaid not only to break Gods commandment, but his Covenant: ſo that becauſe the initi-

al seal was added to the Covenant, and such as received it, received it as an evidence of the Covenant, or because they were in covenant. To which I reply.

Two waies a man may be said to break Gods covenant: one by breaking the command, which was in reference to the Covenant, or enjoyned in testimony of it; and if this be his sense, then Mr. *Ms.* speech is trifling, when he saith, he that rejected or neglected the seal, is said not only to break Gods commandment, but his Covenant, it being all one to break the command and the covenant. The other sense is; he hath broken my covenant, that is, as *Piscat. sch.* on *Gen.* 17. 14 as much as is in him, by depriving himself of the grace of God, promised in the Covenant. For otherwise the incredulity of man doth not make void the faith of God, *Rom.* 3. 3. But take it either way, it proves not that which was to be proved, that the rule about circumcising persons was their interest in the Covenant. All that follows on this is, that the observance of circumcision was strictly enjoined under this penalty, that otherwise they should be cut off from Gods people, and so deprived of the benefit of the Covenant signified; but this doth not prove that every one circumcised was in the Covenant, and should have the benefit of the Covenant. So that though it be granted which Mr. *M.* saies, That to lay Circumcision upon Gods command, and the Covenant of grace too, are well consistent together; Yet his Major is not proved, That it was Gods Will that such as are in Covenant from *Abrahams* time, and so forward, should be sealed with the initial seal of the Covenant, supposing them only capable of the seal, and no special bar put in against them by God himself. Nor is Mr. *M.* more happy in answering my exceptions.

Whereas you allege, saith he, concerning *Melchisedec*, *Lot*, *Job*; we find no such thing, that they either received this seal of Circumcision or were tyed to it. I reply, its very hard for you to prove that *Melchisedeck* was then alive: and had he been alive, he was of an higher Order, and above that Pædagogy.

Answ. I grant it cannot be demonstratively proved, that he was alive: yet it being probable he was, who not many years before met *Abraham*, though he were in Covenant, yet being not appointed to be circumcised, it overthrows the proposition by which Mr. *Ms.* Enthymeme was to be proved, That all that are *fœderati*, must be *signati*. Yea Mr. *Ms.* answer here, That he was above that Pædagogy, doth plainly intimate that circumcision was peculiar to that Pædagogy, and so the rule about circumcision not obligatory to Christian Gentiles, to whom that Pædagogy is abolished, and who have a Priest of an higher Order, to wit, that of *Melchisedec*. As for *Lot*, he denies not that he then lived, but saith, That no Scripture saith he was not circumcised, which he saith of *Job* also, whose time is uncertain, by reason of the Scripture-silence, though probably he was of *Esaus* posterity. But in matters of fact, *à non Scripto ad non factum non valet consequentia.*

Nevertheless for *Lot*, it seems to me very unlikely he should be circumcised living then in *Sodom*, not in *Abrahams* house, and no mention made of him, when *Abraham* circumcised his own house, and *Lots* posterity being after uncircumcised *Jerem.* 9. 26. And for *Job*, what time soever he lived, it is likely he was an *Edomite*; who are reckoned for uncircumcised *Ier.* 9. 26. and there are no passages that give any intimation of his acquaintance with *Israel*. But

if

if these serve not the turn, the example of *Cornelius* undeniably uncircumcised and not blamed for want of it, though undoubtedly in the Covenant of grace, being one that feared God with all his house, and his prayers and alms heard, therefore he was not to be circumcised though in the Covenant of grace, nor all that enter into Covenant ought to be sealed with the initial seal, though capable, and no bar put in against them by God.

I instanced in male infants of Jews under eight daies old, who were not to be circumcised, though in Covenant. Mr. *M.* answers, To that of infants there was a peculiar exemption of them by God himself; whether for any typical reason, or in regard they were not fit in nature to undergo so sharp a pain, as was to be endured in Circumcision before the seventh and Critical day was past, or whether for any other cause, I dispute not; it is sufficient, God forbad them to have the seal till they were eight daies old.

Answ. This is a grant of the objection, and overthrows the proposition of Mr. *M.* in his *Sermon*; All that are in Covenant are to be sealed. And the forbidding, being onely by not appointing it, the proposition can be true onely in this sense; All those in Covenant are to be circumcised, to whom it is appointed, and no other; But infants are in Covenant, and to them it is appointed to be sealed with the initial seal in the New Testament: *Ergo.*

Wherein I should grant the Major, and deny the Minor, and infer that without appointment interest in the Covenant did not make capable, no not of Circumcision, though it's likely infants might have born it in the end of the seventh day as well as on the eighth.

I alleged that no females in *Abrahams* family, though in Covenant, were to be circumcised. To this Mr. *M.* answers. For the women, they were not *Subjectum capax circumcisionis*, there was in them a natural impediment against it, therefore could it not be enjoined them: and suppose some men amongst them, or some who turned proselytes to them, had not had a *præputium* (as some sort of Eunuchs) this Ordinance had not reached them; whether the wisdom of God purposely chose a sign that women might not be capable of receiving it, for some typical use, as some conjecture, it is sufficient they were not capable of it, and were exempted from it by God himself.

Answ. If it be true, which many Authors relate, that the *Habassines*, and *Iacobites* do at this day, circumcise females; then it is not true, they were uncapable of it by reason of natural impediment. But if it be true which Mr. *M.* saith, yet Gods chosing a sign of which they were not capable, and that for a typical use, when he might have chosen one as baptism, of which both sexes were capable, it is an evidence, That it was not the Will of God since *Abrahams* time, and so forward, that all in Covenant should be sealed with the initial seal, which was Mr *Ms.* proposition. Nor do his two limitations added in his *Defence* help him. For if incapacity and non-appointment be a sufficient exemption from the initial seal, yea a prohibition of it, then his proposition is but what I contend for, that those in covenant to whom God appoints it and no other, are to have the initial seal; which is as much as I would evince, that it is not bare interest in the Covenant without institution or appointment that gives right to a person to claim either circumcision or baptism, nor warrants a baptizer to admit a person to baptism. And therefore though it were yielded that all infants of believers were in covenant, yet they have not right

to either initial seal without a command, or institution concerning each rite.

As for Mr. *M's.* general proposition as he states it, as it advantageth it him not for the reason last given, so it may be granted, if he mean by exemption or particular dispensation, the non-appointment of it. For then I am sure infants of believers are exempted from baptism till they be proved disciples of Christ, or believers by profession; which if it could be proved, we need not fetch it from circumcision and the Covenant. From which they that deduce infant-baptism, do but in vain weary themselves and others, as they that seek to draw water out of a pumice stone.

But there is some more in Mr. *M.* about womens circumcision, which I must not omit. Mr. *M.* in his Sermon had answered, that women were circumcised virtually in the Males. To which I answered, that a virtual circumcision was not enough to make good his argument: For then his Syllogism must have four terms, thus. They that are in Covenant must be sealed actually in their now persons, or virtually in others. But infants of believers are in the Covenant, therefore they are to be sealed. If the Conclusion be meant of actual sealing in their own persons then there are four terms, and more in the Conclusion then in the premisses. But if it be meant disjunctively, they are to be sealed actually or virtually: then it is less than is to be proved, his business being to prove that they were to be sealed actually. For a virtual sealing is less than Mr. *M.* would have, and might be granted without any detriment to the cause of Anti-pædobaptism. To this Mr. *M.* makes no answer at all, but chargeth me with a scoff where there was none, tells me it is like refuting *Bellarmine* with, *Thou lieſt*: whereas I did shew wherein his answer was insufficient, and that by putting his Syllogism into form, according to his own meaning, and then shewing how it would not conclude what he should prove. And to this in his Defence he makes no answer, but tells us, what his plain meaning was, which is nothing to the present point: he should have shewed how, with that exposition or limitation his argument would prove actual sealing of infants in their own persons. But to slight a reason and speak nothing to it, is not to answer, but to shift.

But I also said, to speak exactly, women were not circumcised virtually in the Males: For that supposeth they might receive it in their own persons, whereas it had been a sin in them to be circumcised, God not appointing it: which is confirmed by the like, it would be sin for the male to be circumcised afore the eighth day, sith it was not appointed: which may now be confirmed by Mr. *M's.* words, that God forbad them to have the seal till they were eight daies old.

To this saith Mr. *M.* But first give me leave to observe by the way how you pinch me with a point of Law, that no man can be said virtually to have that by his Proxy or Attorney, which he might not actually receive himself in his own person. I question whether this be good Law; but I am confident it is bad Divinity; sure we sinned virtually in *Adam*, yet we could not actually, though the sin of *Adam* be ours by imputation. The Sun is virtually hot, yet Philosophers say, it's not actually. And the Jews of old offered to God such things by the hands of the Priests, who were their Proxies in that work, which they might not offer in their own persons, yea and received such things by the

hand

hand of the High Priest (who bare their names in the most holy place) which they might not receive in their own persons immediately: and the Saints now in this world do virtually and *quoad effectum juris*, receive some such privileges in Christ their Advocate, who in their right is at Gods right hand, which here they are not capable of receiving immediatrly in their own persons.

Answ. My words were not as Mr. *M.* recited them, but thus. He is said virtually to have a thing by another, as by a Proxy or Atturney, that might receive it by himself; yet *quoad effectum juris*, according to the effect of Law another's receiving it is, as if he had received it. In which I understand by [having a thing] that having a thing which is by possession of it, as a benefit, privilege, commodity, and by [might receive it] without any prohibition in Law, and that he receives it not in his own person, is onely from some temporary impediment, as minority, absence or the like. And this according to that skill I have in such terms, I conceive still to be the meaning of them. Nor do Mr. *Ms.* instances take me any whit off from it, being without fear of being chargeable with bad Law or Divinity. For our sinning in *Adam* is not receiving something as a benefit: the Suns heat is natural, not by vertue of any Political Law, it is not having as a proxy or atturney for another; the High Priests offering for the people was an action in their stead, not receiving a benefit for them, and what they received for the people which they might not receive in their own persons immediately was not by reason of any prohibition, but from some other cause, nor were they in imparting it, the peoples Proxies or Atturneys, but Gods: were it an answer from God or any other thing they received for them, if God had immediately communicated it to them, it had not been their sin. And the like may be said of what Christ receives for us as our Advocate. But the circumcising of women had been a sin forbidden, according to Mr. *Marshalls* and others doctrine before recited, they were prohibited to be circumcised, it being limitted to the males on the 8. day. Mr. *M.* addes.

I also obiter desire you to remember this expression of yours, that it had been a sin for a child to have been circumcised after the eight day was past, and try how you will reconcile this with another opinion of yours delivered elsewhere; *viz.* That Circumcision might be administred oftner then once; surely those other times must be after the 8. day.

Answ. Where I deliver this, that Circumcision might be administred oftner than once, I remember not, except in my Examen, page 118. However I conceive no necessity of Circumcision or baptism above once, yet I profess my self unsatisfyed in this, that there is either a command that a person be but once circumcised, or a person once onely baptized. And my reason of the speech is from hence. 1 *Cor.* 7. 18. the Apostle saith, Is one called circumcised, μὴ ἐπισπάσθω, Let him not be drawn up, that is, let him not draw up his fore-skin: we translate it, Let him not become uncircumcised. Whence it may be perceived, that some Jews had an art to draw up their fore-skin. Now in such a case, while the Law stood in force, I conceive he was bound to be circumcised again, because it was to abide in his flesh, *Gen.* 17. 13. Nor do my words at all contradict this, when I say more fully then Mr. *M.* recites them; It had been a sin for a child to be circumcised afore, or after the eigth day in them that altered or swerved from the appointment of God: where I make the sin not to be

the doing of it, on the eighth day, and then doing it again (though I deny not but unneceſſarily to do it after the eight day had been ſin, that day being determined for it) but not doing it that day which God appointed by thoſe that altered or ſwerved from that appointment unneceſſarily: which in the caſe mentioned, and any other of the like, might be done after the eighth day.

But M. *M.* will confirm his proofs, that the women were circumciſed in the men.

My firſt, ſaith he to me, was, that the whole houſe of *Iſrael* are in the Scripture ſaid to be circumciſed. You anſwer, that by the whole houſe of Iſrael muſt not be meant all, but the Major part. But Sir do you imagine that any of your judicious Readers can be ſatisfyed with this anſwer, when (you know well enough) that the Circumciſion is put for the Church and people of God in oppoſition to the uncircumciſed, that is, all the reſt of the World who were not the people of God.

When *Peter* was to go to the circumciſion, and *Paul* to the Gentiles to preach the Goſpel; does not circumciſion include the women Jews as much as the men, in oppoſition to Gentiles, as well as the word Gentiles includes women Gentiles as well as the men, to whom *Paul* was ſent? *Gal.*2.8,9. Surely it muſt needs be granted, that not only the Major or nobler part, but the whole nation of the Jews both men and women, are there meant by circumciſion, which could not have been, if in ſome ſenſe they were not to be accounted circumciſed.

Anſw. My Anſwer might ſatisfie any judicious Reader, ſpecially if the texts had been fairly ſet down by Mr. *M.* wherein I ſhew all *Iſrael*, and all the houſe of *Iſrael* muſt be underſtood Synecdochically, 1 *Sam.*7.3. *Acts* 2. 36. *Acts* 13. 24. And if in the term [circumciſion] be not a Synecdoche of the whole for the part; not onely every individual in *Iſrael* muſt be in ſome ſenſe accounted circumciſed, but be actually circumciſed alſo in their own perſons. Nor againſt ſuch a Synecdoche doth it make, that circumciſion ſtands in oppoſition to the uncircumciſed, which is meant of every individual. For neither is it true, when the uncircumciſed are mentioned, it is meant of every individual, there being many of thoſe nations that were circumciſed; and if it were true, yet the oppoſition doth not prove every individual Jew circumciſed, any more then when they are called the holy Nation in oppoſition to the Gentiles: as when it was ſaid, *Iſrael* was holineſs to the Lord, *Jerem.* 2.3. every *Iſraelite* or *Jew* muſt be counted holy in ſome ſenſe: but the terms are attributed Synecdochically. And for the other inſtance, I grant circumciſion muſt include *Gal.* 2.8. women as well as men, becauſe *Peter* was to go to them: but this proves not that women were in ſome ſenſe accounted circumciſed in the males, but that they are part of the nation which were called the Circumciſion Synecdochically, becauſe of the males. And for the term Gentiles, there muſt be in like manner a Synecdoche conceived of the whole for a part, elſe he ſhould be ſent to preach to infant males as well as women of years.

Secondly, ſaith Mr. *M.* I argued thus, no uncircumciſed might eat the Paſſoever; *Ergo* their women might not have eaten it, if in ſome ſenſe they had not been circumciſed. Your anſwer is, This is to be limitted *pro ſubjecta materia*, none that ought to be circumciſed might eat the Paſſeover, unleſs they were circumciſed. But this anſwer is altogether inſufficient. For where is this diſtinction of yours found or founded in the word of God? other Diſtinctions about eating the Paſſeover are clearly found: the clean might eat it, the unclean

might

might not eat it, the circumcised might, the uncircumcised might not: But of your limitation there is *altum silentium.*

Answ. Mr.*Ms.* conclusion is, That in some sense women were circumcised, and before in some sense they were counted circumcised, neither of which is the same with this [they were circumcised virtually in the males, or the males were circumcised in their stead as their Proxy or Atturney.]

2. My answer was right, and to his Demand, where it is found in the word of God? I answer by another demand, where is his limitation found in Gods word, that women might eat the Passeover, because they were in some sense accounted circumcised? Sure the words are, *Exod.* 12. 48. No uncircumcised person shall eat thereof, not as Mr.*M.* none but those that are counted in some sense circumcised may eat thereof: If there be in Scripture that which doth necessitate to a limitation of that speech, my limitation is as well in Scripture as his is: yea my limitation is plain and easie, whereas his limitation is liable to this objection, that when Gods Law requires persons to be circumcised that they might eat the Passeover, if Mr.*Ms.* limitation or explication be good, it should require no more but this, that persons in some sense should be accounted circumcised. For so Mr.*M.* understands the Law, and then, though the males were not actually circumcised, but virtually, in some sense, so accounted they might eat it, without breach of the Law, which absurdity doth not follow on my limitation, but follows inevitably on Mr.*Ms.*

2. Saith Mr.*M.* I demand further, where is there any command or institution for women to eat the Passeover (more than for women now to eat the Lords Supper) unless it be founded upon circumcision? yet in practice we know they did eat it? and if they eat it not as circumcised persons, tell me by what right they did it.

Answ. I have proved *Examen* part. 3. S. 12. pag. 112. *Postscript to my Apology* S. 11. that 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. & 10. 17. and 12. 13. *Acts* 20. 7. are expres precept and example for womens receiving the Lords Supper. And for eating the Passeover, there is an expresse precept, That all the Congregation of *Israel* shall keep it, *Exod* 12. 47. in which women were meant, and they were to eat according to the number of the Souls v. 4. and no leaven was to be in their habitation, v. 20. therfore either women must eat the Passeover, or else they must not eat bread: so that we need not go to circumcision for womens eating the Passeover. Yea, if we use no other way than that of Mr.*M.* it will not be proved that women ought to eat it. For *Exodus* 12. 48. no mention is made of any circumcised who are to eat it, but males; and though it be said, no uncircumcised might eat, yet it is not said, all circumcised must eat, much less they that are only in some sense counted circumcised. But Mr.*M.* seeks to make his advantage of this point thus.

If you say they were included in the Household *Exod.* 12. 3, 4. every household was to eat the Paschal Lamb, and there was no exception of women; I reply, first grant but the same consequence, that when we read so frequently in the New T. that whole households were baptized, and no exception of children, that therefore all the children in those households were baptized, and this Controversy is quickly ended.

Answ. If it were granted that we had no other way to prove women were to eat the Paschal Lamb (which yet we need not, as I have shewed) but from

*Exod.*12.3,4. in that every houſhold was to eat the Lamb, and there was no exception of Women, yet the conſequence were not good; whole houſholds were baptized, therefore infants, becauſe not expreſly excepted. For as *Exod.* 12. 3,4 infants are excepted from being required to eat the Lamb, though not in expreſs words, yet becauſe the thing to be done was not ſuch as could agree to infants of a few daies old, ſuppoſe eight or nine. So where *Act.*16.15,33. and 18.8. 1 *Cor.*1.16. the houſhold is ſaid to be baptized, beſides this, that no infants are expreſſed, in the ſame chapter or elſewhere, the ſpeech is plainly interpreted to be meant of thoſe that heard the word, and believed, as *Acts* the eleventh chapter, and fourteenth verſe, and ch.16. v.32,34. and 18.8.1*Cor.*16. 15. as if the holy Ghoſt had of purpoſe prevented this miſconſtruction and frivolous conſequence of Pædobaptiſts.

But ſaith Mr.*M.* I add further, it is not ſaid the whole houſhold ſhall eat it, for all uncircumciſed perſons were forbidden to eat it, and none but circumciſed perſons had warrant to eat it.

Anſw. It is ſaid, *Exod.* 12. 4. they ſhall eat the Lamb according to the number of Souls, i. e. *hominum Piſc. Schol. in locum*, every man according to his eating, which is a plain precept for women to eat who could eat.

Yea further, ſaith Mr.*M.* ſuppoſe ſome words in the inſtitution ſhould reach the Jewiſh women, yet how doth it reach the women Gentiles who ſhould prove Proſelytes to them? For *Exodus* chapter 12. verſe 48, 49. there is order taken for the male ſtranger, let all his males be circumciſed, and then let him come near and keep it, but there is not any word that takes order for the ſtrangers females.

Anſwer. It is ſaid verſe fourty ſeven, That all the Congregation of *Iſrael* ſhall keep it, and the Proſelytes of Righteouſneſſe, women as well as men were of that Congregation, and verſe fourty nine, it is ſaid, One Law ſhall be to him that is homeborn, and unto the ſtranger that ſojourneth among you: if then the Law appointed the *Iſraeliti∫h* women to eat, the ſame law appointed the Proſelyte Women to eat. So that notwithſtanding Mr.*Ms.* vain hope, my exception againſt the conſequence of his Argument, *They are fœderati; Therefore they are to be ſignati*, ſtand good and it is not yet proved, that bare intereſt in the Covenant *Geneſis* 17. or the Covenant of grace did intitle to Circumciſion, much leſs to baptiſm, which were enough to overthrow his firſt argument.

But ſith it is my task, I will now go on to the reſt of his Diſpute, taking in by the way Maſter *Blakes* third ſection of the 42.chapter of his *Vindic. fœderis.*

SECT.

SECT. XIX.

Mr. Blakes *exceptions againſt my Speeches in the point about the connexion between the Covenant, and initial ſeal, are refelled.*

MR. *Blake* aſſerts a reality of connexion between the Covenant and initial ſeal, and firſt he meddles with my Examen, and then with my Anti-pædobaptiſm. To my objection that the Propoſition is not true, that all that were federate in *Abrahams* family, were to be ſigned, for neither Males afore the eighth day, nor females were to be circumciſed, beſides his avouching Maſter *Marſhalls* anſwer as ſufficient, which is reviewed before, he ſaith, Is there no connexion between them, becauſe he that receives into Covenant and appoints the ſeal, hath preſcribed a time when it ſhall be applyed?

To which I ſay, it proves that there is not a connexion between being federate, and to be ſigned, to make this Propoſition true, All that are federate are to be ſigned, barely in that they are federate. For they are federate the firſt, ſecond, third, fourth, fifth, ſixth, ſeventh day, as well as the eighth, yet not to be ſigned, whereas if there was ſuch a connexion between them according to Gods will, that the one being put, the other is to be put, they would be to be ſigned as ſoon as ever they are federate. And if it be Gods will that they ſhould be ſigned, but not till the appointed time after, I might ſay that though infants were federate, yet they were not to be ſigned with baptiſm till Gods appointed time, which is not till they be diſciples, and ſo infant baptiſm is not proved from their being in Covenant, the Major Propoſition, All that are in Covenant are to be ſigned, being true only with this limitation, in the appointed time, which is not for baptiſm till they be Diſciples. And whereas in anſwer to my objection, that if infants have right to the ſeal by being in covenant, then they have right to the Lords Supper, he anſwers.

1. That in baptiſm there is no more of neceſſity than to be paſſive. This is falſe, for baptiſm is enjoined as a duty, and ſuch as is to have repentance and faith antecedent Mark chap. 16. 16. *Acts* the 2. chap. 38. *Act.* chap. 8. verſe 37.

2. He grants that infants have true title to the Lords Supper, *jus ad rem*, not *jus in re*, a right to it, yet by reaſon of infancy have their actual intereſt ſuſpended.

But 1. ſtill Mr. *Blake* ſpeaks of the Lords Supper, and of baptiſm, as of priviledges meerly, whereas the Scripture ſpeaks of each as a duty as well as a priviledge.

2. By the ſame diſtinction an anſwer is given to him concerning infants baptiſm, that though they have the right to it, yet by reaſon of infancy, the actual intereſt of it is to be ſuſpended, they being no more able to profeſs the faith, till they be grown to ſome riper age then a Cradle King to rule a Kingdome.

So that Mr. *Blakes* anſwers yield more exceptions againſt Mr. *Ms.* argument, confirm it not at al, but ſhew how we may grant his Major, and yet ſo limit it that it will be too ſhort of proving baptiſm of federate perſons in infancy:

cy: and these passages of Master *Blake* appear to be Cavils and not Answers.

He next sets upon the fifth section of the first part of my Review, and excepts,

1. That I shew not where to find Mr. *Baillees* words. But if he had looked into my Letter mentioned, he had found them quickly in the third section.

2. That I denyed the Metaphor of a seal to be rightly made, the *genus* of a rite, as of baptism, to which he replies in his flirting fashion. We shall expect another letter to shew Saint *Pauls* definition, *Rom.* 4.11. to be alike light (who runs upon the same errour, if an errour) when he saies that Circumcision is a sign and seal, there is the *genus* and the *differentia* lies in these words to distinguish it from other signs, and seals of the righteousness of faith. The nature of a Sacrament stands in a figure, and the whole efficacy of it in the use. And how else then should the nature and use of it be held out?

To which I answer, *Paul* doth not give a definition, *Rom.*4.11. of circumcision, much less doth he define a Sacrament in general. Every Definition is reciprocal with the thing defined, but Mr.*Bl.* I presume will not say, every circumcision is a seal of the righteousness of faith, and every seal of the righteousness of faith is circumcision. Besides individuals are not wont to be defined, but what is there said is said of the singular circumcision of *Abraham*, and no other. The title given to *Abrahams* circumcision doth but shew what the use of it was to him, not what was the constant nature, and use of it on and to others. Which appears from the particularizing circumstances so exactly noted by the Apostle, to wit, the times of his justification and circumcision, which do shew that it was appropriated to *Abrahams* circumcision, on his own body, what he there said of Circumcision. There is no more reason to make this the definition of Circumcision [the seal of the righteousness of faith] then to make that [1 *Tim* 6.10. the root of all evil] the definition of the love of money, or that [*Heb.*6.16. the end of all strife] the definition of an oath, or that [v.19. the anchor of the soul firm and stable] the definition of hope, or that [*Heb.*11.1. the evidence of things not seen] the definition of faith A seal cannot be the *genus* of it, being a Metaphor, for a Metaphor shews not what it is, but what it is like. Circumcision is an action as it is from the agent, as in the subject a passion. The relation that comes to it is not from its nature, but by institution, and is the end of it, rather than the *genus*, rather for what it is, than what it is. A seal is an artificial body compound of a substance and figure, which cannot be said of Circumcision. What Mr.*Bl.* saith, that the nature of a Sacrament stands in a figure, cannot be true of such a figure as is in a Seal, for so baptism, the Passeover, the Lords Supper should be no Sacrament sith they do not make any figure on the body, nor of figure of speech, for so a Sacrament should not be a visible sign, but an audible. I grant the use of it is to resemble by a visible sign some other thing, as the breaking bread, Christs body broken, and in that sense it may be called a figure as *Augustine* called the bread the figure of Christs body. But the use belongs to the difference to distinguish it from the same action or passion used to another purpose, not to the *genus*. And yet sign and seal of the righteousnesse of faith, cannot be the difference to distinguish a Sacrament from the preaching of the Gospel, for the preaching of the Gospel by word or writing is a sign or seal of the righteousness

teousnes of faith. What is said *Rom.*4.11. that *Abraham* received the sign of circumcision, the seal of the righteousnes of faith, is not all one with this [a seal of the Covenant of grace] For it is added [which he had yet, being uncircumcised] and therefore was a sign not of a promise or covenant, concerning a thing to be done, but of a thing accomplished or already done. I see not how *Rom.*4.11. either the general nature of a Sacrament, or the special nature of circumcision may be said to be defined. Nor do I conceive it true which Mr. *Bl.* saith, the whole efficacy of a Sacrament is in the use: I suppose baptism, and the Lords Supper have their efficacy in comforting, moving to holines, love, &c. after the use. The nature and use of a Sacrament may be otherwise held out then Mr. *Bl.* doth, which I now omit. It is sufficient at present to shew the emptines of Mr. *Bls.* dictates. And for my rejecting of the common use of the terms of seals of the Covenant, and initial seals as Synonymous to sacraments and baptism, especially in disputes wherein proper terms should be used, I have given sufficient reason from the abuses of Pædobaptists inferring errours from a late devised term, and imposing on mens consciences: yet I profes, if baptism were granted to be a seal or initial seal, that I think that it would not follow, that it hath that relation to the Covenant; that infants in Covenant must not be denied it, but that it is a frivolous argument, infants are in covenant, therefore they must have the initial seal of the Covenant: for which if I had no other reason, yet that one of Mr. *Bl.* that though a person be in Covenant, and have right to the seal, yet he is not to have it till the appointed time, it were sufficient to justifie my censure.

Mr. *Bl.* excepts against my speech, that to have the promise, and to be a disciple or believer, are not all one, for he conceives to have a promise in Scripture phrase is to possesse it, as those Jews after the flesh did possess, *Rom.* 9. 4. And how to possesse a promise without faith, he doth not yet understand.

Whereto I reply, that I find the term [promise] used in Scripture sometimes metonymically for the thing promised,, as *Luke* 24.49. when Christ saith, I send the promise of the Father upon you, he means the Holy Ghost promised, and it is true in this sense, to have a promise is to possesse it. But in proper acception the term [promise] notes the act of the person promising, as *Gal.* 3. 16. to *Abraham* and his seed were the promises made, or spoken. So likewise v.17,18. And in this sense he hath a promise, who hath not possession of the thing promised, and thus we usually say, I have not yet such an office, revenue, estate, &c. but I have a promise of it. In which sense I took it, and so it is true, that in this sense, a man may have the promise, and not be a believer or disciple as yet. And thus I conceive it taken in all the three places in the new Testament 2 *Cor.*7.1. 1 *Tim.*4.8. *Heb.*7.6. and in this sense a person may have a promise afore he is a believer.

Mr. *Blake* further excepts against me:

That 1. I make these terms all one, to have a promise, and to be a child of the promise.

2. That I make a child of the promise, *Rom.*9.8. to be all one with to be an elect person, as *Isaac* and *Jacob*, v.10,11,12. were children of the promise, to whom the promise was made before they were born.

But Mr. *Blake* saith, That to have a promise, and to be a child of promise, are two different things in Scripture; yet shews not the difference between them.

In

In that expreſſion *Rom.*9.8. the child of the promiſe (according to the uſuall *Hebraiſms*, *Child of light*, *Child of wrath*, *Son of perdition*, which note the perſon who is the ſubject or object of thoſe ſeveral terms attributed) is a perſon of whom, or for whom, the promiſe is made, and ſo it is all one with [to have the promiſe.]

But ſaith M. *Bl.* if the child of the promiſe were all one with to be elect, then (according to me) all the Jews according to the fleſh were elect perſons; they had the promiſes, yea thoſe that were actors in Chriſts death *Acts* 2.39. which he muſt needs yield to be an abſurdity.

To which I reply, I do not conceive how this is true according to me, that if children of the promiſe be all elect, all the Jews according to the fleſh were elect perſons. Sure I no where make all the Jews according to the fleſh children of the promiſe.

Yea the text *Rom.*9.8. is ſo expreſs againſt it, that the children of the fleſh, are denied to be children of Gods, that is, children of the promiſe, which the words ſhew to be equipollent. Yea it is the expreſs determination, v.6. that all that are of *Iſrael*, to wit, by natural generation, are not *Iſrael*, to whom the promiſe was made; nor all children (that is, of God, and of the promiſe) who are the ſeed of *Abraham*, v.7. But that no other were children of the promiſe, though the ſeed natural of *Abraham* and *Iſaac*: but elect perſons, the Apoſtle doth not onely aſſert, but prove it in *Eſau* and *Jacob*, v.10,11,12, 13. It is true, *Rom.*9.4. it is ſaid the promiſes were the Iſraelites: but whatever the promiſes there meant were, whether of ſpiritual or corporal good things, yet it follows not that of every *Iſraelite* were the promiſes any more than that of every *Iſraelite*, v. 5. was Chriſt according to the fleſh. Nor *Acts* 2. 39. is it ſaid that all the Jews according to the fleſh had the promiſes. But that the promiſe was to them, their children and all afar off, whom God ſhould call: the promiſe is attributed to none but the called of God. The generality of *Anti-Arminian* Proteſtants make children of the promiſe to be all one with the elect, *Rom.*9.8. ſome I allege in my *Exam.* part. 3. ſect. 4. ſome more in my *Præcurſor*, and more I meet with in my reading. It is not true which Mr. *Bl.* ſaith, that *Iſaac* being born by promiſe, all his poſterity originally were of the ſame birth, for the Apoſtle concludes the contrary of *Eſau*, *Rom.* 9. 10, 11, 12. The text *Gal.*4.28. is rightly brought to ſhew that all Jews according to the fleſh, are not the children of the promiſe, but as Mr. *Dicſon*, we, that is believing Chriſtians, who were born after the ſpirit, and preſented by them that were born after the fleſh, v. 29. that is, by the unbelieving Jew, who ſtuck to the legal covenant. Nor need we ſay, that all the viſible Churches of *Galatia* were born after the ſpirit, but ouely that the true believers in them were ſo. Nor is there a word of any privileges inferiour to juſtification, as the ſeries of the text ſhews, and many learned Proteſtants cleerly expreſs. That which Maſter *Blake* ſaith, he will maintain, that every one in Covenant is a believer, a diſciple, that believers are ſame formally, ſuch as in act aſſent to Goſpel revelations; ſome virtually, ſuch as have the privileges of profeſſing believers, that infants in Covenant are virtually believers, in that they are honoured with the privileges of believers, and that this diſtinction the Scripture warrants, are all vain dictates, there being not one Scripture that ever calls any a believer from a privilege, but from the act of aſſent or profeſſion of faith, nor

is

is there the leaſt colour for it out of Scripture to call infants in covenant believers without their own act of aſſent or profeſſion of faith, and therefore I let paſs theſe ſpeeches of M. *Bl.* as idle unproved talk, of which his book is full.

Mr. *Bl.* excepts againſt my ſpeech, ſome not yet born, ſome not yet called are in the covenant, have the promiſe of grace made to them. I have read (ſaith he) of a covenant entered with thoſe that at the inſtant time of the making of the Covenant were preſent, and with thoſe that were not preſent, *Deut.*29.15. with men of years, and them with their little ones, *Deut.* 29. 11. But I read not of a covenant actually made with any unborn.

Anſw. My expreſſion [are in Covenant] I confeſs that I remember not uſed in the Scripture, yet it is uſual in the writings of Pædobaptiſts, who uſually ſay, infants are in the Covenant of grace with their parents. The Aſſemblies larger Catechiſm avoucheth infants of parents, profeſſing faith in Chriſt within the Covenant. Mr. *M.* in his Sermon p.8.15, &c. And this expreſſion of theirs I knew not how to conceive they meant otherwiſe then thus, Infants have Gods promiſe of grace made to them, or for them, as in the Directory, the promiſe is made to believers and their ſeed. For infants ſaid to be in the covenant muſt be ſo by ſome act either their own, or the adminiſtrators, or Gods. Not by any act of their own, for they do nothing to that effect; not by the adminiſtrator of baptiſms act, for he doth nothing but baptize, and if his act be bringing into Covenant then bringing into covenant is all one with baptizing, and if an infidels child be baptized it is in Covenant. Beſides Pædobaptiſts aſſert they are within the Covenant afore they are baptized, as the Directory ſaith, they are fœderally holy before baptiſm. It remains then that it is by Gods promiſe. Now ſurely Gods promiſe to *Abraham*, and his ſeed *Gen.*17.7. which is uſually made the promiſe whereby infants of believers are in covenant, was many thouſand years ſince, 430. years before the law, *Gal.* 3. 16.17. Therefore even according to the uſual language of Pædobaptiſts infants of believers are in Covenant afore they are born: which Mr. *Bl.* had no cauſe to carp at (as he doth) but that it is almoſt all his art, eſpecially when I had to prevent it, ſo diſtinctly added to ſhew my meaning [have the promiſe of grace made to them] If Mr. *Bl.* have any other way whereby infants are in the covenant, as the parents vow, or profeſſion, or ſuretie for them, according to it; I ſuppoſe, infants may be ſaid to be in covenant afore they are born, ſith ſuch vows, profeſſion and promiſes may be made for them afore they are born. Let's conſider what Mr. *Bl.* ſaith. He tels us, he reads not of a covenant actually made with any unborn. And as I conceive by his Appendix to his *Vindic. fœderis*, as an addition to his firſt chapter, his reaſon is, becauſe he conceives that it is of the general nature of a covenant properly ſo called, that there be a mutual contract and agreement, which I ſhall examine when I conſider Mr. *Cobbets* part.1.c.3.ſect.9. of his *Iuſt Vindic.* For preſent, if this be true, neither can a Covenant be actually made with an infant born, ſith an infant born can no more contract, or agree, or conſent, then one unborn. Nevertheleſs I conceive, there is a covenant actually made with perſons unborn *Gen.* 9. 12. where God ſaith, This is the token of the Covenant which I make between me and you, and every living creature, that is, with you, for perpetual generations: which doth expreſs a covenant actually made with every living creature of all fleſh for perpetual generations, therefore for thouſands of perſons unborn. Yea

where he saith, he readeth of a Covenant entered into with those that were not present, *Deut.*29.15. he reads of a covenant made with persons unborn, as *Piscator*, *Ainsworth*, *Iackson*, *Grotius*, *the New Annot. The notes out of the Arch-bishop of* Yorks *Library*, &c. do conceive, and reason proves it: sith that covenant was made only with *Israel*, not with any other people then existent, but there was none of all *Israel* then born, which was not there that day, as appears from v.10.therfore those that were not there with them that day, can be no other then persons unborn, and so Mr.*Blake* saith not true, that he hath not read of a covenant actually made with any unborn. But were it granted that by them that were not present were meant persons existent then, there is no reason why a covenant may not as well be said to be actually made with the unborn as with the absent, who do not express any actual consent or agreement. Surely if it be true that the Covenant of grace was made with Christ afore the world for all the elect, or in the beginning of time, *Gen.*3.15. or at his death or resurrection, as many Divines speak, and sundry texts seem to intimate, *Gal.* 3. 16. 1 *Cor.* 11. 25. *Tit.* 1. 2. 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. *Job.* 6. 38, 39, 40. *John* 10. 15, 17, 18, 29, 30. *Iob.* 17. 9, 10, 20, 24. *Isa.* 53. 11, 12. *Psal.* 2. 7, 8. *Heb.* 1. 5, 6. *Heb.* 10. 7, 15, 16. *Heb.* 8. 6. *Heb.* 13. 20. it must of necessity be made with many persons unborn. But Mr.*Blake* adds.

Mr. *Tombs* seems here to make the Covenant and election to be one and the same, as by this passage, so by that which follows; but these Scripture still distinguishes.

To which I say, it is true that I make the elect and those that are in the Covenant of grace one and the same, but neither in that passage or any other, do I make the covenant and election to be one and the same, as Mr.*Blake* mistakes me.

He saith further; We find promises and prophecies, as to the taking into Covenant in time to come, *Ezek.*20. 37. but not any such respective to election.

To which I say, the prophecy of taking into Covenant, *Ierem.* 31. 33,34. is respective to election, or else God promises to write his Laws in their hearts, and not to remember their sins who are not elect.

He goes on. All the promises of call of the Gentiles is to bring them into the privileges of glory, formerly proper to the Jews. To be in covenant was their great privilege: And this is not conferred on the Gentiles before all time, but done in time, *Isaiah* 42. 6. when he brings them light, then he brings them into Covenant.

To which I say, The Jews privileges were some of them (as those *Rom.* 9. 4, 5.) such as God never promised to the Gentiles to bring them to, he never promised to make any entire nation little ones, servants, &c. to be his visible Church.

But God promised to the Gentiles the saving privileges of justification, adoption, regeneration, eternal life, *Ephes.*3.5,6. and this was onely to true believers or elect persons, verse. 11, 12. And these were in Covenant in respect of Gods act of promise before they were in being, in which sense alone infants may be said to be in the covenant of grace; but in respect of the conferring of the things promised and the possession of them by faith, so neither they then were in Covenant *Ephes.* 2.12. nor are infants now.

He

He adds, That text *Rom.*11. 26, 27, is too notoriously abused; a prophecy of their future call into covenant, is made a proof that they are already in covenant, upon that account we may make the resurrection (if not past, as the antient Hereticks *Hymeneus* and *Philetus* affirmed, 2 *Tim.* 2. 18. yet) at least present. There is like promise of the resurrection of the dead, as there is of the call of the Jews into Covenant, and resembled to the resurrection, as *Ezek.* 37. so also *Rom.* 11. 15. If by vertue of the text alleged they be already in covenant, by virtue of like Texts the dead are already raised.

Answ. Had Mr. *Bl.* either heeded my words, or been willing to give them any fair interpretation, he had forborn this censure, in which he doth too notoriously abuse me. I said, the Jews, *Rom.* 11. 26, 27. not yet born, or not yet called are in the Covenant, have the promise of grace made to them, which later words I put in on purpose to shew in what sense I said they were in covenant, to wit, in that they had the promise of grace made to them (in which sense I took the Pædobaptists to mean, that infants are in the covenant of grace, nor do I yet know how they can mean otherwise) and this is proved plainly from *Rom.* 11. 26, 27. That God hath promised to save all *Israel*, to turn away ungodliness from *Iacob*, and saith, this is his covenant unto them, when he shall take away their sins. I say not they are in covenant in respect of the things promised as already possessed, but that they are in covenant in respect of Gods act of promise, they have promise of that which they shall have when they are called, as I often express my self: which being rightly understood, the cavil of Mr. *Bl.* vanisheth of it self, for though the resurrection be not past, because of a promise of it, yet the term Covenant being the same with a promise they may be said to be in Covenant in respect of a promise made to them, who yet enjoy not the thing promised. Which is confirmed even from the common allegation of Pædobaptists, who say, that by vertue of the promise, *Gen.* 17. 7. to be a God to *Abraham* and his seed, infants of believers are in the covenant, which can be true only in respect of the promise made, which is as much before they are born as after.

To this Mr. *Bl.* answers, 1. That this can be an argument barely *ad hominem*; seeing though we affirm, yet he denies any such Covenant. I reply:

1. That it is true that I deny that *Gen.* 17. 7. there is a covenant made to believers and their seed, but I deny not the Covenant to be to *Abraham* and his seed, nor do I deny elect infants to be therein comprehended, and that afore they are born.

2. If it be only an argument barely *ad hominem*, yet it is sufficient, till the tenet on which it proceeds be disclaimed by them, which Mr. *Bl.* hath not yet the heart to do.

But he answers, 2. I say, as they were in being, so they were also in covenant, not actually, but potentially, which is nothing to Master *Tombes* his purpose.

I reply. To be potentially in Covenant may be meant either in respect of possession of the things promised, and so I grant they were in covenant onely potentially, or in respect of the making of the Covenant, and so they were in covenant actually, that is, the promise was made to them, and this is enough for my purpose to prove a person may be in covenant unborn, in which sense

onely infants are in covenant, and therefore if infants thus being in covenant make them visible Church-members, and give right to their baptism, by the same reason unborn or uncalled infidels have right to baptism.

Mr. *Bl.* page 386. saith, he willingly closeth with me, where I say, that the judgement of charity is no rule to a Minister whom to baptize; not do I dissent from what he saith, if his meaning be as the words seem, I as well know when any man is in covenant, as he knows when he is a believer: when any man doth avouch himself to be one of the people of God, as he knows when they professe to believe. I do confesse that by the same knowledge whereby any man is known, and so far as he is known to be a believer, he is known so far to be in covenant; he that avoucheth himself to be one of Gods people, and that professeth to believe is in appearance, and to be taken as in covenant, and a believer. But how doth Mr. *Bl.* know that this or that infant is in covenant and to be baptized? not by Gods promise, for there is no such promise of any Gentile believer, that all his infants, or any one in particular shall be his people, either by regenerating grace, or outward ordinance: not by profession of believing or avouching himself to be one of the people of God, for no infant doth, or can without miracle do it; therefore it must be by a judgement of charity (which Mr. *Bl.* agrees with me to be no rule to a Minister whom to baptize) or no way. And consequently were it granted (which is not) that being in covenant in respect of Gods promise of being a God to some infants of believers did give a title to baptism, yet no Minister could upon this ground baptize this or that particular infant, nor any infant now existent, sith he neither doth nor can know without special revelation, that God hath made this promise or covenant to it.

What he addes, And it appears when it is brought home, this is all his ground of challenge of baptism of persons in covenant, because their interest in covenant is not manifest, is not right. For I assert first, that bare interest in the Covenant, that is, as I have often said, this thing, that God hath promised to be his God, doth not of it self intitle a person to baptism, sith God hath made this promise to thousands yet unborn, and of those that are born to thousands yet uncalled, perhaps Jews, yet professed unbelievers, whom no man can say rightly to have title to baptism. 2. That if it were granted this interest in the covenant did intitle to baptism, yet no Minister can by this rule justify his baptizing of an infant, sith he neither hath, nor can have, ordinarily, knowledge, that the infant he baptizeth hath this interest in the Covenant.

What he saith of me, that I seem to make election and interest in covenant *commensurate*; All elect are interessed in covenant, and all interessed in Covenant are elect; I do grant it, being understood of the covenant of Evangelical grace, of regeneration, justification, &c. in respect of Gods promise of it, and I have often shewed that both *Paul*, *Rom.* 9. 8. and many of the soundest Protestant Divines say the same. But what he addes of me, And elect infants (as he hath more then once acknowledged) might be baptized in case their election were known, is Mr. *Bls.* mistake of me, who do no where say, that they may be baptized in case their election were made known, but that infants born might be baptized in case their regeneration, faith, sanctification were made known. Whereas a person not yet begotten, may be known to be elect,

but

but not to be regenerated, or made a believer. And by my tenet there is a bar against baptizing of infants, in that they want title to baptism; and if they have title, we want knowledge of it. As for Pædobaptists tenent I profess, I do not know what they count a bar against baptizing of infants according to their tenent, there being such uncertainty in their tenents, some holding all are to be baptized in case of danger of death, some all born in a Christian nation, some, all who are in families of persons professing the Christian faith, though the parents were infidels; some, onely the children of Church-members after the way they call Congregational; some judging of the interest in the covenant by a judgement of charity; some by a judgement of certainty. What my tenet is, I have shewed already. Though I conceive that Christs words, *Mat.* 19. 14. did import that the infants were elect, yet I do not say, that Christ was displeased with the disciples for being ignorant of their election and justification, and for that reason not admitting them to be blessed by him, but for that knowing Christ was the great prophet, who was sent to bless, they did hinder those that were brought to be blessed from access to him.

As for Mr. *Bls.* question, who say that the covenant of grace without any other command is a command to baptize infants, I think Mr. *Stephens* said it when he made a convertibility between the word of promise, and the word of command; and whereas Mr. *Bl.* saith, if Christ had never given a command for it, neither old nor young ought to have been baptized, it is true; nor in my speech of his, and Mr. *Stephens* tenet did I mean when I said [without any other command] to exclude the institution of baptism, but it being supposed to be instituted by Christ, Pædobaptists do frequently prove a command to baptise infants by vertue of being in covenant, without any particular command of baptizing them, or any other description that comprehends them, as Mr. *Marshalls* first argument in his Sermon, Mr. *Bls.* second argument, *Vindic. fæd.* chap. 43. sect. 1. shew.

Mr. *Geree* calls denying infant-baptism, A defalking the Covenant, and Mr. *Bl.* himself maintains the third speech, that the commaud to baptize disciples is all one as to command to baptize persons in covenant, when he saith, p. 335. every disciple is in covenant, and everyone in covenant is a disciple And for his Arguments asserting that infants are of Christs disciples what I have met with either are answered already in the second part of this *Review*, or will be answered in this part (if God permit) my conceit being still more confirmed by fuller examination of them, that they are very frivolous.

SECT. XX.

The exceptions which in the first part of my Review, sect. 5. are made against the proof of connexion between the covenant and initial seal, are confirmed against Mr. Blake, vindic. *fæd.* 42. ch. sect. 3.

Mr. *Bl.* proceeds to vindicate the proofs for the reality of connexion between the Covenant and initial seal from *Gen.* 17. and *Acts* 2.38,39. from my Answers.

And to my answer that the particle rendered [therefore *Gen.*17.9.] may be rendered [and, or, but thou] he saith, 1. we have no reason but that it may be an illative as well as a copulative; and being an illative particle, he hath no exception against the strength of it.

Whereto I reply: There need be no reason given, why it should be read [and or but] and not [therefore] but this, that either of those are the usual acceptions of the particle, that [and] is the most frequent use of it, that it may well be so in that place, and that learned interpreters do so render it. Which being not denyed, there is no strength in that proof which is made barely from the term [therefore *Gen.*17.9.] to infer that to them belongeth the initial seal, whether of the Jewish or the Christian Church, who have interest or title to the Covenant of grace. For he that will prove from it, must assert that it must be rendered [therefore] for a certain conclusion cannot be inferred from an uncertain *medium.*

Whereas Mr: *Bl.* only asserts, it may be an illative as well as a copulative particle, and not that it must be, he intimates a grant of what I answer, that it may be a copulative as well as an illative particle,

What he adds, that it being an illative particle, I have no exception against the strength of it, is manifestly untrue, sith I added three more exceptions against the proof of that proposition from thence.

But Master *Blake* proves the same from verse 10. taking in *Acts* 7. 8. and would have me at more leisure find answer to this argument. That which God himself calls by the name of a covenant ought not to be separated from it: but God calls circumcision by the name of a covenant; *Ergo* they ought not to be separated.

To which I answer, First, if the Conclusion be good, then circumcision and the Covenant ought not to be separated; but the covenant according to Master *Marshall*, Master *Blake*, &c. remains the same; therfore according to Master *Blake* circumcision ought to remain still to our children, they being in covenant.

Secondly, If the Conclusion were good, then the females and males afore the eight day being in covenant must be circumcised:

Thirdly, The conclusion is neither of those propositions, which were to be proved, to wit, 1. That the reason why *Abrahams* infants were to be circumcised, was their interest in the Covenant: For though it were granted that circumcision and the covenant ought not to be separated, yet it proves not the reason of this conjunction to be from interest in the covenant, sith it may be,

yea,

yea, is indeed to be deduced from the command.

2. To them belongeth the initial seal, whether of the Jewish or Christian Church, who have interest or title to the Covenant of grace. For the Conclusion of Mr. *Bl.* doth not say any thing at all concerning the initial seal of the Christian Church, but only of circumcision.

Fourthly, To his Syllogism I answer, 1. That God calls circumcision the Covenant only by a metonymia of the thing signified for the sign.

2. That [ought not to be separated from it] may be understood of every person that hath interest in the covenant, or of every person to whom it is commanded, and when it is not dispensed with: in the former sense I deny the major, it is not true, that what God himself calls by the name of a covenant ought not to be separated from it, or that Gods calling any sign the Covenant, proves that all in covenant are to have that sign on them. For neither was it true of circumcision, sith neither were males afore the eight day or females in covenant, nor any in the wilderness to be circumcised, God either not commanding it, or dispensing with the observation of it; nor is it true of any other sign called the Covenant (if there be any) without Gods command undispensed with.

Mr. *Blake* saith further, 2. Let him consider the relation in which the Apostle puts this Sacrament of circumcision to the covenant *Rom.*4. 11. an instituted appointed sign and seal is not to be divided from that which it signifies, and seal is not to be divided from that which it signifies and seals; circumcision was an instituted appointed sign and seal of the covenant; therefore it is not to be divided from it.

Answ. 1. Neither doth the Apostle, *Rom* 4.11. make circumcision the sign and seal of the Covenant mentioned *Gen.* 17. nor of any covenant to be kept for the time to come, but of a benefit *Abraham* had before obtained *Gen.*15.6. to wit, righteousness by faith, being yet uncircumcised, nor is any ones circumcision besides *Abrahams*, on his own person, called, the seal of the righteousness of faith.

2. The Conclusion is, neither of the Propositions to be proved, that the reason why *Abrahams* infants were to be circumcised, was their interest in the covenant, that to them belongeth the initial seal, whether of the Jewish, or the Christian Church, who have interest or title to the Covenant of grace.

3. The Major proposition is true in this sense, an instituted appointed sign and seal, is not to be divided in our conceit of it, from that object or thing which it signifies or seals. But in this sense the Conclusion would be true only of an intellectual division from the object, which is nothing to the purpose. That sense in which it would be to his purpose is this, An instituted appointed sign and seal, is not to be divided, that is, not to be withheld or denied to any person or subject, who hath by promise or possession interest in the thing signifyed and sealed by that sign. But in this sense it is false, for circumcision was not to be to any female, to whom yet the promise of *Canaan* signified by it, belonged; Nor indeed doth any such sign belong to any person meerly from interest in the thing signified, but from the command and will of the Appointer.

I said if [therefore *Gen.*17.9.] were allowed to be the best reading, yet that the inference, v.9. should be made from the promise only, v.7. and not as well,

if

if not rather from the promise, verse 8. I find no sufficient reason given.

To this Master *Blake* replies, This reference engageth me, 1. in a contradiction to my self, *Exercit. page* 3. the promise of the Gospel was confirmed to *Abraham* by the sign of Circumcision, and that the covenant made with *Abraham Gen.*17. was a mixt covenant. 2. In a contradiction to the Apostle, who makes circumcision a sign and seal, not alone of the land of *Canaan*, but of the righteousness of faith.

Answ. Either I have lost all my skill in *Logick*, or else there is not the least colour of this charge, but Mr. *Blake* writes as one that scribles any thing that comes first into his fancy. A contradiction is of two propositions opposite in quantity and quality, the one universal, the other particular; the one affirmative, the other negative, my propositions are. If it were granted that [therefore *Gen.*17.9.] is the best reading; yet that the inference verse 9. should be made from the promise onely, verse 7. and not as well, if not rather from the promise verse 8. I find no sufficient reason given; the promise of the Gospel was confirmed to *Abraham* by the sign of Circumcision, the Covenant *Gen.* 17. was a mixt covenant made up of spiritual and temporal mercies: The Apostle *Rom.*4.11. saith *Abraham* received the sign of Circumcision a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised. If Master *Blake* shew in these propositions I will not say contradiction onely the greatest of oppositions, but any contrariety at all, let me be taken for a heedless Scribler; if not, let Master *Blake* bear the blame.

His other words [all that know the nature of Covenants, and use of seals know that the seal ratifies all that the Covenant contains. But the Covenant (Master *Tombs* being judge) contained not barely the promise of the land of *Canaan*, and therefore the reference must carry it further than the Land of *Canaan*] what are they but a grant of my exception, that the reference *Gen.* 17. 9. must be not onely to the promise verse 7. as if infants were circumcised meerly because of the promise, I will be a God to thee, and to thy seed, but also to the promise verse 8. and that they were circumcised also because of that promise of the Land of *Canaan*, which belongs not to us, and therefore the reason of circumcision of infants from the Covenant *Gen.*17. can be no rule to us to whom some of those promises belong not. If the seal ratifies all that the covenant contains, then it ratifies the promise of the Land of *Canaan*, and in respect of that it was to *Abrahams* infants, which not belonging to our infants the reason of circumcising infants, if it be taken from the covenant, it will not pertain to our infants to whom that promise belongs not.

I said, if it were yielded that the inference were made peculiarly from the promise, verse 7. to be a God to *Abraham* and his seed; it must be proved, that every believers infant-child is *Abrahams* seed, afore it be proved the promise belongs to them.

To this Master *Blake* saith, It must either be proved that they are *Abrahams* children, or have the privilege of the children of *Abraham*, which from *Genesis* 9. 27. *Rom.* 11. 17. is sufficiently proved, especially being confirmed by those texts that carry the covenant in Gospel times to the issue.

Answ. What privilege of the children of *Abraham* he should mean, except the promise, I will be a God to them, which should belong to every believers infant child, I understand not. The privilege of circumcision, or visible

Church-

Church-membership in the Christian Church is neither inferred from the promise *Gen.*17.7. nor from *Genesis* 9. 27. *Rom.*11.17. nor is there one text that carries the Covenant in Gospel times, I mean that covenant of which Christ is Mediator, mentioned *Heb.*8.10. *Heb.* 10. 16. (besides which I know no covenant in Gospel times) to the issue, that is, all the natural infant-issue of every believer, and that neither those texts mentioned, nor any other produced by Mr. *Bl.* Mr. *M.* Mr. *Cobbet*, or any other prove it, will be shewed in that which follows. For present my speech is right, the promise is not, I will be a God to thee, and to thy seed, and to him that hath the privilege of thy children. This is Master *Blakes* addition to the Text. And therefore no man can prove the promise belongs to the infant-child of a believer, till he be proved to be *Abrahams* seed: Whatsoever privilege of *Abrahams* children, any child may have, yet from that promise none can claim privilege, but *Abraham* and his seed, sith the promise is made to no other, and therefore no child of ours can claim an interest in that promise till he be *Abrahams* seed, which Master *Blakes* shift doth no whit avoid.

To my exception, that the Covenant was not made to every child of *Abraham*, he saith, Though it were true, yet it would not serve my purpose, provided, that we in Gospel times are under the same covenant as was *Isaac*; if some of *Abrahams* children were left out, that concerns not us, so that we are taken in.

But I reply, sure if it were true, it were much to my purpose to shew the insufficiency of the Pædobaptists inference, from *Gen.* 17. 7. that every child of a Gentile believer is not in covenant by vertue of that promise, if it be true that the Covenant was not made to every child of *Abraham*. No Pædobaptist hitherto that I know hath had the face to avouch that our children by vertue of that promise are more in covenant than *Abraham* children; Master *Bl.* himself saith, To make the inference good from *Gen.*17.7. that believers children by virtue of that promise have title to the initial seal, it must either be proved that they are *Abrahams* children, or have the privilege of *Abrahams* children; If then the covenant was not made to every child of *Abraham*, then every child of *Abraham* had not the privilege by the covenant, and then if it were granted that our children by that covenant had the privilege of *Abrahams* child, yet it could not be proved thence, that every child of ours hath the privilege of the Covenant, sith every child of *Abraham* had it not. Nor doth Mr. *Bls.* proviso at all help him.

For 1. it being granted, that we in Gospel-times are under the same covenant as was *Isaac*, and that we are taken in, (though without the limitations, first of the covenant onely, as it contains promises of saving grace; secondly, onely of true believers before God, I deny it) yet it follows not that our children are taken in.

2. Nor if it were true, that our children are taken in, doth it follow that all our children are taken in, by vertue of that promise *Gen.* 17. 7. sith neither all *Abrahams* children, nor all *Isaacs* children were taken in by it, *Esau* being expressly excluded, *Rom.*9 10, 11, 12, 13. and elsewhere, nor doth God stile himself the God of *Esau* as he did of *Jacob*.

But Mr. *Blake* saith, my instance from *Gen.* 17. 19. *Heb.* 11. 9. is very weak to prove, that the Covenant was not made to every child of *Abraham*, *Ishmael*

Ishmael himself was in Covenant, though not established in covenant (as God there, and verse 21. promised concerning *Isaac*) nor his seed never received, appears not alone by the sign and seal which he received vers. 23. which yet is sufficient (for God to seal to a blank is very strange; to sign a covenant to a man never in Covenant) but also from *Gal.* 4. 30. what saith the Scripture? cast out the bond-woman, and her son, for the son of the bond woman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman A man cast out of Covenant, was before casting out in Covenant; ejection supposes admission, unless we will give way to Mr *Tombs* his dream of ejection by non-admission. He was cast out after the time of the solemnity of his admission by circumcision, as may be seen, *Gen.* 22.

Answ. The Apostle *Rom.* 9. answering the objection, that if the Jews were rejected from being the children of God then the promise falls, or takes not effect, which God made to *Abraham* and his seed to be a God to them, answers verse 7, 8, 9, in these expres words, neither because they are the seed of *Abraham* are they all children, but in *Isaac* shall thy seed be called, That is, they which are children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise, are counted for the seed: For this is the word of promise, at this time will I come, and *Sarah* shall have a Son. Which words if they do not affirm, that the promise or covenant, *Gen.* 17. 7. was not made to all *Abrahams* seed, and particularly that it was not made to *Ishmael*, I cannot perceive any pertinency in the Apostles speech to the answering the objection made, nor know how to understand his words, nor do I remember that I ever met with an interpreter, which did not thence conceive, that the Apostle in those words did assert, that the promise or covenant was not made to *Ishmael*. Some I have produced *Exam.* part 3. S. 4. so conceiving, and many more might be alleged if it were necessary. But the words of God to *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 19, 20, 21. do sufficiently prove, that the Covenant *Gen.* 17. 7. was not made to *Ishmael*, and therefore he was not in Covenant by Gods act of promise. For when *Abraham* upon Gods promise concerning *Sarah* and her son, ver. 15, 16. had laughed verse 17. and petitioned for *Ishmael*, verse 18. God answers *verse* 19. by repeating his promise concerning *Isaac*, and saith, he would establish his Covenant with him for an everlasting Covenant, and with his seed after him, *verse* 20. Then tells him he heard him concerning *Ishmael*, and recites what he would do for him; which expresseth how far he had heard his petition. And then follows *verse* 21. But my Covenant will I establish with *Isaac*, which being adversative hath this plain sense, that he would do that for *Ishmael* which he had expressed, *verse* 20. But he would establish his Covenant, that is, confirm and perform what he had promised before *verse* 7, 8. in *Isaac* not in *Ishmael*; he promised not to be a God to *Abraham* and his seed, by *Ishmael* in their generations, nor to give them the Land of *Canaan*.

As for what Master *Blake* saith, that *Ishmael* himself was in Covenant, though not established in Covenant; it seems to intimate that he conceives, that God made the Covenant to him, but did not establish it. But sure God makes no Covenant with any which he doth not establish, if he did, he should not be true. Nor is there any such emphasis in the word אנים, I will establish, which doth intimate, that the Covenant was made to *Ishmael*, but established; that is, confirmed, and to be certainly performed onely to *Isaac*,

for

for the phraſe uſed elſewhere, *Gen.* 9. 9, 11. doth expreſs no more than is meant v. 12. this is the token of the Covenant I make between, me and you.

As for Maſter *Blakes* proof that Iſhmael was in Covenant, becauſe he was circumciſed, *Gen.* 17. 23. it reſts upon theſe unproved falſe ſuppoſitions.

1. That circumciſion was appointed to men becauſe they were in covenant with God.

2. That God did by circumciſion ſign the covenant to him that was circumciſed.

3. That every one that was appointed by God to be circumciſed was in covenant. As for the ſpeech that God doth not ſeal to a blank, it is a ſpeech the Scripture uſeth not, and it having various ſenſes may be true in ſome ſenſe, in other falſe. A blank is ſuch a paper as hath no writing in it, or wherein there is ſome empty ſpace left to write more in, whether perſons names, or promiſes, or other matter. By Gods ſealing Mr. *Bl.* means the uſing of Circumciſion, baptiſm, the Paſſeover, the Lords Supper, according to Gods appointment. That which he conceives to be ſealed thereby is the Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 7. which he makes all one with the Covenant of grace, and by proving every Sacrament to be a Seal of the Covenant of grace, from *Rom.* 4. 11. his meaning ſhould be, that God ſeals in the adminiſtrators right uſe of every Sacrament to every perſon, that he is in Covenant, that he hath the righteouſneſs of faith, elſe God ſhould ſeal to a blank. But in that ſenſe I do aver it to be moſt true, that God doth ſeal to a blank, that is, that many thouſands had circumciſion, the Paſſeover, baptiſm, and the Lords ſupper, according to Gods inſtitution and appointment, who were never in Covenant with God, nor did God ſeal, that is, aſſure to them their intereſt in the Covenant, *Geneſis* 17. or the Covenant of Grace in Goſpel times, or the righteouſneſs of faith. But in this ſenſe I grant it to be true that God doth not ſeal to a blank, that is, when he appoints any ſign or ſeal of a Covenant, he doth not appoint it a ſign and ſeal of a Covenant that hath no promiſes, or wherein the perſons to whom, and the promiſes are not ſufficiently expreſt, yet he doth command that ſign to be uſed upon perſons to whom is no promiſe in that covenant, as well as thoſe to whom it is made, yea the uſing it on one perſon may ſeal to thouſands, who are not to have it on their own perſons, as the circumciſing of Abraham himſelf was a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith to all believers of the Gentiles, who were not to be circumciſed. And if every ones Circumciſion ſhould ſeal to him, the righteouſneſs of faith, then circumciſion ſhould by Gods appointment ſeal that which is not true, which is not to be ſaid of God.

Nor doth Mr. *Blake* prove from *Galatians* 4. 30. that Iſhmael was firſt in Covenant, becauſe he was after caſt out; for the caſting out is not appointed to be out of the Covenant, for that Abraham could not do, to whom this ſpeech is directed, it is God that puts in and out of his Covenant, but the caſting out is out of Abrahams family, which was to be done by Abraham. If it be replyed, that this was a ſign of caſting out of Covenant, and therefore ſuppoſed he was in Covenant, I anſwer ſo it was a ſign of caſting out of the inheritance, out of the righteouſneſs of faith, out of the Kingdom of heaven, which yet neither he, nor thoſe whom he typified, and ſo were caſt out with him, ever had.

What he calls my dream of ejection by non-admiſſion, doth but ſhew Mr. *Blakes* own oſcitancy.

For *Matthew* 8. 12. it is said, the children of the Kingdome, that is, the Jews shall be cast out, to wit, of the Kingdom of heaven, where *Abraham*, and *Isaac*, and *Jacob* sit down, into outer darkneſſe; and yet thoſe children of the Kingdom, were never in the Kingdom of heaven, nor ever ſhould be.

Iſhmaels caſting out after the time of the Solemnity of his admiſſion by circumciſion, doth not prove he was in covenant before. Neither circumciſion, nor baptiſm, doth admit men into covenant with God. If they did, then adminiſtrators could put men in and out of Covenant with God; but that is Gods prerogative, not in mans power. Even according to Pædobaptiſts ſuppoſitions, perſons are firſt to be in Covenant afore they are to be baptized, therfore baptiſm doth not admit them into Covenant.

Maſter *Blake* addes; For tha tof *Hebrews* 11. 9. it is a myſtery, what he will make of it, unleſſe he will conclude, that becauſe *Abraham* ſojourned in the Land of promiſe, that therefore none were in Covenant, that were not taken into that Land, ſo *Moſes* and *Aaron* will be found out of Covenant.

To which I reply. The myſtery might have been unveiled, if Mr. *Blake* had heeded that the Author of that Epiſtle calls onely *Iſaac* and *Jacob* of thoſe that dwelt with *Abraham* in tents, heirs with him of the ſame promiſe, therefore *Iſhmael* and *Eſau* were not heirs with him of the ſame promiſe, though he dwelt in tents with them, and conſequently were not in the Covenant, or had not the Covenant or promiſe of *Abraham* made to them.

Upon thoſe words of mine; As for a viſible Church-ſeed of *Abraham*, that is neither his ſeed by nature, nor by ſaving faith, nor by excellency, in whom the nations of the Earth ſhould be bleſſed, to wit, Chriſt, I know none ſuch in Scripture, though ſome men have fancied ſuch a kind of Church-ſeed, as it is called.

Maſter *Blake* thus animadverts. I know not how ſaving faith comes in, when a faith of profeſſion will ſerve the turn. *Abrahams* ſeed had circumciſion as a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith, when their parents had no more than a faith of profeſſion.

To which I reply, a meer faith of profeſſion will not ſerve turn to make any Gentile to be rightly according to the Scripture termed *Abrahams* ſeed. None of them in Scripture are counted *Abrahams* ſeed, but either true believers before God, or elect perſons. No where doth the Scripture ſay, that the Circumciſion which any of *Abrahams* ſeed had was as a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith to them, when their parents were true believers, much leſs when their parents had no more than a faith of profeſſion. Mr. *Blakes* talk, that all that which my three former exceptions gainſaid is made good, is but vain, as the reſt of his arguing. Let us here ſee what he addes further.

I had ſaid, Laſtly, were all theſe things yielded, yet the propoſition could not be made good from hence, ſith the inference is not concerning title or right of infants to the initial ſeal, as if the Covenant or promiſe of it ſelf, did give that, but the inference is concerning *Abrahams* duty, that therefore he ſhould be the more ingaged to circumciſe his poſterity.

Hereupon Mr. *Blake* tells me, I ſhould rather have left this to my adverſaries for the ſtrengthening of their propoſition, than have made uſe of it my ſelf for refutation of it. It was *Abrahams* duty to give them according to Gods

command

command the initial seal: in this Master *Tombs* and we are agreed; whether it will thence follow that they had right and title to it, or without right, let the Reader determine.

Answ. The Adversaries propositions to be refuted were, first, That the reason why *Abrahams* infants were to be circumcised, was their interest in the Covenant, which they would gather from *Gen.* 17. 7, and 9. put together; secondly, That to them belongeth the initial seal, whether of the Jewish or Christian Church, who have interest or title to the Covenant of grace. But if the inference be not of title or right in the persons to be circumcised, but of duty in the administrator, and the propositions be of title or right from the Covenant, and not of duty, the adversaries propositions are not rightly gathered from that inference, which is not concerning right or title but duty. As for Master *Blakes* jeer rather than answer, it is unworthy a serious sober man. For my speech did not intimate that the infants were circumcised without right or title, but that the inference, *Gen.* 17. 9. was of duty, not of title or right, and that what title the infants had to circumcision it was not, as Pædobaptists suppose, from the interest in the Covenant which the circumcised had, but the command of God to the circumciser, and therefore there is not any connexion between interest in the Covenant and title or right to the initial seal without the command, nor this proposition true. All they who are in Covenant are to be sealed with the initial seal, unless this limitation be added, when it is commanded. Now if this limitation be put, then, though the infants of believers were granted to be in Covenant, yet they are not to be baptized, till over and besides their being in Covenant a command for their baptism be shewed, which hath not been yet, nor I think ever will be.

There are some more of *Mr. Blakes* jeers or flirts rather than sober and serious answers yet remaining. To what I said, that *Abraham* was engaged to circumcise only those that are males, and not afore eight daies, and not onely those that were from himself, but also all in his house, whose children soever they were, which apparently shews that the giving circumcision was not commensurate to the persons interest in the Covenant, but it was to be given to persons as well out of Covenant as in, if of *Abrahams* house, and not to all that were in the Covenant, to wit, females: which doth clearly prove that right to the initial seal, as it is called, of circumcision did not belong to persons by vertue of the Covenant, but by force of the command, Mr. *Blake* in his flirting fashion thus speaks. If he can prove that Abraham kept Idolaters in his house, professedly worshipping a false God, and gave Circumcision to them in that faith and way of worship; it would prove that a man might have the seal, and not be in Covenant. And it will prove a man might have the seal, and not be in covenant, though I cannot prove any Idolater in Abrahams house, if I can prove there were or might be infants or young persons who were children of Idolaters, for such were not in covenant as the seed of believers, or by their own profession.

But, saith he, it would not prove that he might be in covenant, and be denied the seal. True, but this that infant-males under eight daies old, and females in covenant might be denyed the seal, would prove it.

And then, saith Mr. *Bl.* infant-baptism might be of easier proof. Though they were not in Covenant, though they were not holy, yet they might be

baptized. I reply, I grant that persons in Covenant might be denyed Circumcision, but think infant-baptism never a whit the easier proved. I ſtt-circumciſion is commanded of all in *Abrahams* houſe, whether in covenant or no, but baptiſm to none becauſe he is in covenant, or holy, but becauſe a diſciple, which is not true of any infant ordinarily.

But, ſaith Maſter *Blake*, I will not yield ſo much; I do not believe that *Abraham* carried circumciſion beyond the line of the Covenant, and that he had thoſe in his houſe which were aliens from God; ſeeing I find that teſtimony of the Lord concerning him, *Geneſis* chap. 18. verſe 19. and find that reſolution of *Joſhua*, Joſhua chap. 24. verſe 14, 15. I believe *Abraham* catechized all he took in as Heathens, and did not circumciſe them as Heathens.

Anſw. I believe he did not circumciſe them as Heathens, but as his own bought with his money, and of his houſe, and if he bought any infants, or young children (which was then, and hath been ſince uſual, where men and women are ſold as ſlaves) he did circumciſe infant or young males of heathen Idolaters. For the command of God was he ſhould, and yet thoſe infant or young males of heathen Idolaters could not be catechized, nor were in Covenant, either by their own profeſſion, or their parents right, or any promiſe of God to them; and therefore circumciſion in that caſe muſt be carried beyond the line of the Covenant.

To what I added of Maſter *Marſhalls* Confeſſion, That he granted the formal reaſon of the Jews, being circumciſed, was the command, and the covenant he makes only a motive, *Defence* page 182. Maſter *Blake* ſpeaks thus. I wonder what need there is of an argument to force ſuch a Confeſſion. The reaſon I ſay, why Jews were circumciſed, and Chriſtians baptized, is the command; were there a thouſand Covenants and no inſtitution of a ſign or ſeal, ſuch a ſign or ſeal, there could have been no circumciſion, no baptiſm. The command is the ground, and the Covenant is the Directory to whom application is to be made: we ſay, all in Covenant are entitaled to the ſeal for admiſſion; but we preſuppoſe an inſtitution.

I reply, If the formal reaſon why the Jews were circumciſed were the Command, and the Covenant onely the motive, then the command was the differencing reaſon; for the form diſtinguiſheth, and the formal reaſon is the reaſon which differenceth. Motives are not directions what to do, but commands, the ſame motive may be to contrary commands. The Command is the Directory to whom application is to be made both of circumciſion and baptiſm. The command doth expreſs not only the act to be done, but alſo the perſons to whom. The Covenant is no Directory to whom circumciſion, or baptiſm is to be applyed. The whole Covenant of Circumciſion is expreſſed, *Geneſis* 17. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. But there is not a word who are to be circumciſed, but after. There is not the leaſt hint in the inſtitution of baptiſm, *Matthew* chap. 28. verſe 19. *Mark* chap. 16. verſe 15. of any Covenant God makes to man. To imagine God commanded circumciſion and baptiſm, and yet not to tell who are to be baptized or circumciſed but from the Covenant, which no man knoweth to whom it belongs, is to imagine God gives a blind command, which no wiſe Maſter would do. It is not true, all in covenant are entitled to the ſeal for admiſſion, for then females, males under eight

daies

daies old, believers out of *Abrahams* house, Proselytes of the gate had been entitled to Circumcision, for they were in Covenant as well as those who were to be circumcised.

And it is as certain on the other side that *Ishmael*, *Esau*, the infants of strangers bought by *Abraham*, with his money, were to be circumcised, though they were not in Covenant, and therefore I inferre it as certain, that being in covenant or interest in the covenant, or having the promises of the Covenant, *Genesis* 17. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. or the new Covenant in Christs blood *Heb.* 8. 10, 11, 12. and 10. 16, 17. or any other Evangelical Covenant, all, or some of them made to a person did not intitle a person to circumcision, nor doth now to baptism, nor can be without the command or institution of Christ, or primitive example, a rule, Directory or sufficient warrant for any to baptize a person, nor acquit him from profaning and abusing baptism, and therefore there is no such reality of connexion between the Covenant and seal, that this proposition is thereby proved true, All in Covenant are intitled to the seal for admission: or this false, some of those who are not in covenant are intitled to the seal (as they call it) for admission: and Master *Blakes* censure of my exceptions as frivolous trifles shews his weakness in disputes, there being very little in his arguings or answers but flirts, quips, dictates and impertinencies.

What he addes of my grants discovers the like vanity; For though I say that believers, and disciples are to be baptized, not barely on their faith and knowledge, but upon the Command to baptize such, yet how it follows which Mr. *Blake* saith, so that the command is with reference to the Covenant, with reference to the interest in the Covenant, is to me a meer inconsequence, unless he imagine the command and Covenant all one, which to assert were ridiculous. And who will believe that I attribute as much to the Covenant respective to this seal, when I say *Examen* page the seventieth eight, That the common privilege of Circumcision belonging to the Jews, did not arise from the Covenant of grace, according to the substance of it, but according to the administration that then was, as Master *Marshall* to the Command, when he said, The Command was the formal reason of the Jews being circumcised.

When I do not at all make circumcision to arise from the Covenant as any reason of the duty, much less the formal reason of it, but as from the occasion of it, whereas Master *M.* makes the command, the very formal reason of the existence of the duty.

Sect.

SECT. XXI.

The ten Exceptions of the first part of my Review against Pædobaptists exposition and allegation of Acts 2. 38, 39. for the connexion between Covenant and seal are vindicated from Master Blakes *answer*, Vindic. Fœderis, ch. 37, 43.

MR. *Blake* addes some snatches against my ten exceptions to Pædobaptists exposition of *Acts* 2. 38, 39. To the first which was, that the promise is not proved to be that *Genesis* 17. 7. and *Acts* 3. 25. *Acts* 2. 30. lead us to some other, he saith, when a promise is mentioned and a seal, any man but he will presently understand that promise, which is ratified by such a Seal.

To which I reply. Where is there mention of a seal? or of a promise sealed or to be sealed as he speaks? If there were, is there no other promise to be ratified by such a Seal but that? Did circumcision seal no other promise but that? Doth the Scripture give the least hint of sealing that promise, *Gen.* 17. 7. understood as Pædobaptists expound it, that God would be a God to every believer, and to his seed, in respect at least of visible Church-membership, yea though he be a believer onely by profession? They use to tell us that Circumcision seals the righteousness of faith, from *Rom.* 4. 11. But to seal this and to seal the promise, *Gen.* 17. 7. (as Pædobaptists do rack rather than expound the words) are as much different as are the payment of Gold, and lead. Have not learned men expounded the promise, some of that mentioned, ver. 38. of the gift of the holy Ghost, some of other promises? why then doth Master *Blake* so ineptly intimate me to be singular in my conceit? why doth he so falsely insinuate that no more than bare words can be found for my exposition; when I bring two texts to confirm it, and Mr. *Bl.* saith not a word to infirm my alleging them? what he refers me to in his 37. ch. and Mr. *Cobbet* shall be examined in its place.

To the second, which was that [the promise is *Acts* 2. 39] is expounded,

1. of a promise of a thing to come, whereas it may seem rather from *Acts* 13. 32, 33. to be meant of a promise already fulfilled.

2. That the thing to come promised was some outward privilege to be conferred on them and their children.

Mr. *Blake* saith, yet he quotes no man for this exposition of a thing to come, but on the contrary quotes Mr. *Cobbet* in the margin against it. It is meant of a present right; for as yet they were not broken off from the olive, nor Gentiles grafted in.

Answ. 1. That Pædobaptists do understand the words *Acts* 2. 39. of a promise of some thing to come appears, 1. in that many of them make it the same with this, I will be a God to a believer, and his seed.

So Master *Marshall Defence* page 126. Mr. *Drew ubi supra*, Mr. *Blake* out of *Calvin*, *Vindic. fœderis* page 270. and others. Now a promise that he will be a God to them is a promise of a thing to come. 2. In that they disclaim the

supplement

ſupplement [is fulfilled] as Mr. *Cobbet Juſt. Vindic.* part 1. ch. 2. ſect. 3. and uſually, as *Beza*, the *Engliſh Directory*, Mr. *Blake* and others expound it, the promiſe is made, which proves it is, according to them, meant of ſomething to come, not of a thing paſt, for if it were it ſhould be a promiſe fulfilled. Mr. *Cobbet*, it is true, ſaith, the promiſe *in præſenti* is to you in reſpect of external right; but then he muſt needs mean it, that the promiſe was *in præſenti* made of external right to come, or elſe he muſt mean it of a promiſe fulfilled, which he denies.

And for the other, that Pædobaptiſts do expound it of outward privilege to be conferred on them, and their children, beſides Mr. *Cobbets* words cited, and other in the ſame ſection; Mr. *Hudſon Vindic.* page 223. ſaith, This promiſe Acts 2. 39. is that external covenant to which baptiſm doth belong, and the *Aſhford* Diſputants for Infants-baptiſm, grant, That the promiſe of the eternal inheritance, life and ſalvation is not made, much leſs made good to any upon terms of the parents faith, but upon our own perſonal belief, and obedience, but the promiſe of outward privileges, and of right to participation of Ordinances as to be baptized, and inchurcht, this belongs to children upon their parents faith, and in this laſt ſenſe it is, that *Peter* ſaies the promiſe is to you and your children, &c. i. e. you and yours have the privilege of right to baptiſm.

To my third exception, that [to you] is taken, as if it were meant of thoſe perſons to whom he ſpake, as then believers, and under that formal conſideration, Mr. *Blake* ſaith, I do not interprete it of any preſent explicit faith in Chriſt as the Meſſiah; but now this conviction, that ſo evidently appeared, did evidence them to be in an hopeful way, and with that Scribe not to be far from the Kingdom of God, and therefore he takes his opportunity, and preſſeth it on to come into the way of believers in Chriſt Jeſus.

Anſw. This grant is ſufficient, firſt, to juſtify my exception, ſecondly, to overthrow Mr. *Blakes*, and other Paedobaptiſts inference from this text,

1. That in this text the Covenant in New Teſtament times is held out in this latitude to believers and their ſeed, *Vindic. fœd.* chap. 37. For if they had not any preſent, explicit faith in Chriſt as the *Meſſiah*, then they were not believers.

2. That this ſpeech [the promiſe is to you, and to your children] is equipollent to this promiſe [I will be a God to believers and their ſeed] for if they were not then believers, it had been falſe if the Apoſtle had ſaid as they would have him, the promiſe that God will be a God to believers and their ſeed, is *in præſenti* to you and your children, when they were not believers.

To my fourth Exception, that [your children] is expounded of their infant-children; yea it is carried as if of them onely, he ſaith, to this is ſufficient ſpoken, ch. 37. I ſhall therefore look back to that chapter, page 270. he ſaith, Acts 2. 39. an effectual call cannot be meant (which the Apoſtle calls a call according to purpoſe) proper onely to the elect, ſo the viſible ſeal would be limitted to inviſible members. But this is not true, for then the being of the promiſe would be limitted to them, not baptiſm.

It is falſe which Maſter *Blake* ſuppoſeth, that baptiſm is limitted to them to whom the promiſe is, and that the being of the promiſe to a perſon intitles to his baptiſm. He ſaith; it is a call unto ſuch a Church-ſtate as the whole

tion of the Jews did then enjoy as the first-born in the family. To which I reply, The whole Nation of the Jews enjoyed a Church-state, by which they were joyned in one national society under an high Priest, and other Priest offering sacrifices at the Temple, whither the Church-members were to bring their gifts, and to observe the Levitical rites. It is a dotage with a witness to conceive that *Peter* meant *Acts* 2. 39. that the promise was to them or those afar off, whom God should call to this Church-state. It is certain that the calling of the Jewes and Gentiles, by the Gospel was to remove them out of that society, and Church-state, as appears by v. 40. nor did the Apostles ever associate the Christians to the Jews as Proselytes to them, nor did they ever draw them into any such Church-state, as the Jews had to take in a whole Nation, City, or Family, comprehending Infants into the Christian church, but onely so many as believed as v. 41. 42, &c. shew: yea to call them to such a Church-state as the Jewes had, had been to call them not to baptism, but to circumcision and the observation of *Moses* Law. The call of God, *Acts* 2. 39. is no other then what is mentioned in the new Testament to be Saints, to his Kingdom and Glory, to the fellowship of his sonne by his word and spirit, or one of them at least, yea the promise being meant of Christ, which Master *Blake* doth not deny, as will appear in that which followes, it can be expounded onely of those that are effectually called, sith to them onely Christ belongs: on the other side to understand it of a call unto such a Church-state as the whole nation of the Jewes did then enjoy, is to limit the promise to Jewish proselytes, or to national Christian Churches, which is a wild conceit, unfit for a serious and sober Divine. But Master Blake goeth on from whence this Argument may be drawn, those to whom the Covenant of Promise appertains have a right to baptism, But the Covenant of Promise appertains to men in a Church-state and Condition and to their Children. The Major cannot be denied by any that will not make themselves the Apostles opposites. The Minor proposition is now onely to be considered, that the Covenant of promise to men in a Church-state and Condition is in that latitude as to comprize their Children, For which the words of the Apostle are full and clear. To you is the promise made, and to your Children, on which *Calvin* rightly comments. *Peter* observes (saith he) a due order when he assignes the first place of honour to the Jewes, that it takes in Children, it depends on the word of promise *Gen.* 17. 7. I will be thy God and the God of thy seed, where God joynes children with their parents in the priviledge of Adoption, where Adoption is taken in the Apostles sense, *Rom.* 9. 5. to the inheritance of privileges belonging to all Church-members, as he after explains himself.

Ans. The *Major* is ambiguous, and in some sense it is true, and in some sense false. It is true in this sense, Those to whom the Covenant of Promise by their beleiving, and Covenanting to be Christs Disciples, appertains, have a right to baptism. But in this sense (in which Master *Blake* seems to understand it, for he comprehends Infants in the Covenant) Those to whom the Covenant of Promise by Gods Acts of Promise, whether of saving Grace or Church-privileges, appertains without their personal believing or covenanting, have a right to baptism, it is false. Nor is the Contradictory thereto opposit to any thing the Apostle saith, who doth indeed exhort to repentance and baptism, but doth not from the promise without each persons repentance ascribe a right to bap-

baptiſm to any parent or child, the promiſe is not urged by him to declare a right to baptiſm of it ſelf without repentance, but to encourage to repentance and baptiſm into the Name of Chriſt as their duty. The *Minor* alſo is ambiguous, it being uncertain what he means by the Covenant of Promiſe, whether the Covenant whereby the perſons promiſe to God, or God to them; and if of this latter, whether the Covenant wherein God promiſeth to them, be of ſaving-graces, or of Church-priviledges; if he mean it of the former, & underſtand it univerſally, it is manifeſtly falſe, contrary to Scripture and experience; whether the Church-ſtate be in reſpect of the viſible or inviſible Church, there is no ſuch promiſe of God, that if the Parent be in a Church-ſtate or condition, ſo as to be elect, or true beleiver, much leſs if he be onely in the viſible Church, that his child, as his child, ſhall be in the Covenant of ſaving grace, have Chriſt, his Spirit, remiſſion of ſins, and life everlaſting by him. Nor is it true of the promiſe of Church-priviledges, that God will take the child of him who is in a Church-ſtate and condition for a viſible Church-member, capable of the initial ſeat, (becauſe he is his child) without the childs perſonal faith and repentance. Nor do I know of any Covenant of Promiſe now under the Goſpel of ſuch outward Church-priviledges, but take it to be a faction of Pædobaptiſts; nor is there in the Apoſtles words any thing to prove the *Minor*. For neither doth the text ſay, the promiſe is that, *Gen.* 17.7. nor that it is made, but onely [is] nor doth ſay, it is to you as in a Church-ſtate and condition, and to your children as the children of men in a Church-ſtate and condition. And for *Calvins* words neither are they plain for Mr. *Bls.* purpoſe, nor if they were, ſhould I take them for an oracle, but ſhould expect better proof then his or Maſter *Bls* ſayings. As for the Adoption, *Rom.* 9.5. it is clear from the text, and confeſſed by Maſter *Rutherford*, Due right of Presbytery ch. 4. Sect. 4. pag. 192. to have been a prerogative of the Jewes, as was the giving of the Law, the deſcent of Chriſt, &c. and therefore it is untruly ſuggeſted by Maſter *Blake* to be an inheritance of priviledges belonging to all Church-members, or that the Apoſtle doth after ſo explain himſelf; and Maſter *Blake* continues his want of dictating without prooſe. He next takes on him to anſwer objections. One is, that the children are the ſame with ſons and daughters mentioned, v. 17. from *Joel* 2. 28. and conſequently the promiſe is of the ſpirit of prophecy, and appertaining to none but thoſe of age and capacity for prophecy. To which he anſwers, 1. That the promiſe cannot be that extraordinary gift of the Holy Ghoſt in that viſibie way, becauſe it is enlarged to all the Lord ſhall call: but all theſe have not the Holy Ghoſt in that extraordinary way, nor any promiſe of it. I confeſs, this anſwer is good againſt thoſe that expound the words thus, the promiſe of the gift of prophecy, *Joel* 2. 28. is to you and your children, and to all afar off, as the ſubjects to whom this gift is promiſed; for then it would not be true, ſith all had not that gift, 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. yet it may be true in this ſenſe. The promiſe of the gift of the Spirit in that viſible way, is fulfilled to you and your children, and all afar off called by God, as the perſons who had benefit by it, and ſo were the *Finis cui* of thoſe gifts promiſed as having the benefit of them, though not the ſubjects in whom they were. 2. Saith Maſter *Blake*, however the promiſe be extended, yet that promiſe is on condition of their baptiſm, and is an encouragement to baptiſm, and in that latitude as they had formerly known the command of circumciſion. To which I ſay, 1. If the promiſe be interpreted ſo as to belong to all that are

beleivers, and call on the Name of the Lord, as here followes, then the promiſe is to the elect onely, and the call into the viſible Church, which Maſter *Blake* before denied. 2. Though extraordinary gifts were given after baptiſm often, yet they were given alſo before, *Acts* 10. 44, &c. and therefore I doubt it is not true which Maſter *Blake* ſaith, that promiſe of extraordinary gifts is on condition of their baptiſm, nor doth the text aſſert it. 3, As the promiſe is an encouragement to baptiſm, ſo it is to repentance, which is firſt required afore baptiſm by the Apoſtle. 4. There is not a word in the text, *Acts* 2. 38, 39. which yields a proofe of any of thoſe poſitions which Maſter *Bl.* ſo importunely obtrudes, 1. That baptiſm is there urged as a ſign and ſeal of the promiſe. 2. That they were encouraged to baptiſm in that latitude as they had formerly known the command of Circumciſion. 3, That the Scripture delivereth, and the Apoſtle urgeth the promiſe as to men and their poſterity, to them and theirs, ſo as that God promiſeth to be a God in Covenant to his and their ſeed. 4. That the Apoſtle holds this out to draw them on to this ſeal of the Covenant, to accept baptiſm on the ſame terms that *Abraham* did circumciſion.

But Maſter *Blake* his chiefeſt oppoſition about this text is againſt me, and therefore he bends himſelf againſt the fourth Section of my *Exercit.* And firſt. he excepts againſt my words, that the promiſe made (which reading I then followed, but ſince like rather the ſupplement [fulfilled] is the ſending of Jeſus Chriſt and bleſſing by him, as is expounded, *Acts* 3. 25, 26. *Acts* 13. 32. *Rom.* 15. 8, 9. Thus I anſwer, it is true that Jeſus Chriſt is the moſt eminent mercy promiſed, and may be called the promiſe *virtualiter*, being the ground of all promiſes, and therefore ſome Interpreters have mentioned the gift of Chriſt on this occaſion. But it is plain that Gods Covenant and this gift are to be diſtinguiſhed; Chriſt is promiſed in priority to the Jew, before the Gentile; The Jew then is taken into Covenant before this gift of Chriſt can be of them expected: It is therefore the covenant it ſelf (entred with parent and child, root and branch) that is here meant, as *Calvin* in the words before obſerves, from which the giving of Chriſt in the fleſh followes. And therefore *Diodati* fully pitches upon the true ſenſe of it, ſeeing as you are *Abrahams* children, you are within the Covenant, you ought to acknowledge Chriſt to be the head and foundation of the covenant. The covenant I will be thy God and the God of thy ſeed is here meant, which from *Abraham* had been the Jewes priviledge, *Rom.* 9.

To which I reply, If Chriſt may be called the promiſe virtually, then it is no obſcuring the text, to interpret the being of the promiſe to them of the ſending of Jeſus Chriſt and bleſſing by him, nor doth this hinder the diſtinguiſhing of Gods covenant and this gift, or the promiſing of Chriſt to the Jew before the Gentile, or the Jewes taking into covenant before this gift of Chriſt can be expected of them, or that the giving of Chriſt in the fleſh followed the covenant it ſelf entered with parent and child, root and branch, meaning *Abraham* and his ſeed, as the Apoſtle, *Gal.* 3. 16. underſtands it; and therefore in all this there is nothing brought by Maſter *Blake*, which makes void my interpretation, but confirms it rather. But for ſuch a covenant as Maſter *Blake* imagines of Gods being God to every believer and his infant child, in reſpect of Church-membership in the Church viſible of Chriſtians, and other outward

Church-

Church-priviledges, I find no word in all the Scripture. And for *Diodati* his words, if he ſo meant what he ſpeaks of their being in covenant, becauſe they were *Abrahams* children by natural deſcent, he anſwered from the ſenſe of the place; but Maſter *Blake* hath more to ſay to me.

I had ſaid, the limitation, as many as the Lord our God ſhall call, ſhewes that the promiſe belongs to them, not ſimply as Jewes, but as called of God, which is more expreſly affirmed, *Acts* 3. 26. To this Maſter *Blake* anſwers, I wonder how it came into Maſter *T.* his head to call this application a limitation; it plainly enough ſpeaks his boldneſs in dealing with the Scriptures; had the Apoſtle ſaid, to you is the promiſe made, and to your ſeed, in caſe God ſhall give you a call, he had ſpoke to Maſter *T.* his purpoſe: but ſaying, to you and to as many as the Lord your God ſhall call, it plainly ſhewes that he does not limit, but amplifie the mercy, extending it not barely to the Jewes (who in preſent by reaſon of fruition of ordinances were a people near to the Lord, *Pſal.* 148. 14. but alſo to the Gentiles, who, *Epheſ.* 2. 17. were afarre off.

To which I reply, A limitation of a propoſition is the determining of it according to what the predicate agrees to the ſubject, or doth not agree, as *Keckerm. ſyſt. Log.* l. 2. ſect. 1. c. 4. And thus do the words [as many as the Lord (not as Maſter *Blake*, your, but) our God ſhall call] limit the copulative propoſition [the promiſe is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off] determining to which of each of theſe, and in what reſpect the promiſe is to them. And to take away Maſter *Blakes* wonderment (the fruit of ignorance, and often of folly) which he and his brother *Baxter* do often expreſs about me, that they may deſcribe me as ſome ſtrange example of Gods judgment in blaſting my intellectuals, I will tell him how it came into my head to call thoſe words a limitation of the propoſition. Firſt, the placing of the words at the end of the propoſition, did give me occaſion to take them for a limitation. Secondly, the term ὅσοι as many as] is a limitting term, appropriating the thing ſaid to thoſe ſubjects forenamed, who were ſo qualified as to be called by the Lord. Thirdly, (which was the prime inducement) I conceived the ſpeech of *Peter* had not been true without that limitation, And this I long ſince told Maſter *M.* in my Exam. part. 3. Sect. 6. pag. 60. If the promiſe be of ſaving graces, if of Chriſt ſent, if of the outward ordinances of baptiſm, &c. if of the Holy Ghoſt in extraordinary gifts, it is none of theſe wayes true without that limitation. For neither God promiſed ſaving graces, nor outward ordinances, nor extraordinary gifts, , nor ſent Chriſt to them, their children, or all that are afar off without calling them, and every of them. And but that Maſter *Bls.* Maſter *Bs.* and ſuch like wonderers heedleſneſs and peeviſhneſs are no ſtrange thing to me, I ſhould wonder that Maſter *Blake* ſhould no better heed my words in my Examen, nor *Diodati* his words (who, he ſaith, fully pitches upon the true ſenſe of it) which in his Annot. on *Acts.* 2. 39. are theſe, ſhall call, namely by his Goſpel. So he doth reſtrain the *Iſraelites* to whom the promiſes are directed onely to thoſe, who by Gods gift believe in Chriſt; ſee *Rom.* 9. 8. *Gal.* 4. 28. which had Maſter *Blake* faithfully ſet down in ſtead of ſome other words I find in him, his Reader might have diſcerned how falſe it is, that the promiſe is to an infant child of a believer,

as his child, without calling; and have diſcerned that it is not my device onely, but that which others before me apprehended, and ſo no more boldneſs in my dealing with the Scriptures then was meet, and the Apoſtles words to have this plain ſenſe, the promiſe is to you, being called of God; and to your children, being called of God; and to all afar off, being called of God; and to no other. And to requite Maſter *Blake*, I may more truly ſay, It's a wonder how it came into Maſter *Blakes* head to call this limitation an amplification. For though the words [to all that are afar off] contain an amplification of the mercy either to the poſterity of the Jewes, or to thoſe in the diſperſion, or to the Gentiles (of which I will not now diſpute) yet the words [as many as the Lord our God ſhall call] are a plain limitation of his ſpeech, as I have proved. But Maſter *Blake* addes of me, 2. In that he ſaith, this promiſe belongs to them not ſimply as Jewes, but as called, is a full contradiction; A Jew uncalled (at this time before the Kingdome was taken from them) is as much as a convert unconverted, or a Gentile diſciple undiſcipled: In caſe he think to come off by limiting it to an effectuall call, the Scripture by himſelf quoted doth evidently contradict it; Chriſt came to give them that effectuall calling, and not onely to thoſe that were thus called.

Anſ. Maſter *Blakes* charge of contradictions is as frivolous as his wonderment. Maſter *Blakes* conceit of a calling into ſuch a Church-ſtate, as the whole nation of the Jewes did then enjoy, is but a dream of his own, for which he hath not one Scripture nor other proofe. The calling is to communion with Chriſt, and an effectuall calling, elſe the propoſition were not true; nor is there any contradiction in any of the places byme quoted, to this expoſition, the promiſe of Chriſt is fulfilled for the remiſſion of your ſins, and your childrens, and all that are afar off, as many as the Lord our God ſhall effectually call, and no other; nor hath Maſter *Blake* ſhewed any. For though Chriſt came to give effectual calling, yet it is true alſo, he came to give remiſſion onely to thoſe that were thus called; nor is there any oppoſition, much leſs contradiction in thoſe ſpeeches.

Maſter *Blake* goes on. He yet ſaid, *Peter* doth exhort to repentance and baptiſm together, and in the firſt place perſwades to repentance, then to baptiſm, which ſhewes repentance to be in order before baptiſm. To which he anſwers, not by denying it, but by giving a reaſon of it, becauſe they had crucified Chriſt, &c. To which I reply, this grant ſhewes that they had not right to baptiſm without repentance, though the promiſe were to them, they were in the Church-ſtate of the Jewes, &c. and conſequently Maſter *Blakes* propoſition falſe. Thoſe to whom the Covenant of promiſe appertains (in his ſenſe) have a right to baptiſm. What he addes, And yet he ſhewes that they and their ſeed are under the promiſe of God, and puts them into a way in acceptation of Chriſt in the Goſpel-tender, in his preſent way of adminiſtration, to be continued his people ſtill in Covenant, and that (as is plainly enough ſignified) that they might enjoy it in their former latitude to them and to their children; that the Jewes (even thoſe that had not yet embraced Chriſt) were not yet diſpoſſeſt of the promiſe, but ſtood as a people of God in viſible covenant, and their children, in the ſenſe in which Maſter *Blake* means is falſe; and yet were it true, it is againſt Maſter *Blakes* propoſition, ſith notwithſtanding this being in covenant, yet were they not admitted or to be admitted to baptiſm without repen-

repentance. He addes, Maſter *T.* hath yet this evaſion, and ſaith, the text ſpeaks not expreſly of infants, but of children indefinitely; and if infants be not children, we will be content that they be caſt out of covenant, and will hold no plea for their Church-memberſhip and baptiſm.

Anſ. As infants are children, ſo are men and women of twenty, or more years old, and therefore the term (children) unleſs it be proved to be taken univerſally or particularly of infants, the Covenant-ſtate (as they call it) though we ſhould grant ſuch an eſtate there meant, would not be thence concluded. And yet infants were to be circumciſed not ſimply becauſe they were *Abrahams* ſeed, nor becauſe in Covenant, but by reaſon of Gods command. And though a woman and diſciple be not *Synonyma*, yet women being numbred among diſciples, it is an expreſs example of womens coming together to break bread, which mentions the diſciples breaking bread; nor was I at all put to it, much leſs hard put to it, when this came in for an anſwer. For without this an anſwer was given before to the Argument, and this was added as an over-plus, and ſo was that which Maſter *Blake* nibbles at in that which followes.

I had ſaid the text ſpeaks not of the children of the Gentiles at all, (of whom we are) but of the children of the Jews; and therefore if that promiſe be extended to infants, which doth not appear, the promiſe is to be expounded ſo as to note ſomething peculiar to the Jewes infants. To this Maſter *Blake* thus ſaith, If the Goſpel held out any ſuch tranſcending priviledges appertaining to the ſeed of the Jewes above the Gentiles, Maſter *T.* may do well to produce a text for it, otherwiſe we ſhall take it for granted from Saint *Paul*, that there is none at all, that there is neither Greek, nor Jew, circumciſion nor uncircumciſion, Barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free.

To which I reply, there is no need I ſhould ſhew any ſuch priviledge held out in the Goſpel to the Jewes ſeed above the Gentiles, but that Maſter *Blake* ſhould ſhew ſuch priviledge as he ſpeaks of, to the Jewes ſeed held out in the Goſpel. But this I ſay, if he will have the text, *Acts.* 2. 39. to be for his purpoſe, he muſt ſhew that the children of the Gentiles (of whom there is not a word) are mentioned as thoſe to whom the promiſe is as well as the children of the Jewes, which he thus attempts.

And when the Apoſtle addes, to thoſe that are afar off, even as many as the Lord ſhall call, he plainly means the Gentiles, as appears, comparing *Epheſ.* 2. And though I take not the boldneſs to adde to the words, and to their children, as Maſter *T.* challenges Doctor *H.* yet it is clear, that the ſame is underſtood there in reference to the children of the Gentiles, that is expreſt before to the children of the Jewes. If any ſhall grant an inheritance to *Titius* and his heirs for ever, and to *Caius*, every one will underſtand that the heirs of *Caius* are meant as well as the heirs of *Titius*, eſpecially if it can be proved out of the grant it ſelf, that the priviledge conveyed to *Caius*, is as ample as that to *Titius*. We can prove the priviledges granted to the Gentiles in the Goſpel to be equal to thoſe granted to the Jewes; when the Jewes children are under the promiſe with their Parents, the children of believing Gentiles cannot be excluded.

To which I reply, that it appeared not plainly to *Beza*, *Annot. in locum*, that by *thoſe afar off*, Acts 2.39. are meant the *Gentiles*, but rather the poſterity of the Jewes, which ſhould be in after Generations, or thoſe in the diſperſions

amon

among the Gentiles. For it seemes unlikely that *Peter* did then consider or declare the calling of the Gentiles, who was so averse from preaching to *Cornelius*, *Acts* 10. or that it would have been born with them, when even the brethren expostulated with him for that fact, *Acts*. 11. 3. nor do I think πᾶσι τοῖς εἰς μακρὰν *Acts*. 2. 39. the same with οἱ ποτὲ ὄντες μακρὰν *Ephes*. 2. 13. this latter noting manifestly remoteness from God in respect of knowledge and communion, the former remoteness from them to whom he spake, either in descent or distance of place. However were it resolved that the Gentiles are meant, *Acts*. 2. 39. as many Interpreters conceive, yet it is too much boldness to adde to the text [and to their children] and not much less in Master *Bl.* that it is understood, when there is neither word in the text, nor defect of sense without it, nor any ancient copy, which necessitate that addition or supplement. And for Master *Blakes* case in law, it is not opposite. For, *Acts* 2. 39. there is no mention of a grant to them and their heirs for ever, but only a promise to them and their children, which there is no necessity, nor I think intention in *Peter* in those words to extend to any other then were then existent. But if it were opposite, yet so far as I know their mindes, either by such experience in law-cases, or converse with Lawyers, (with whom I sometimes lived) I presume they would say otherwise then Master *Blake*, that a grant of an inheritance to *Titius* and his heirs for ever, and to *Caius*, without mentioning his heirs, is not a grant to the heirs of *Caius*, no not though it could be proved the priviledge conveyed to *Caius* is as ample as that to *Titius*. As for what Master *Blake* tells us, he and others can prove of the priviledges of the Gentiles granted in the Gospel equal to the Jewes, I yield it, if meant of believing Jewes and Gentiles, and saving spititual blessings in Christ, according to that, *Ephes*. 3. 6. But meant (as Master *Blake* would have it) of visible Church-membership, and the initial seal, I take it to be a vain brag, neither he nor any other having yet proved it, or that the Jewes or Gentiles children are or were universally under the promise of the Covenant of Grace, which is Evangelical, with their believing Parents, and by reason of their faith, I know no more about *Act*. 2. 38, 39. in that ch. to be answered. I return to his answer to my exceptions ch. 43. pag. 393. he thus dictates after his fashion, Children as theirs whether they be called or no, is (he knowes with us) a contradiction; children are called in their Parents call, and we say they are in covenant, the promise is made to them, they are visible Church-members till they reject the covenant, and deny their membership.

To which I say, I know many things to be taken for truths and contradictions with Pædobaptists, which were neither truths, nor contradictions: but this conceit that [Jewes children uncalled, as calling is meant, *Acts* 2. 39.] is a contradiction. I had not so mean an opinion of Master *Blakes* and other Pædobaptists intellectuals, as to imagine they would own it, till Master *Blake* vented this foppery, which how vain it is was shewed above. In like manner I was secure of ever meeting with such a foolery as this of Master *Blake*, children are called in their Parents call, till I read the like in his brother *Baxters* vain-mocktitled-book plain Script. proof, &c. ch. 3. that he that converteth the Parent, maketh both him and his infants disciples: to which I have said somewhat in my Review, part. 2. sect. 12. And for the other speech that they are in covenant, the promise is made to them, they are visible Church-members

till

till they reject the Covenant, and deny their membership, it contains sundry inconsistencies with Pædobaptists hypotheses. For first, they say, the children of believers are in covenant, and visible Church-members as theirs; children as theirs, whether they be called or no is (he knowes with us) a contradiction, saith Master *Blake* here. If so, then they are in covenant, and visible Church-members while theirs, *Quatenus ipsum* includes *de omni & semper*. But they are so when they reject the covenant, the relation to their parents ceaseth not then; therefore neither their Church-membership, if the hypothesis be true. Secondly, they suppose the visible Church-membership of believers children, is by vertue of Gods promise to be their God, *Gen.* 17. 7. and this promise requires no other condition but the parents faith, no condition from the child; for then it could not agree to infants; therefore if the parent be a believer, and the Child be not a visible Church-member, God keeps not his promise which he hath made, according to their hypotheses, and so they do make God a lyar, which is blasphemy. Thirdly, they magnifie the priviledge of infants visible Churchmembership, they enveigh against anti-Pædobaptists, as robbing them, thereof, and parents of their comforts, though they grant the Parents as much ground of hope for them, as the Pædobaptists grounds can truly give them; and for reality of priviledge, setting aside an empty title and rite as to them in infancy, they grant them visible Church-membership, when they profess the faith, which in respect of Church-communion Pædobaptists themselves grant them, not before; but mock both Parents and children, telling them they are in covenant, and visible Church-members by their parents faith without their own, yet denying them Church-communion, which is due to every visible Church-member, without their own personal avouchiug the faith; besides, their injurious dealing with them in their mock-baptism of them, when it is not due, nor does them any good, and denying baptism to them, yea, persecuting them for seeking it after when it is due, and might do them much good by engaging them to Christ, and thereupon assure Christ to be theirs.

My fifth exception Master *Blake* passeth over as fore-spoken to, ch. 37. which hath answer before, and my sixth as falling in with my tenth, where I shall overtake him. To my seventh, wherein I excepted against Master *Stephens* for holding the command [Be baptized every one of you] in a covenant-sense as he calls it to be, as if he had said, Be baptized you and your children, which I said to be a new devised non-sense, such as we have no Dictionary yet to interpret words by. To this saith Master *Blake*, I am sure here is a non-sense device, to talk of Dictionaries; does *Calepin* or *Scapula*, *Rider* or *Thomasius* help us to compare covenant and seal, promises and Sacraments?

I reply, that speech is non-sense, in which the words used to signifie that which the speaker would signifie by them, do not in the use of them so signifie. But this speech [Be baptized every one of you] doth not in the use of the words signifie [be baptized you and your children] therefore that speech so used in that which Master *Stephens* calls Covenant-sense is non-sense. This appears by Dictionaries, in none of which [every one of you] is as much as [you and your children] Therefore that speech in that sense is a new devised non-sense. As for Master *Blakes* words, either they are non-sense, or as bad. For first, to talk of Dictionaries is not a device, an action of the mind; but a speech, an action of the tongue or hand; and therefore it is non-sense to call it so. Secondly,

ly, to talk of Dictionaries is not non-ſenſe; for then all ſpeech of Dictionaries ſhould be non ſenſe, and ſo all the verſes before *Riders* and others Dictionaries ſhould be non-ſenſe. But to ſpeak of Dictonaries otherwiſe then the words ſignifie, ſo as the meaning cannot be perceived by them, which he cannot ſay of my ſpeech of Dictionaries. As for Maſter *Blakes* queſtion, it is frivolous, as much of the reſt of his writing here is. For though Dictionaries do not help us to compare covenant and ſeal, promiſes and Sacraments, yet they do help us to know the ſenſe of words, and diſcover to us the non-ſenſe of words uſed otherwiſe then their ſignification is. Maſter *Blake* himſelf in the 43. ch. ſect. 2. refers me to the Dictionary about the word *Pax*. To my eighth exception that there is not a word of any ſcruple in the text, as ſome have imagined, if we be baptized our ſelves, and not our children, they will be in worſe caſe then in the former diſpenſation, in which they had the ſeal of the covenant; nor is it likely that they were ſollicitous about ſuch an imaginary poor priviledge of their children. He ſaith, I am of his minde, that there was no ſuch ſcruple in their heads. Maſter *T.* his unhappy conceit of caſting the ſeed out of the Covenant was not then in being, though I think the reaſon he gives is little to purpoſe, yet I ſay, this ſcruple raiſed by Anti-pædobaptiſts, and heightened by Maſter *T.* as in many other, ſo in this text is removed.

Anſ. My exception then ſtands good againſt thoſe who make that ſcruple the occaſion of *Peters* mentioning their children. And for my reaſon, Maſter *Blake* had done better to give a reaſon of his cenſure, then barely to ſay he thinks it to little purpoſe. It is his calumny that I have any conceit of caſting the ſeed out of the covenant, and his conceit that the ſcruple mentioned is in this text removed, hath been ſhewed to be but his dream.

My ninth exception was that Pædobaptiſts make [for v. 39.] to infer a right to baptiſm, whereas it infers onely a duty, which is proved in that [v. 38. baptized] is in the *Imperative Mood*. To this ſaith Maſter *Blake*, Maſter *T.* does groſſely abuſe his judgment in this way of refutation, as though the right in which they ſtood, could be no Topick, from which in a moral way the Apoſtle might perſwade them to baptiſm; when *Shecaniah* perſwaded *Ezra* to the reformation of the marriage of ſtrange wives in theſe words: Ariſe, for the matter belongeth to thee, *Ezra* 10. 4. here was a motive in the moral way to call upon him to do it, and an argument inferred, that it lay upon *Ezra* as a duty by command from God to ſet upon it. And to my reaſon he ſaith, he hath quite forgotten, that the words holding out their right are in the *Indicative Mood*. For the promiſe is to you and your children. And here is a notable correction of the Apoſtle, he ſhould have ſaid, if this had been his meaning, you muſt be baptized; and he ſaies, Ariſe, and be baptized.

Anſ. Sure I am Maſter *Blake* doth moſt groſſely abuſe me, in inſinuating as if by my refutation, the right in which they ſtood could be no Topick, from which in a moral way the Apoſtle might perſwade them to baptiſm, when I proved that the Apoſtle did not from v. 39. infer a right to baptiſm, which in a legal way they might claim, but a duty, to which in a moral way he perſwades. And therefore he ſhootes wide from the mark, when he goes about to prove that a right may be a motive in a moral way to a duty. And yet as if he could write nothing to the point, his own allegation, *Ezra* 10. 4. is not to his own purpoſe, the motive as himſelf alledgeth, it being not a right to a priviledge,

lege; but a command from God. The like roving talk is in his answer to my reason. For whereas I alleged that verse 38. a right is not inferred from verse 39. but a duty, because [be baptized, v. 38.] is not in the *Indicative*, but the *Imperative Mood*, tels me the term [is v. 39.] is in the *Indicative Mood*, which is nothing to my objection, but like as in the contention between two deaf men in Sir *Thomas Mores* epigram, he that was charged with theft answered, his mother was at home. The like random talk is in his insinuation of my notable correction of the Apostle, who corrected not the Apostle, but shewed the Pædobaptists conceit incongruous to the Apostles words; He himself seems (I think out of heedlesness) to correct the Apostle, when he speaks thus, And he saies, Arise and be baptized, which are not *Peters* words, *Acts.* 2. 38. but the words of *Ananias* to *Saul*, *Acts.* 22. 16.

My tenth exception was, usually Pædobaptists in their paraphrases put not in any thing to answer [repent, v. 38.] which is true, though Master *Stephens* be alleged in my sixth exception, as paraphrasing it by covenant, for your selves and your children, Master *Blake* grants the Apostle presseth to a duty, and such as was to have repentance precedent in his then hearers: If so, then he doth not infer a right to bapeism barely from their interest in the promise. What he saith, right and duty very well stand together, and that the Apostle fitly makes use of their interest as a motive, I deny not. It is true, the Apostle mentioned more to whom the promise was then, he then perswaded to repent, for he mentions the promise as pertaining to the absent, or unborn; but he perswades none to be baptized but the penitent, nor mentions any to whom the promise was, but the called of God.

To my Argument from the precedency of repentance to baptism, *Acts.* 2. 38. against infant-baptism, he answers as before, ch. 37. to which I have replyed before. As for Master *Stephens* his paraphrase avowed by Master *Blake* as the Apostles meaning, that if the Jewes who had crucified Christ, would receive him as the particular *Messiah*, the same promise should still continue to them and their children in the new dispensation, it is far from the Apostles minde. For the Apostle doth not make the continuance of the promise as the benefit consequent on their receiving Christ, and the receiving of Christ the condition of continuance of the promise: but the being of the promise is alleged as a thing already existent, nor is there any likelyhood that the Apostle *Peter* would urge them to so hard duties as repentance, receiving Christ by so slender a reason as the continuance of the promise of visible Church-membership and baptism to them and their infant children, yea, the text it self shewes that the things by which he would perswade them to receive Christ, were the assurance of remission of sins, and receiving the Gift of the Holy Ghost, and the alleging the promise, v. 39. is to take away the great objection against these great benefits from their crucifying of Christ, and their imprecation on them and their children, *Matth.* 27. 25. If then Master *Stephens* build his word of command to baptize father and child, on that paraphrase, he builds on a foundation which will not hold. Master *Blake* addes; To this the word repent refers, as may be made plain. But what he means by this assertion I do not well understand, it being ambiguous, what he means by [this] whether the paraphrase of Master *Stephens*, that the same promise should still continue to them and their children in the new dispensation, if they would receive Jesus as

the particular *Messiah*, or the word of command to baptize father and child, and in like manner what kind of reference he means, whether as a medium to prove it, or as a motive to it. If he mean the same with that which his allegations seem to tend to, his meaning is, that the promise of visible Church-state, was to the Jewes as they had been formerly, if they did receive Christ, and the term [repent] refers to it as the motive. Now though I grant that the promise, *Acts.* 2. 39. is alleged as a motive in a moral way to repentance v. 38. yet I deny such a promise to be meant, v. 39. as Mr. *Bl.* and Mr. *Stephens* fancy. Nor do any of Mr. *Blakes* allegatione prove it. For *Acts* 3. 25. doth not speak of such a covenant as Master *Blake* means, but of that Evangelical covenant wherein God promised Christ and saving blessings by him. Nor are the Jews there termed children of the Covenant onely, but also of the Prophets. Now the Prophets there are the same with all the Prophets, v. 24. and those Jewes to whom, *Peter* spake, were no otherwise their children, then in that they had been raised up of, and sent to that nation in their predecessors times, and they are in like manner called children of the Covenant, because they were the posterity of those ancestors, specially *Abraham*, to whom that Covenant was made. But this doth not prove that they were then Gods visible people, that the Covenant of visible Church-state did belong to them and their children, or that such a covenant is meant, *Acts* 2. 39. What Master *Blake* allegeth from *Matth.* 8. 12. *Matth.* 21. 43. that they were in danger to be cast off, doth prove rather the contrary, that the nation or body of the Jewish people who had rejected Christ, were not in covenant with God; and although those particular persons, *Acts* 2. 37. to whom *Peter* spake, v. 38, 39. were more awakened then others, yet they could not be then said to be in the covenant of visible Church-state, being not then believers in Christ. What Master *Blake* allegeth and infers from *Matth.* 21. 31, 32. *Luke* 7. 29, 30. I assent to, but know not what it make for his purpose. Yea, me thinks his calling baptism to which *Peter* exhorted, entrance into a new covenant-way, crosseth Master *Stephens* paraphrase of continuing the same promise to them and their children. In his third allegation he misreports me, as if I excluded all consideration of right in the Jewes and their children from those words which are, *Acts* 2. 39. Whereas that which I said was this, that from the promise, *Acts* 2. 39. (what ever right beimported by it) *Peter* doth not infer their being baptized as a right or privilege, accruing to them in manner of a legal title and claim, but as a duty to which he perswades in a moral way. What good interpretation I give of those words, v. 39. suitable to *Peters* exhortation, I have set down, Exam. pag. 61. Review part. 1. pag. 41. and elsewhere Master *Blake*, if he could, should have overthrown it. Master *Cobbets* exception is answered in the next section. Mr. *Bl.* hath been oft told that the children are mentioned *Acts* 2. 39. because of the imprecation, *Matth.* 27. 25. That the words, *Acts* 2. 38, 39. are carried in that way, that interest in Covenant and Covenant-Seals in Mr. *Bls* sense formerly ran, is supposed, but not proved by him. That the Jews yet persisting in their adherence to *Moses*, not embracing Christ, should be in covenant and have thereby a right to baptism, is such a dotage as me thinks Master *Blake* should disclaim. That the words of the text, *Acts* 2. 39. hold out such a covenant-right, as Master *Blake* imagins, in Scripture-language, according to the grand charter of heaven, I will be thy God and the God of thy seed, is said, but not proved by Master *Blake*. Whether my exceptions against

the

the Pædobaptists expoſition of *Acts* 2. 38, 39. or Maſter *Blakes* anſwers are frivolous ſhifts the intelligent Reader will perceive. My Antipædobaptiſm is enough to refute Maſter *John Goodwins* charge, and my cenſure of his interpretations others have made good. As for the text Maſter *Blake* mindes me of, *Job* 38. 2. it may appear from my writings to be more pertinently applyable to himſelf, then me. Had ever any man ſhewed me ſo much confuſed ſcribling, ſo many irrational unproved dictates, ſo many impertinent allegations in my writings as I and Maſter *Blake* have ſhewed in his, I would have ſilenced my ſelf from writing any more, except a retractation of my former bookes.

SECT. XXII.

Animadverſions on ch. 2. part. 1. *of Maſter* Thomas Cobbet *his juſt vindication touching the explication of* Acts 2. 38, 39. *in which his expoſition is ſhewed to be vain, and mine juſtified.*

TWo points the Pædobaptiſts do endeavour to confirm from *Acts* 2. 38, 39. 1. That the children of believers are in the Covenant. 2. That this being in covenant gives them right to baptiſm. This latter point is that which I am yet upon, for which how inſufficient that text is hath been ſhewed in anſwer to Maſter *Blake*. My intent was in this place to have ſaid no more of this text till I came to examine Maſter *Ms.* 2. Concl. But ſith Maſter *Blake* tels me Maſter *Cobbet* hath, p. 23. ſaid that which utterly overthrowes my expoſition, I ſhall examine what he ſaith, *Juſt vindic.* ch. 2. part. 1.

Sect. 3. He argues thus againſt my expoſition. Firſt, the promiſe is to you, that is, fulfilled to you accordingly as made to *Abraham*, for ſending of Chriſt, &c. there wants Scripture-proof, to make this ſenſe of the promiſe, is to you, (*i. e.*) is fulfilled to you, nor yet doth that in *Acts* 3. 25, 26. ye are the children of the promiſe, &c. prove this ſenſe.

Anſ. My ſenſe of the words is this. The promiſe of raiſing up of Chriſt is now fulfilled to you, that is, for your benefit in the remiſſion of your ſins and bleſſing you, being called of God, and in like manner to your children, and to all that are afar off This to be the ſenſe I gather, 1. From Scriptures which ſeem to me to ſpeak ſuitably thereto. The firſt is *Peters* ſpeech in the ſame ch. v. 30. of *David*. Therefore being a Prophet, and knowing that God had ſworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loynes he would raiſe up Chriſt to ſit on his throne, &c. Hence I argue. It is moſt likely that *Peter*, v. 39. meant a promiſe mentioned before, and known to them to whom he ſpake. Not the promiſe of the miraculous gift of the Holy Ghoſt, for reaſons to be preſently expreſſed; therefore the promiſe mentioned, v. 30, 31, 32. The ſecond is *Acts* 3. 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26. whence I argue. It is moſt likely that ſenſe is beſt which hath moſt conſonancy with the ſpeech of the ſame Author to the ſame perſons, to the ſame purpoſe, on the like occaſion. But the words, *Acts* 3. 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26. are ſuch, and my ſenſe of *Acts* 2. 38, 39. hath moſt conſonancy with thoſe words. For in that ſpeech he exhorts to repentance, v. 19. becauſe that was fulfilled which was foretold by

the Prophets, to wit, Christs resurrection; and v. 25. the covenant mentioned is that of blessing all the kinreds of the earth in *Abrahams* seed, that is, Christ. And that this was fulfilled, v. 26. in raising up Christ, and this was first to them, to wit, for their benefit, by blessing and converting them: which hath much consonancy with my sense of *Acts* 2. 38, 39. therefore my sense is most likely. A third is *Acts* 13. 32, 33, &c. which though it were spoken by another, to wit, *Paul*, and to other company, yet by one endued by the same Spirit, to persons in respect of their nation, and estate like, alleging v. 35. 36, 37. the same text and almost in the same words which *Peter* used, *Acts* 2. 27, 31, 32. Now in that place *Paul* makes the promise to the Fathers to be the raising up of Christ, and speaks of it as to them, in that it was fulfilled, and that for their benefit, the forgiveness of sins, v. 38. and thereupon exhorteth to repentance and embracing of Christ v. 40. Somewhat to like purpose might be alleged from *Rom.* 15. 8, &c. But this is enough to shew that my exposition doth not want Scripture-proof. 2. I gather my sense thus. The term [*is*] is in the present tense. This Master *Cobbet* takes notice of when he saith, that the Apostle doth not say, the promise was to you. The proposition must be understood either as a proposition *secundi adjecti*, as *Logicians* speak, the promise is to you, that is, the promise exists to you, so as that the Verb substantive should note meer existence: But this construction [the promise existes or hath existence to you] seems to me to be defective in sense or truth. For the promise being a transeunt act, was not then existent. Nor were it true, do I conceive to what purpose he should mention the bare existence of the promise, which could be neither comfort to them, nor motive to the duty he pressed. Or else the proposition must be *tertii adjecti*; and if so, there must be a supplement either of the term [made] or the term [fulfilled] For I know no third. But not the term [made] For then the sense should be [the promise is now made to you, &c.] but this is not true, the promise was not then made to them, but to their fathers, *Acts* 13. 32. therefore the supplement [fulfilled] is most probable, it being the term used, *Acts* 3. 18. and 13. 33. 3. This exposition of mine seems to me to be right, because it is opposite to the Apostles scope, which was to direct ane erect those affrighted Jewes to whom he spake. Now the sense that I give is very proper to comfort them against the horrour of their fact in crucifying Christ, and wishing his blood to be on them and their children, *Matth.* 27. 25. by telling them as *Peter* did, *Acts* 3. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18. that though they did unwittingly kill Christ, yet God had thereby fulfilled his promise, even for their good and their children, even as *Joseph* when he told his brethren, *Gen.* 45. 5. *Gen.* 50. 19, 20, that though they thought evil against him, yet God meant it unto good, to bring to pass; as it is this day to save much people alive. And this sense is a very fit motive to move them to repent and be baptized in the Name of Christ for remission of sins, by testifying that the promise of sending Christ was fulfilled in the raising of Christ from the dead. 4. My exposition is confirmed, because all other expositions have less evidence, and are more liable to exceptions. The most likely exposition after that which I give, seems to be that which expounds the promise to be that of giving the holy Ghost in the miraculous gifts, which is called, v. 33. the promise, *Luke* 24. 49. and was mentioned in the next words before, *Acts* 2. 38. And of this I confess the sense may be good thus understood. The promise of giving the ho-

ly

ly Ghoſt, *Joel* 2. 28. is fulfilled in that which ye ſee and heare, *Acts* 2. 33. to you, and your children, and all that are afar off, that is, for their benefit, by moving them to own Chriſt. But me thinks if the promiſe were meant of that gift, it ſhould be meant thus, The promiſe is to you, that is, God hath promiſed to give to each of you, &c. this gift of the holy Ghoſt, becauſe the words immediately before, v. 38. are, and ye ſhall receive the gift of the holy Ghoſt. But thus the propoſition ſhould not be true; For all afar off who were called of God, had not that gift, and therefore it was not promiſed them. Nor had this ſenſe been ſo fit as to comfort them, ſith that gift might be given, and was to perſons whom God rejected. As for the other expoſition, that the promiſe is, that God will be a God to them and their children, as to *Abraham* and his ſeed, *Gen.* 17. 7. it cannot be the promiſe meant, *Acts* 2. 39. For, 1. there is not the leaſt intimation in the text of that promiſe. 2. There was no ſuch promiſe in all the Scripture, that God would be a God to thoſe to whom *Peter* then ſpake, and to their children as their children, no nor ſuch a promiſe as this, I will be a God to a believer and his ſeed. For if this promiſe were made to the ſeed of every believer, then either God keepes it, or not. If not, then he breaks his word; if he do, then he is a God to them. But that is not true: For neither in ſaving graces, nor in Eccleſiaſtical priviledges, v.g. Church-membership and baptiſm, is God a God to every one that is the ſeed or natural child of a believer. Yet if it were true, it had been falſe, being ſpoken to thoſe Jewes, who were not then believers, nor perhaps many of them evet believers in Chriſt. And it is moſt falſe, that the Chriſtian Church-membership and baptiſm did belong to the Jews as Jews, by vertue of any covenant made with that nation. For then *John* Baptiſt did ill to expoſtulate with them for coming to his baptiſm, *Matth.* 3. 7. and to diſſwade them from alleging they had *Abraham* to their father, v. 9. and to tell them of another ſort of children of *Abraham* that had more right to it then they. Yea, *John* the Baptiſt and the Apoſtles did ill to require perſonal repentance and believing, if they had right to ſuch priviledges by a promiſe without them. Nor is the promiſe ſaid to be to any children, but thoſe that are called of God, and therefore not to infants uncalled, and conſequently this Scripture is very ill applyed to prove federall holyneſs of believers infants. Maſter *Cobbet* addes, Secondly, it is ſending of Chriſt or of Chriſt ſent. But let it be conſidered, 1. That the Apoſtle doth not ſay, the promiſe was to you, as in reference to the time of making it to the Fathers, with reſpect unto them, or in reference to Chriſt, who was not now to come, but already come, as the Apoſtle proveth from v. 3, to 37. Nor is it the uſe of the Scripture, when mentioning promiſes as fulfilled, to expreſs it thus in the preſent tenſe: the promiſe is to you, or to ſuch and ſuch, but rather to annex ſome expreſſion that way, which evinceth the ſame, for which let *Rom.* 15. 8. 1 *John* 2. 25. *Epheſ.* 3. 6. *Nehe.* 9. 8, 23. 2 *Chron.* 6. 15. 1 *Kings* 8. 56. *Acts* 2. 16, 17, 33. and 13. 32, 33. *Joſh.* 21. 45. and 23. 14. *Matth.* 1. 22, 23. and 21. 4. *Luke* 1. 54, 55, 68, 69. and *Pſal.* 111. 9. *Rom.* 11. 26, 27. be conſidered.

Anſ. 1. How the verb ſubſtantive [is] in the preſent tenſe, and the promiſe referred to Chriſt, who was now come, agrees with the words and ſcope of the Apoſtle, is already ſhewed. And my ſenſe is like or the ſame with Maſter *Ms.* when he ſaid in his Sermon, pa. 17. The plain ſtrength of the argument, is

God.

God hath now remembred his covenant to *Abraham* in sending that blessed seed, and the new Annot. *in Locum*; The promise is to you, Christ is promised both to Jewes and Gentiles: But the Jewes had the first place. Which is agreeable to the speeches of, *Mary*, *Luke* 1. 54, 55. and of *Zacharias*, v. 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75. 2. It is true, that the expression in that manner is not usual, and it is confessed that in the places cited and many more the fulfilling of a promise is otherwise expressed. But what then? doth it follow that is not the meaning which I give? If it did, by the same reason, neither Master *Cobbets* is right. For it is usual to express a promise belonging to some of a thing yet to be done in some other expressions, as 1 *John* 2. 25. 2 *Pet.* 1. 4. yea, in the place *Rom.* 9. 4. of which Master *Cobbet* p. 31. saith, for the promise is to you or belongs to you, as *Rom.* 9. 4. hath it, the expression is not in the Dative case, as *Acts* 2. 39. but in the Genitive. But it is needfull to consider how Master *Cobbet* himself expounds the words, Sect. 1. He saith thus, The promise is to your children: not, was to you, &c. as intending any legal blessing, but, a promise then in force after Christs ascension, to effect some promised blessing [ἐπαγγελία] used to signify the free promise, or covenant of grace, to which they had visible right. Sect. 3. remission of sins may not be excluded, but must be one principal thing intended. It is that promise to which baptism the seal is annexed. Sect. 4 Nor was *Abrahams* charter less then what here avowed by the Apostle, *scil.* that the promise even of sins, did belong to the Jewes, and to their children in respect of external right and administration, and no more is pleaded for. But repent and be baptized *de futuro*; for the promise *in præsenti* is to you, *scil.* in respect of external right, Sect. 7. And this promise here mentioned, *Acts* 2. 38, 39. containing in it remission of sins, and so the righteousness of faith. The promise of remission of sins is or belongeth to you; *scil.* in the external right and administration of it. So then according to Master *Cobbets* exposition the promise meant is remission of sins, and of this it is said that it is, not, it was to them, and the manner how is, that it is to them, or it belongs to them in the external right and administration of it. The promise or covenant he means here belonging to them to be *Abrahams* charter, *Gen.* 17. 7. *Jerem.* 31. 33. 34. holding out at least an external interest therein to them being Jewes, not yet believing Fathers, or repenting: for that is rather mentioned as exacted after many words besides, v. 40, 41. yea, rather they were offensive members of the Jewish Church (which was then a true visible Gospel-Church) they were as persons under censure, though they had *jus ad baptismum*, yet not *jus in baptismo* without repentance, yet they were covenant-Fathers, and dispensers of the external right of it to their children, though their children were not called. And herein is the difference between them and those afar off; the Gentiles; it is to the Jews actually, to the Gentiles *de præsenti*, onely intentionally, till they be called of God, which he understands not of an effectual saving call, but calling into visible covenant and church-estate, and then it belongs to their children as to the Jewes. This I gather to be his meaning out of scattered passages, Sect. 4, 5, 7. I shall, 1. observe some things concerning the exposition in general. 2. Clear my own exposition from objections. 3. Make some animadversions on several passages in the latter Sections of this ch. of Master *Cobbet*.

I observe that he brings no proof but his own saying, that the promise is

that

that, *Gen.* 17. 7. or that it belongs to any in external right or administration, or that the Apostle meant the belonging of the promise to them in respect of external right and administration. For to say, it is the promise to which baptism seals, is to prove an unknown thing by a more unknown, sith baptism neither there, nor elsewhere is termed the seal of the promise or covenant, nor doth the Apostle mention baptism as sealing or administring the promise, nor do I understand that there is any such thing as an external right and administration of the promise, or by vertue of the promise, but by vertue of the command. And therefore I judge all this talk to be a parcel of gibberish, which the Scripture yields no hint of, but Pædobaptists have formed it from those leading errors, that the nature of Sacraments is to be Seals of the covenant, that the reason of a person being circumcised, was interest in the covenant, *Gen.* 17. 7. that there is the same reason of baptism as of circumcision Besides, I would know to what the right is, and of what the administration is which he cals external, and in what sense it is called external. External he seems to make all one with *quoad homines*, *& in foro Ecclesiæ*, and the promise is of remission of sins; the sense then is, you have a right and administration of remission of sins in respect of men, and in the Court of the Church. A right is a title to a thing which a man may claim, an administration is a serving or bringing in, as when a Deacon gives money to the poor, *Gehazi* reacheth water to *Elisha*. If there be sense in Master *Cobbets* exposition, this should be the meaning. You Jewes who crucified Christ, and your children, though neither yet believers, nor repenting persons, have a right and administration of the promise of remission of sins, *Gen.* 17. 7. though not in respect of God or the Court of heaven or your own consciences, yet before or by men or in the Court of the Church, so that you may claim absolution from them, and they do or ought to administer it to you by a sentence or baptism or some other way. Which were to make the Apostles speak non-sense, and impious falshood: Non-sense, the words bearing no such meaning according to the Scripture-use or other approved authors; Falshood, in that he should tell them they had such a right and administration as they had not, and this impious, sith it tends to harden them in impenitency and unbelief, and to justify Preachers or Churches in an unrighteous sentence, wherein remission of sins is pronounced to belong to persons impenitent and unbelieving *in sensu composito* while such. The like may be said if the right be meant to visible Church-membership, and baptism and administration of them, the speech would be non-sense; neither Scripture, nor any Author at that time expressing these things by that which *Peter* spake, *Acts* 2. 39. and the speech were false, they then having no right or administration of either, and it had been impious to say so to them; for it had tended to move them to assume that to them, and to justify the yielding it to them, which had been injuriously and profanely both arrogated and yielded to them. Yet further, what a ridiculous salve had this been to consciences so tortured with the sense of that most horrid act of killing Christ, to tell them, the promise of remission of sins was to them in respect of external right and administration before men or in the face of the Church, though not before God or in their own consciences, or that they had outward right and administration of visible Church-membership and baptism, I may use his own words, *mutatis mutandis?* Sect. 6. They were not troubled for want of externall right and administration, and to tell them:

them of such right and administration was both impertinent and unsatisfactory, and it could minister but little comfort to sin-sick soules to promise them such things, which they might have, and yet die in their sins, *Matth.* 7. 23. Besides, it seems to be a contradiction to say, the promise is to you *de præsenti*, in respect of external right and administration, and yet you have not *jus in re*, and in like manner to say that the promise is to all afar off *de præsenti*, in respect of external right and administration, and yet it belongs not to them actually, but intentionaly. And whence hath Master *Cobbet* warrant to say that the promise belongs one way to the Jewes, and another way to the Gentiles? or that the promise belonged to the Jew and his child in respect of external right and administration, though uncalled? Lastly, that I not grate any further on this soare, where doth Master *Cobbet* find in Scripture any mention of Gods calling into visible covenant, and Church-estate? or how can it be true that the Church to which those Jewes who crucifyed Christ joyned, containing the unbelieving Scribes and Pharisees and High Priests, and the people of the Jewes consenting with them, was a Gospel-Church, visibly interested in the covenant of grace, the Subject of the Gospel, and the same essentially with that Gospel or Christian Church, and that there was no other visible Church, then that of the Jewes? *Credat Judæus apella, non ego.* But of these somewhat in the animadversions following.

Master *Cobbet* against my exposition writes further thus. 2. They knew already to their cost, that Christ indeed was sent amongst them, and to be that Jesus or Saviour of his people from their sins, *Acts* 2. 36, 37. compared with *Matth* 1. 21. And this was cold comfort to them, to tell them of that which wounded them, unless there be withall some promise annexed and supposed in his being come. The promise meerly of Christs coming could not comfort them, unless also in and by Christ come in the flesh, there be some promise made to them touching the removall of those burdens of guilt which lay upon them. 3. The blessing principally propounded to them, for their reviving, healing, succour, and support, it was not Christs sending, nor his being sent, but remission of sins, v. 38. wherefore unless the Apostle argue impertinently, this may not be excluded, but must be one principall thing intended. 4. It is that promise to which baptism the seal is annexed, now the seal is ever to the covenant, which is not barely to Christs being sent in the flesh, but to benefits contained in promises by his coming.

Ans. Had Master *Cobbet* heeded my words in my Exam. pag. 60. And was it not a comfortable Argument for men in that case to be told, that notwithstanding all this the promise of Christ and remission of sins by him, was yet to them and their children, &c. And pag. 61. The promise which is made to *Abraham* is now fulfilled in sending Christ to you and your children, and to all that are afar off as many as the Lord our God shall call, that they might be turned from their iniquity, and baptized in his Name for the remission of their sins, these objections had been spared, they proceeding all against me upon this mistake (which my words heeded might have rectifyed) as if I had expounded the promise, *Acts* 2. 39. of Christs being sent and coming without some promise annexed, and particularly that of remission of sins by Christ. Whereas I did expresly include it in my paraphrase (as my words recited shew) gathering it from the mention of it, v. 38. and conceiving it to be

im-

implyed in the expreſſion [to you, v. 39.] that is, for your benefit by remiſſion of your ſins. And therefore theſe three objections are anſwered by ſhewing how according to my expoſition the promiſe of Chriſt ſent includes alſo the benefit of remiſſion of ſins. But on the contrary all theſe objections are againſt Maſter *Cobbets* own expoſition. For, 1. It had been but cold comfort to tell them of a promiſe of remiſſion of ſins onely in external right and adminiſtration. 2. It had not been avaiſable for their reviving, healing, ſuccour, and ſupport. 3. According to Pædobaptiſts ſuppoſitions, baptiſm is not a ſeal of that covenant in which remiſſion of ſins in external right and adminiſtration onely is promiſed, but, as it is in the Directory, it is a Seal of the covenant of grace, of our ingraſting into Chriſt, and of our union with him, of remiſſion of ſins, regeneration, adoption, and life eternal. Therefore the promiſe, *Acts* 2. 39. according to Maſter *Cobbets* own arguments, and Pædobaptiſts hypotheſes is not of remiſſion of ſins onely in external right and adminiſtration. Maſter *Cobbets* third exception, Sect. 3. about thoſe afar off, whether *Iſraelites* in the diſperſion, or in after ages, or the Gentiles be meant, hath been conſidered before. But whereas he ſaith, The Apoſtles afore *Peters* Sermon, *Acts* 10. knew by Chriſts declaration of his minde to all his Apoſtles touching the diſcipling and inchurching of the Gentiles the converſion of them, onely they knew not whether it might be by joyning them firſt by way of addition, as proſelytes to the Jewes, rather then by gathering them into other diſtinct Churches; his ſpeech is not right. For, 1. Though it is true, Chriſt had declared his minde, *Matth.* 28. 19. *Mark* 16. 15. about converſion of the Gentiles, yet either *Peter* underſtood not Chriſts minde, or did not remember it afore the viſion, *Acts* 10. 2. It is apparent from *Acts* 11. 3. that the exception againſt *Peter* was not for that he had gathered *Cornelius* and his company into a diſtinct Church, and not joyned them as Proſelytes to the Jewes, but that he went in to men uncircumciſed, and did eat with them, which ſhewes they held it unlawfull ſo much as to preach and converſe with any uncircumciſed, though he were a proſelyte of the gate, as *Cornelius* appears to have been. As for not joyning the Gentiles as proſelytes to the Jewes, they knew that well enough, that they were not to be ſo joyned, ſith neither *John* the Baptiſt, nor Chriſt or his Diſciples did ever by baptiſm joyn any as proſelytes to the Jewes, but did take even the Jewes themſelves (who embraced their Doctrine) into diſtinct Churches or Schooles, though they did not erect any new political States or Common-wealths, as the nation of the Jewes was.

Maſter *Cobbet* further excepts againſt me in theſe words. 4. It's affirmed, that this promiſed of ſending Chriſt was to them, their children, and thoſe afar off, as many as our God ſhould call, that they may be turned from their iniquity, and be baptized for remiſſion of ſins, and yet alſo that the promiſe, what ever it be ſuppoſed to be, was to them all, with that limitation, that they repent, or that they be called. What? is it to as many as the Lord ſhall call, or convert, or cauſe to repent? and yet is it, that they may be turned from their iniquity? is it to perſons called, and yet alſo to uncalled perſons? is it to them that they may be called, yet the perſons to whom the promiſe is, are as many as are ſuppoſed to be called? how can theſe two be right? yea, it is to them all, upon condition that they be called, and yet alſo, that it is to them, that they may be called. Why, if it be to them, that by Chriſt they may be called, then

is that promise to persons as yet uncalled, and their calling is an effect following their interest in that promise as a cause, and not preceding their interest in the promise as a condition.

Ans. the promise is of sending of Christ for remission of sins, their calling is a consequent of Christs being sent, who was sent to turn them from iniquity, that is, to call them; and this calling was for a further benefit, remission of sins through Christ sent, and so their calling is a condition of the remission of sins by Christ sent, nor is the promise of remission of sins by Christ sent to any but those who are called. The calling is a consequent to Christs sending as a prior benefit, and an antecedent to remission of sins as a subsequent. And thus the knot Master *Cobbet* conceives is easily loosed.

SECT. XXIII.

The arguments drawn from Acts 2. 38, 39. *against the connexion between covenant-interest and baptism-right, and infant-baptism are vindicated from Master* Cobbets *answers.*

THere are other passages in the following Sections, on which I animadvert, Sect. 4. he saith, *Acts* 2. he doth not intend it thus, your children (*i.e.*) *Abrahams children*; for *Abraham* is considered rather by him as a patern, having the precedential Copy of the Covenant mentioned. And it had been incongruous to have said; It is to your children, that is, to *Abrahams* children. Concerning which passage I say, that though I conceive it a mistake to understand by [your children] *Abrahams* children, yet Master *Cobbets* words intimate sundry things which are liable to animadversions. 1. The promise, *Acts* 2. 39. is supposed by others, and by Master *Cobbet*, Sect. 7. to be that, *Gen* 17. 7. I will be a God to thee and thy seed after thee, but this was the covenant it self, and not a precedential Copy of the covenant mentioned. I think Master *Cobbet* cannot shew any other after Copy, in which God promised to be the God of a believer and his seed, which it is confessed he did to *Abraham*. 2. That *Abraham* should be considered rather as a pattern to fathers, then as a particular person is said without any proof; nor is it true, 1. Because it is understood in Scripture as meant of *Abraham* as a particular person, *Gal.* 3. 16, &c. 2. Because if he were considered as a pattern, the promise should be to others as to him, *Gen.* 17, 7. but that is not true, the promise is made to none besides as to *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 7. And whereas Master *Cobbet* observes that the promise to them and their children cannot be meant of the children as their children after the Spirit, because they could not be such spiritual fathers to any children of theirs, themselves being not yet such relates, as believing fathers, nor having such correlates as children after the Spirit; this doth plainly shew that the promise to them and their children is not all one with a promise to believers and their children, and the mention of the children, *Acts* 2. 39. is not to intimate any priviledge arising to the child from the faith of the parent. For, as Master *Cobbet* saith truly, as yet they acted not faith and repentance, nor doth Peter say, The promise is or belongs to you, for you have repented,

pented, and consequently believed. As for Master *Cobbets* inference that if th imprecation of the Jewes, *Matth.* 27. 25. were the occasion of *Peters* words *Acts* 2. 39. then the promise must be also to their babes, on whom they wished Christs blood, else the plaister were too narrow for their wounds rising from the guilt of bloud wished upon their children, including, and not excluding their babes; it followes not. For, 1. Though babes be children, yet children indefinitely put without any universal sign may be meant of others then babes or infants. 2. The wish may be meant of infants, and the promise also, yet not to take place or to be accomplished on them or to them in their infancy. That curse and that promise which is made to a mans children being for present infants, is verifyed if it happen to them at twenty years old, they being then the same persons, which they were when they were but a day old. 3. Will Master *Cobbet* assert, the promise must be as large as the curse? If so, then the promise must belong to their children, elder or younger, whether believing or unbelieving, penitent or impenitent, for the wish was on all absolutely. But Master *Cobbet* (I presume) will not assert the promise of remission of sins was *in præsenti* to all the children of the Jewes to whom *Peter* spake, elder and younger, believing and unbelieving, penitent and impenitent in respect of external right and administration. Therefore he must limit the term [your children] if he will have his own exposition to hold good, and consequently the children, *Acts* 2. 39. must be fewer then those the imprecation lighted on, *Mat.* 27. 25.

Sect. 5. That which Master *Cobbet* saith, that those who say the promise made to *Abraham* of sending Christ and now fulfilled, is to them, in effect say as those that expound [the promise is to you] that is, is offered to you, is not right. For the fulfilling notes something past, the offer is of something to be yet done or attained, yet it is true that the speech of *Peter* did contain not onely an offer, but also an assurance of remission of sins to the called by vertue of the promise fulfilled in Christs coming.

Of the sense of the words, *Acts* 3. 25. I have spoken somewhat before. The terms [children of the prophets and of the covenant] are appropriated to the Jewes, as *Rom.* 9, 4. they being the onely people to whom the prophets were sent, as *Beza annot. in locum, id est, Ii estis quibus peculiariter destinati fuerunt prophetæ, & quibuscum fœdus est sancitum, ex Hebræorum idiotismo, quem supra aliquoties annotavimus. Huc pertinet quod ait Paulus,* Rom. 9. 4. And when he saith, they were children of the covenant made with the fathers, and not of the fathers with whom the covenant is made, the intent is not to shew that it's meant of Church and federal interest in them, as covenant-fathers and dispensers, or to shew that the covenant was as seed, by vertue whereof they considered as fœderally and ecclesiastically priviledged, did spring in Master *Cobbets* sense of outward Church-membership and initiating ordinance: but the plain meaning is, that they were the people to whom the first exhibition and tender of the Gospel did belong, in that they were the posterity of the Fathers with whom the covenant was made: and so the Jewes had a priority of not onely external interest in the covenant, but also internal, though when the Gentiles were called, the priviledges of the covenant were equal to the Gentiles with the Jewes, and the condition of the promise, that is, the obtaining remission of sins by the fulfilling of the promise, is equally to Jew and Gentile savingly believing,

Sect. 7. Master *Cobbets* conceit of the term [afar off, *Acts* 2. 39.] that it is, meant of their being strangers from actual interests in the covenants of promise, and Common-wealth of *Israel*, or the visible political Church, *Ephes.* 2. 11, 12, 13. supposeth, 1. The terms τοῖς εἰς μακρὰν those afar off, *Acts* 2. 39. to be the same with οἱ ποτὲ ὄντες μακρὰν who were sometimes afar off, *Ephes.* 2. 13. But the phrases are not the same, and it is for reasons formerly given more likely that the remoteness, *Acts* 2. 39. is meant of place or descent. 2. that the remoteness, *Ephes.* 2. 13. was in respect of external Church interest, and so in like manner, *Acts* 2. 39. But *Ephes.* 2. 13. the remoteness was such as was taken away by the blood of Christ, which is more then external Church-interest, and the nearness such as [you and your children, *Acts* 2. 39.] had not then attained to, but were then afar off from God, or as it is, v. 18. had not access by one Spirit unto the Father. And therefore Master *Cobbets* sayings that the Jewes and their children, *Acts* 2. 39. were not then when *Peter* spake afar off, as the term is meant, *Ephes.* 2, 13. but rather nigh in that sense, and that the promise is to them actually, *& quoad hominem*, and to the other, that is, the Genteles, afar off intentionally, *& quoad Deum*, even whilest afar off, and uncalled, are but conceits arising from the mistakes of *Peters* speech, *Acts* 2. 39. and *Pauls*, *Ephes.* 2, 13. It is true, to the Jewes indefinitely, that is, to that nation or people did the Adoption and promises belong, yet not to every particular person of that nation; For as it is said, *Rom.* 9. 4. To whom pertaineth the adoption, and the promises; so it is said. v. 4, 5. To whom pertain the service of God, of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came: and yet these things not true of every *Israelite*.

It is true, *Moses* made a covenant, *Deut.* 29. 15. with the unborn which were not actually existent in Church-estate and humane being, but that this was a covenant wherein Covenant-grace is expressed, and that it is verified intentionally, *& quoad Deum*, is besides the text, which speaks not of Gods making a covenant, but of *Moses*, v. 14. and this covenant was obliging to duty, not expressing covenant-grace. That which Master *Cobbet* saith, that the righteousness of faith according to the covenant, *Gen.* 17. 7. which containeth the promise of justification, was by circumcision visibly sealed unto the Jewes & their children by Gods own appointment, circumcision being in the Sacramental nature of it, a visible seal of the righteousness of faith it self, and not meerly in a personal respect to *Abraham*, as applyed by his faith to justification, hath either none or very little truth. For though it be true that the promise, *Gen.* 17. 7. was of the righteousness of faith according to the more hidden sense of the words, yet it was so onely to the spiritual seed of *Abraham* by faith, *Rom.* 4. 12, 16. *Gal.* 3. 7, 9, 29. Nor was circumcision appointed by God to seal it to Jewes and their children, nor circumcision in the Sacramental nature of it, a visible seal of the righteousness of faith, nor is any mans circumcision termed in the Scripture a seal of the righteousness of faith, but *Abrahams*, which was not a seal as applyed by his faith to his justification, but as a seal to him that he had the righteousness of faith before he was circumcised, and that all that believe as he did shall be justified, as he was, *Rom.* 4. 11, 12. Master *Cobbet* addes, Nor will it suffice to say, that covenant was a mixt covenant. It held forth temporal things indeed, but by vertue of a covenant of grace, *Psal.* 111. 5. as doth the promise now, 1 *Tim.* 4. 8. But it holds forth

alſo ſpiritual things in the external right and adminiſtration thereof to all, albeit in the internal operation, as to ſome. The promiſes are to them all, *Rom.* 9. 4. *Scil.* in the former ſenſe; and yet, ver. 8. ſome onely are the children of the promiſe, and the choice ſeed in that general covenant, *Scil.* in reſpect of the ſaving efficacy of the covenant upon them, v. 6. And the ſame diſtinction is now held out in ſuch ſort, amongſt perſons in Church-eſtate.

Anſ. It ſufficeth againſt thoſe that make the covenant, *Gen.* 17. to be a covenant of Evangelical grace onely, and make other promiſes of temporal things to be onely adminiſtrations of it, and make circumciſion a ſeal of the covenant of grace, becauſe it was the token of that covenant, to ſay, that the covenant, *Gen.* 17. 7. was a mixt covenant containing promiſes proper to *Abrahams* natural poſterity as well as Evangelical to his Spiritual, and that the covenant is rather to be denominated from the former, which are more manifeſtly held forth in it then the latter, and that the reaſon why circumciſion was appointed, was the ſignifying and aſſuring the former rather then the latter, and ſo the circumciſing of infants was not from intereſt Evangelical, but national or proper to the people of *Abraham.* Nor is Maſter *Cobbets* exception of any validity, that becauſe there is a promiſe of the life that now is, 1 *Tim.* 4. 8. therefore the covenant now is mixt. For the promiſe of the life that now is, is not of any outward inheritance peculiar to the godly and their children, as *Abraham* had of the Land of *Canaan* for him and his, but of fatherly care, and ſanctified uſe of outward things. Nor doth *Pſal.* 111. 5. prove that the inheriting *Canaan*, being great and proſperous, *Gen.* 17. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. were by vertue of a covenant of grace, but it rather appears from many places, *Deut.* 28. &c. *Heb.* 8. 6. that they were by the covenant of works in keeping the law of *Moſes*, unto which circumciſion did oblige, *Gal.* 5. 3. The promiſes *Gen.* 17. ſo far as they were Evangelical did belong to *Abrahams* ſeed by faith onely, nor doth the Apoſtle any where interpret that promiſe, *Gen.* 17. 7. as holding forth ſpiritual things in the external right and adminiſtration of it, and the ſpiritual things aſſured therein are by the Apoſtle determined, *Rom.* 9. 8. to belong onely to the elect, not to all. Nor doth *Rom.* 9. 4. ſay, the promiſes pertained to all the Jewes, nor to any in reſpect of external right and adminiſtration. And though I deny, not but that perſons may be ſaid to be outwardly in the covenant of grace in appearance to men, when they make a profeſſion of faith, though not in reality, yet I deny that God hath made the covenant or promiſe of grace to any other then the elect & true believers, nor appointed any way of ſealing it to any other. Nor is it true that baptiſm as a covenant-ſeal preſuppoſeth a covenant-right, or that the Jewes, *Acts* 2. 38, 39. had any covenant or Church-right to baptiſm, *jus ad rem*, though not *jus in re*, afore they were believers on Chriſt, nor had they any right to baptiſm in that they were members of the Church of the Jewes, nor was the commiſſion of baptiſm firſt given by God to *John* Baptiſt in reference to that Church of the Jewes, as a ſeal of their membership therein, but of their owning *Johns* doctrine, becoming his diſciples, and joyned into a School or Church diſtinct from the Phariſees, and other Jewiſh Church-rulers, though they adhered till after Chriſts death to the law of *Moſes* and temple-ſervice. Nor is there any truth in it that *Peter* required of the Jewes repentance afore baptiſm, *Acts* 2. 38. becauſe though they had covenant or Church-right thereto, yet being adult members under offence, and admoniſhed thereof by *Peter*: they might for

their

their obstinacy against such an admonition notwithstanding Church or Covenant-right have been debarred that seal. For, 1. The Christian Church and the Jewish Church of which those Jewes were members were in their profession not onely distinct, but also opposite; therefore there was no Church-right from being members in the one to be members of the other. 2. For their fact of which they were admonished by *Peter*, they were so far from being in danger of being cast out of the Jewish Church in which they were members, that they were more sure of being cast out for repenting of their sin, and being baptized into the Name of Christ, *John* 9. 22. 3. *Peter* doth not act in his speech, *Acts* 2. 38, 39. as an Elder in the Jewish Church, for he was none, but as an Apostle of Christ: nor was their fact objected to them as an offence to the Church of which they were, but confessed by themselves as an heavy burden that lay on their conscience: nor was *Peters* advice given to remove a Church-censure for re-admission to a seal, but to ease their consciences, and to bring them to the faith of Christ and communion of that Church into which they had never been admitted.

But Master *Cobbet* against my first exception saith, those Jewes were offensive members of that Jewish Church, which was a true visible Church, and not yet dischurched and divorced by the Lord; they were then in the Church of the Gospel, and so externally in covenant and Church-estate also, as being yet in the Olive and Kingdom of God, and not cast out, untill their unbelief, or total and final rejection of the covenant as ratified in Jesus as that promised Messiah, *Rom.* 11. 20. to which the Jewes had not as yet come.

Ans. A Church of the Gospel is such a company as avoucheth the Gospel, the Gospel was that Jesus was the Christ; to the being in the Church of the Gospel, it is not sufficient that there hath not been a total or final rejection of the covenant, but it is necessary there be an explicit believing and owning of Christ, *John* 8. 24. To be a people so cast off as to have the offer of grace taken from them, presupposeth such a rejection, *Acts* 13. 46. *Mat.* 21. 43. But to be a Gospel-Church or member of a Gospel-Church, requires more then a non-rejection, to wit, an expres avouching of the Gospel. Non-rejection doth not make a Gospel-Church or Church-member; if it did, the salvage *Americans* that never heard of the Gospel, and so have not rejected it, should be a Gospel-Church and Church-members. Yet that Jewish Church of which the Jewes, *Acts* 2. 37. were of, and those Jewes themselves had rejected Christ with much violence, *John* 9. 22. *Acts* 3. 13, 14, 15. and therefore they could have no covenant or Church-right, no not externally *quoad homines* from their standing in that Church, by which they might have claimed admission into the Christian Church by baptism without repentance, and faith in Christ, no not though they were supposed to have been without any scandalous sin deserving excommunication or suspense from the seal.

But Master *Cobbet* is bold to avouch, that this Church was a Gospel-Church visibly interested in the covenant of grace, the subject of the Gospel, and the same essentially with that Gospel, or Christian Church: which to me is such a paradox, as is by no means to be received. For then that Church should be a Gospel-Church, which did obstinately adhere to the law, and they interested in the Covenant of grace, who sought righteousnes by the works of the law, and they a Christian Church who denyed, persecuted, killed Christ, and avouched

vouched themselves *Moses* his disciples, *John* 9. 27. not Christs. And if that Church and the Christian be the same essentially, he that was admitted to the Jewish Church was admitted to the Christian, then baptism was needless, yea, irrigular for the entering and admission of a believing Jew into the Christian Church, contrary to that, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. for they were in the Christian Church before, in that they were in the Jewish Church essentially the same, then did *Peter* ill to exhort them to save themselves from them, *Acts* 2. 40. then was *Luke* mistaken in saying v. 47. The Lord added them daily to the Church after they were converted and baptized, for they were in the same Church before; all which are in my apprehension palpable absurdities.

But Master *Cobbet* thus backs his assertion; Unless, whilst the Jewish church stood, any will say, there was no Evangelical visible Church in the world, but a legal Church; for there was no other visible Church, then that of the Jewes.

Ans. the perpetual visibility of the true Church is a point in which Papists and Protestants differ. The Papists assert a perpetual visibility of the Church in Pastors and people, as sensible as any other society of men; so that at any time one may point with his finger and say, this is the Church, the Protestants, that though it abide always upon the earth, holding the whole faith without change, and containing a certain number that constantly profess it, yet this number may be very small, and their profession so secret among themselves, that the world and such as love not the truth, shall not see them, they remaining so hidden as if they were not at all. Thus Doctor *John White* in his Way to the true Church, sect. 17. digres. 17. sets down the difference. If Master *Cobbet* mean (as he seems to do) a visible political Church in the former sense, then it is no absurdity to say, at some time while the Jewish Church stood there was no Evangelical visible Church in the world. For at the time of Christs passion when the Disciples were scattered, the shepherd being smitten, *Matth.* 26. 31. there was no such visible Evangelical Church; yea, some of the Papists themselves quoted by Doctor *White* in the same place, hold that about the time of Christs passion, the true faith remained in none but onely the Virgin *Mary*. *Alsted. suppl. panstr. cath. Chami. de eccl.* l. 2. c. 16. s. 10. *Deinde tempore passionis Christi ecclesia non erat visibilis, talis scilicet, in qua erant prælati & subditi, pastores & oves. Nam ecclesia visibilis non erat apud pharisæos & scribas: Illi enim impudenter, & scelerate errarunt.* But in the latter sense which the Protestants follow, we can assign an Evangelical visible Church in the world, distinct from the Jewish, while the Jewish Church stood. *Alsted. ubi supra. Ergo ecclesia externa etiam tota deficere potest, remanentibus occultis fidelibus; quales tum temporis erant Simeon, Anna, Nicodemus, &c.* At the time of Christs incarnation and before there was in the Protestant sense a true visible Evangelical Church in *Simeon*, *Anna*, and those to whom she spake, who looked for redemption in *Jerusalem*, *Luke* 2. 38. In the time of *John* Baptists and Christs Ministery, many baptized by *John* and Christs Disciples, *John* 4. 1, 2. In the time of Christs passion, besides the Apostles, and those women who professed, *Joseph* of *Arimathea* and *Nicodemus* are expressed, *John* 19. 38, 39. to have owned Christ. And these were a distinct Church from the Jewish, I mean the Priests, Scribes, Pharisees and people who denyed Christ, though not in their political government, yet in their profession of faith, which is ne-

cessary

se quence is there in this, God sent *John* to the Jewes, he had his authority to baptize those of the Jewes, who repented, therefore he sealed their membership in the church of the Jewes, and baptism was administrable in, or by, or to that church of the Jewes? It seems to me that the contrary followes, *John* was sent ro baptize, he preacheth repentance, tells them that it availed not them to say *Abraham* was their father, gathers them into a distinct School or society from the Pharisees and Lawyers, *Luke* 7. 29, 30. directs them to Christ, who should sever chaffe and wheat; therefore he was not given by God in reference to that church of the Jewes as a seal of their membership therein, but severed a people from them by repentance and baptism, and that baptism was not administrable in, or by, or to that church of the Jewes, but in a distinct company, by a select officer, to a severed people from that church. Nor do I know it to be true that baptism is a church-ordinance, to be in ordinary dispensation administred onely in and by a church of Christ, but conceive it a ministerial ordinance to be administred by one single Minister without the presence or consent of a church of Christ: nor do I think baptism was at that time the Jewish ordinance being neither appointed in their law, nor by Ministers chosen by them, nor by their authority, nor according to their direction, nor for the setling of their church-discipline, or authority, but in these and all other respects opposite or distinct from the Jewish church. And although I grant the Jewish people or church (though *Pareus com. in locum* saith, *Dominus areæ suæ, h. e. ecclesiæ. imo totius mundi*) Christs floor, yet from hence it followes not they were Christs visible Church, there being other reason why they are called Christs floor, because Christ imployed his fanne, to wit, his preaching among them, being Minister of the circumcision, *Rom.* 15. 8. though they were not Christs visible church, that is, a company or people professing themselves to be his Disciples. Nor is it true that in *John* Baptists and Christs time, all sorts which *John* baptized, hypocrites, or upright ones, were interessed in the Jewish church as Christs floor, nor any such thing proved from *Matth.* 3. 11, 12. the being in the floor importing onely their position, no benefit or interest accruing to them thereby. But Master *Cobbet* goes on.

Into this Church-fellowship also did Christs own Disciples by that new way of initiation, visibly seal persons, which were the reformed part of that Jewish church, continuing still their relation to those officers of the Jewish church, and their fellowship in the Church-ordinances, then dispensed, and not separating from the same, either gathering into distinct churches, or calling to them other ordinary church-officers, which yet were not actually given by Christ, untill upon his ascension, *Ephes.* 4. 8, 11, 12.

Ans. The Disciples of Christ did not visibly seal persons by that new way of initiation into the Jewish Church-fellowship; the fellowship they had in the Jewish church, was by their birth and circumcision and the law they were under, which they submitted to, while it was in force, and observed such legal ordinances as were appointed them, acknowledging the Priests and other Officers of the Jewes according to their place: yet in respect of profession of Doctrine they were by baptism separated from the Jewes, and were gathered into a distinct church, had Christ and his Apostles and the 70. as their Officers in ordinary afore the ascension of Christ: nor is there one jot of Scripture that doth in the least countenance this fond conceit of Master *Cobbet*, that Jewish Church-

membership gave title to baptism, or baptism visibly sealed persons into Jewish Church-fellowship.

Master *Cobbet* having cashiered the spurious reasons (as he imagins) why *Peter* required of the Jews, to whom he said, The promise is repentance afore baptism, he takes on him to assigne the genuine reasons thus.

But the reason rather was, partly because (as was said) they were under such offence. Ans. He required repentance, because they had sinned in crucifying Christ, but repentance was not required to take away the offence of the church the Jewes were of, nor for the removing of a suspension from the seal. For *Peter* was no Jewish Church-officer, neither did any of the Jewish church in way of Discipline deal with those Jewes by any church-act, tending to their correction for that sin, yea, the rulers of the Jewes with the people did generally avow that act as well done: nor was any thing more offensive to them then the profession of Christ, and repentance for the killing of him. But *Peter* requires repentance as a necessary prerequisite universally to baptism, and as the way to remission of sins, which their perplexed soules needed. Master *Cobbet* addes: And partly because, albeit their church were a true Evangelical church, yet it was not so pure and perfect, but had many gross mixtures both of ceremonial administrations, which were now to be laid aside, and of most palpably and openly corrupt, and rotten members.

Ans. Neither doth Master *Cobbet* offer any proof for this his speech, neither is there any likelyhood that *Peter* ever intended to urge repentance by reason of these things, sith in none of his speeches he doth take exceptions at their church by reason of them, nor had this been a sufficient reason to urge them to repentance afore baptism, because though they had covenant and Church-right to baptism, yet their right was to be suspended to the seal without repentance, because they had gross ceremonial mixtures, and openly corrupt members, the Jewish church of which they were members being a gospel-church & essentially the same with the christian, if Master *Cobbet* say true; for if this were a reason, the *New-England* Elders do ill to admit godly persons to the seal with them, which came from a Parish-church in *England*, in which were the like mixtures, and corrupt members without like repentance: nor doth it appear that those Jewes had any hand in those ceremonial administrations; and though they sinned a great sin in crucifying Christ, yet it was through ignorance, *Acts* 3. 17. In a word, were it granted Master *Cobbet* that *Peter* did require repentance for any of these reasons, yet the argument is no whit infringed thereby, that bare interest in the covenant doth not give title to baptism without repentance, sith it did not give title to these Jewes, even then when notwithstanding their offence, and the corruptions in their church, yet the promise was asserted to belong to them *de præsenti* in respect of external right and administration, if Master *Cobbets* exposition hold good, which is directly opposite to the requiring of repentance to baptism by reason of a suspension of their right to the seal by reason of offence and corrupt mixtures. But let's hear Master *Cobbet* a little further.

And partly, saith he, because it was now requisite, not onely to acknowledg the promised Messiah of *Abrahams* loynes, to be he alone, which by his bloud should come actually, as well as virtually, to ratifie the covenant of grace, visibly made with them, as they did in receiving the seal of circumcision, but

ſequence is there in this, God ſent *John* to the Jewes, he had his authority to baptize thoſe of the Jewes, who repented, therefore he ſealed their membership in the church of the Jewes, and baptiſm was adminiſtrable in, or by, or to that church of the Jewes? It ſeems to me that the contrary followes, *John* was ſent to baptize, he preacheth repentance, tells them that it availed not them to ſay *Abraham* was their father, gathers them into a diſtinct School or ſociety from the Phariſees and Lawyers, *Luke* 7. 29, 30. directs them to Chriſt, who ſhould ſever chaffe and wheat; therefore he was not given by God in reference to that church of the Jewes as a ſeal of their membership therein, but ſevered a people from them by repentance and baptiſm, and that baptiſm was not adminiſtrable in, or by, or to that church of the Jewes, but in a diſtinct company, by a ſelect officer, to a ſevered people from that church. Nor do I know it to be true that baptiſm is a church-ordinance, to be in ordinary diſpenſation adminiſtred onely in and by a church of Chriſt, but conceive it a miniſterial ordinance to be adminiſtred by one ſingle Miniſter without the preſence or conſent of a church of Chriſt: nor do I think baptiſm was at that time the Jewiſh ordinance being neither appointed in their law, nor by Miniſters choſen by them, nor by their authority, nor according to their direction, nor for the ſetling of their church-diſcipline, or authority, but in theſe and all other reſpects oppoſite or diſtinct from the Jewiſh church. And although I grant the Jewiſh people or church (though *Pareus com. in locum* ſaith, *Dominus areæ ſuæ, h. e. eccleſiæ. imo totius mundi*) Chriſts floor, yet from hence it followes not they were Chriſts viſible Church, there being other reaſon why they are called Chriſts floor, becauſe Chriſt imployed his fanne, to wit, his preaching among them, being Miniſter of the circumciſion, *Rom.* 15. 8. though they were not Chriſts viſible church, that is, a company or people profeſſing themſelves to be his Diſciples. Nor is it true that in *John* Baptiſts and Chriſts time, all ſorts which *John* baptized, hypocrites, or upright ones, were intereſſed in the Jewiſh church as Chriſts floor, nor any ſuch thing proved from *Matth.* 3. 11, 12. the being in the floor importing onely their poſition, no benefit or intereſt accruing to them thereby. But Maſter *Cobbet* goes on.

Into this Church-fellowſhip alſo did Chriſts own Diſciples by that new way of initiation, viſibly ſeal perſons, which were the reformed part of that Jewiſh church, continuing ſtill their relation to thoſe officers of the Jewiſh church, and their fellowſhip in the Church-ordinances, then diſpenſed, and not ſeparating from the ſame, either gathering into diſtinct churches, or calling to them other ordinary church-officers, which yet were not actually given by Chriſt, untill upon his aſcenſion, *Epheſ.* 4. 8, 11, 12.

Anſ. The Diſciples of Chriſt did not viſibly ſeal perſons by that new way of initiation into the Jewiſh Church-fellowſhip; the fellowſhip they had in the Jewiſh church, was by their birth and circumciſion and the law they were under, which they ſubmitted to, while it was in force, and obſerved ſuch legal ordinances as were appointed them, acknowledging the Prieſts and other Officers of the Jewes according to their place: yet in reſpect of profeſſion of Doctrine they were by baptiſm ſeparated from the Jewes, and were gathered into a diſtinct church, had Chriſt and his Apoſtles and the 70. as their Officers in ordinary afore the aſcenſion of Chriſt: nor is there one jot of Scripture that doth in the leaſt countenance this fond conceit of Maſter *Cobbet*, that Jewiſh Church-

membe r-

membership gave title to baptism, or baptism visibly sealed persons into Jewish Church-fellowship.

Master *Cobbet* having cashiered the spurious reasons (as he imagins) why *Peter* required of the Jews, to whom he said, The promise is repentance afore baptism, he takes on him to assigne the genuine reasons thus.

But the reason rather was, partly because (as was said) they were under such offence. Ans. He required repentance, because they had sinned in crucifying Christ, but repentance was not required to take away the offence of the church the Jewes were of, nor for the removing of a suspension from the seal. For *Peter* was no Jewish Church-officer, neither did any of the Jewish church in way of Discipline deal with those Jewes by any church-act, tending to their correction for that sin, yea, the rulers of the Jewes with the people did generally avow that act as well done: nor was any thing more offensive to them then the profession of Christ, and repentance for the killing of him. But *Peter* requires repentance as a necessary prerequisite universally to baptism, and as the way to remission of sins, which their perplexed soules needed. Master *Cobbet* addes: And partly because, albeit their church were a true Evangelical church, yet it was not so pure and perfect, but had many gross mixtures both of ceremonial administrations, which were now to be laid aside, and of most palpably and openly corrupt, and rotten members.

Ans. Neither doth Master *Cobbet* offer any proof for this his speech, neither is there any likelyhood that *Peter* ever intended to urge repentance by reason of these things, sith in none of his speeches he doth take exceptions at their church by reason of them, nor had this been a sufficient reason to urge them to repentance afore baptism, because though they had covenant and Church-right to baptism, yet their right was to be suspended to the seal without repentance, because they had gross ceremonial mixtures, and openly corrupt members, the Jewish church of which they were members being a gospel-church & essentially the same with the christian, if Master *Cobbet* say true; for if this were a reason, the *New-England* Elders do ill to admit godly persons to the seal with them, which came from a Parish-church in *England*, in which were the like mixtures, and corrupt members without like repentance: nor doth it appear that those Jewes had any hand in those ceremonial administrations; and though they sinned a great sin in crucifying Christ, yet it was through ignorance, *Acts* 3. 17. In a word, were it granted Master *Cobbet* that *Peter* did require repentance for any of these reasons, yet the argument is no whit infringed thereby, that bare intereſt in the covenant doth not give title to baptism without repentance, sith it did not give title to these Jewes, even then when notwithstanding their offence, and the corruptions in their church, yet the promise was asserted to belong to them *de præsenti* in respect of external right and administration, if Master *Cobbets* exposition hold good, which is directly opposite to the requiring of repentance to baptism by reason of a suspension of their right to the seal by reason of offence and corrupt mixtures. But let's hear Master *Cobbet* a little further.

And partly, saith he, because it was now requisite, not onely to acknowledg the promised Messiah of *Abrahams* loynes, to be he alone, which by his bloud should come actually, as well as virtually, to ratifie the covenant of grace, visibly made with them, as they did in receiving the seal of circumcision, but

that they own the Lord Jesus, who was crucified by, and among them, as he which alone did thus: which amongst other testimonies baptism witnesseth, therefore more was now required of the adult Jews than formerly, which yet was not required of their unripe children.

Ans. I deny not circumcision to have had this use, that it might signify, that the promised Messiah should come out of *Abrahams* loynes, and I take it as certain that baptism was appointed, that thereby the baptized should own the Lord Jesus, and witness that he was the Messiah, and that this wasth e reason why even the Jewes circumcised, what ever their interest in the promise should be, were bound to witness by baptism Christ to be come: But this though true, and such as shewes a manifest difference between circumcision and baptism in their use; and confirmes the necessity of faith or owning of Christ by the baptized at his baptism, yet is not pertinent to the intent of Master *Cobbet*. sith thereby neither is the argument from *Peters* requiring repentance to baptism infringed, which argues that therefore covenant-interest is not sufficient title to baptism without repentance, nor is thereby any reason given of repentance being required by *Peter* afore baptism: Nor is there any proof in Master *Cobbet* why more should be required to baptism of the adult Jewes, then of their unripe children, onely he tels of their practice in *New England*, that when any are received to fellowship with them, though they being as transient members by vertue of communion of churches, are admitted upon their former church-ingagement, yet desirous to be fixed Members, they require testimony of their repentance of their former church-sins and personal scandals therein committed, not so of their children not *sui juris*, nor capable of personal satisfaction, so it was with them, *Acts* 2. being to be incorporated into a purer company, exhibiting the ordinances of Christ in a more perfect Evangelical way. But setting aside the question, whether this course in *New England* be justifiable and by what rule they require more of the fixed member then of the transient, the defilement being alike in both. 1. It is not true that it was so with the Jewes and their children as with fixed and transient members in *N. E.* For neither was the church of the Jewes then an Evangelical church less perfect then that of the Apostles, but openly opposite to Christ and the christian church: Nor was that which those Jewes perplexed did propound, that they might be of their church as a purer church, but what *Peter* and the Apostles would advise them to do to free them from the guilt of crucifying Christ. Nor doth *Peter* at all as an Elder assign repentance to them for admission to outward Church-priviledges, but as an Apostle preacheth to them repentance for remission of sins and easing their consciences, which was an act of doctrine, not of jurisdiction. 2. If it had been so, yet neither doth this prove that the Apostle required more of the aged Jewes to baptism then formerly, nor that he did it because they were to be incorporated into a purer company exhibiting the ordinances of Christ in a more perfect Evangelical way, nor that he did require more of the Fathers then the children to baptism; nor is the argument infringed, that if covenant-interest intitle to baptism of it self without repentance the Father to whom the promise is as well as the child, yea, in priority to the child, who derives his title from the Fathers covenant-interest, then it should much more intitle the Father to baptism without repentance: *Idem qua idem semper facit idem*, so that after so many shifts, absurdities, unproved dictates, vain dreames of making the case of

the

the Jewes like persons received into fellowship in *N. E.* and the overweening conceit of the purity of their church, and exhibition of the ordinances of Christ in a more perfect Evangelical way, there is nothing yet produced to invalidate the argument from *Peters* requiring repentance of the Jewes afore baptism, against the connexion between covenant-interest and right to baptism.

Master *Cobbet* goes on thus: nor must that needs follow, that because it's said, they were added to the church, that therefore they were not of the church before, but after *Peter* spake those words, v. 39. the promise is to you, &c. for this is as well spoken after that expression that they were baptized, as after that mentioned, of their receiving the Word gladly, and yet will our opposites conclude, that therefore they were not of the church, nor in the covenant before they were baptized, but came into that estate by baptism. If baptism were the form of the church, or that which they so much urge wholly failed, that a person must be first discipled, and so in covenant and Church-estate before he be baptized.

Ans. Either I understand not the force of words, or else it is a cleer argument, *Acts* 2. 41. And there were added in that day souls about three thousand, v. 47. And the Lord added the saved daily to the church, and these were of the Jewes, therefore Jewes were not of the church before that day, and that addition. For what is addition to a company but a joyning or bringing one more to them then was before? even as in arithmetick addition is putting to another member then was before reckoned. And this argument seems so plain to me, that I count the denial of it as the denial of a common notion. That which Master *Cobbet* answers is to the argument framed thus, they are not said to be added till after *Peters* speech, v. 39. therefore they were not of the church before; and I confess the argument so framed is not so cogent, sith historians do not alwaies relate things in order as they were done. Yet supposing *Lukes* relation orderly (of which there is no cause to doubt, sith the particles μὲν οὖν then v. 41. shew it) the argument is good, after *Peters* words it is said, then, and that day were added, therefore they were not before of the church. Nor do I know any absurdity in it to say they were added by baptism to the church, it being one means of addition to the church, and though I say not that baptism is the form of the church, but that there may be a church without baptism, nor the onely way of adding to the church, for the preaching of the Word is also a means of adding to it, yet this I say, that neither is a church regular, nor the addition as it should be without baptism. And though I say a person is to be discipled afore he be baptized, yet he may be baptized afore he is in some sense in covenant and church-estate, meaning in covenant by Gods promise to him, and in church-estate, that is, so as to be reckoned a member of a visible church in compleat fellowship of other ordinances with it.

Master *Cobbet* proceeds thus. Nor is that cogent, which is urged against the childrens right in the promise, and unto baptism, that they should be so privileged, when they came to be effectually called, and to be turned from their sins, as if this were *quoad homines*, their onely rule of judging of persons visible interest in the covenant of grace, or visible right to the initiatory seal thereof: or at least the onely way of having such a visible interest in the visible churches cour'. For besides that it was not so of old, in applying of circumcision, as Gods appointed seal of the parties visible covenant-estate and right:

even

even with us also it is not the rule *in foro Ecclesiæ*; for then none are by the church to be by rule admitted to baptism, but such as are effectually called, and then *John* which knew, that the most of them, which he baptized, would be as chaffe in the floor, he kept not rule in baptizing of them. Or if calling be taken for external inviting in the Word preached, and offer of Christ, that I suppose will not be pleaded; for then every hearer should be forthwith baptized, albeit an *Indian* or *Blackamore*; but calling as taken in reference to baptizing unto remission of sins, seemeth to be rather calling into visible covenant, and church-estate; unto which some, whose was the promise intentionally, yet were afar off from that estate actually at present, but when called to it, they were then to be baptized.

Ans. The objection answered here by Master *Cobbet* (if this passage here relate to my Examen, as it's likely it doth) was thus formed, Exam. pag. 60, 61, 62. Exercit. sect. 4. the promise, *Acts* 2. 39. is neither to fathers, nor their children, nor those afar off without calling, therefore nor to infants, who are not called by the Lord, and this calling I conceive an effectual calling to the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ, as the Apostle speaks, 1 *Cor.* 1. 9. Master *Cobbet* doting on his own frivolous exposition of the being of the promise in respect of external right and administration, propounds the objection as if the objectour agreed with him therein, and then the absurdities I confess would follow, which Master *Cobbet* drawes from the objection as thus interpreted [The promise is in respect of external right and administration, to none but the effectually called] that the onely rule to judg a persons visible right to baptism, and the onely way of having such a right is effectual calling. But Master *Cobbet* might have understood that I still disclaimed this, that right to baptism is from interest in Gods promise or covenant, and have asserted; that is onely from the persons own profession of Christ and covenanting to be his Disciple, and for the promise, *Acts* 2. 39. I understand it of Christ sent for remission of sins, and thus it is most true, that the promise is neither to father nor child uncalled; what therefore Master *Cobbet* refutes is not owned by me, yet his refutation I count not valid. For that which he allegeth, it was not so in circumcision, therefore it must not be so in baptism, proceeds on this mistake that the rule of circumcision is a rule about baptism. And for that which he saith, that *John* knew that the most of them which he baptized, would be as chaffe in the floor, I conceive not true, nor doth it appear that *John* did admit to baptism those he knew were hypocrites and reprobates. *Pareus, Comm.* in *Matth.* 3. 7. *non ad baptismum indignos admisit*, and of all others me thinks a *New England* teacher should not alledge that, which, if it were true, would condemn their strictness in admission of members into their churches, excluding them whom they are not satisfied to be truly regenerate, so far as they can discern. For doubtless whom *John* baptized they may and ought admit to Church-membership. And this plea is made by Master *Norton, Resp. ad Apollon. c.* 1. *propos.* 1. for the *New English* strictness that *John* Baptist repelled hypocrites from baptism. Now to the objection as I conceive it in the answer is insufficient, Master *Cobbet* denies that the words [as many as the Lord our God shall call] do circumscribe [to you and your children] as well as [all that are afar off, *Acts* 2. 39.] But then he would have it to be meant of calling into visible covenant, and

Church-

Church-eſtate, in which he would have infants included? But the Scripture ſpeaks of no ſuch calling, and both that conceit, and Maſter *Cobbet* expoſition conformable to it, have been ſo fully refuted before, that I ſhall add no more. Onely whereas he ſaith, that if calling were taken for external inviting in the Word preached, and offer of Chriſt, then every hearer ſhould be baptized forthwith, albeit an *Indian* or *Blackamore*. I conceive it will not follow, ſith they that would have all outwardly called by the offer of Chriſt baptized, it's likely do mean it of ſuch a calling as is with effect, ſo as that the perſon called be brought to outward profeſſion at leaſt of the faith of Chriſt.

Maſter *Cobbet* addes three conſiderations to prove, that infants not capable of actual repentance. were not in defect of that repentance, excluded from the promiſe mentioned, *Acts* 2. 38, 39. which I might grant underſtanding it of the promiſe of remiſſion of ſins before God and of elect infants, and yet no proof thence for infant-baptiſm. But becauſe Maſter *Cobbet* takes the promiſe to be in reſpect of external right and adminiſtration, and that from it there's a title derived for infant-baptiſm. I ſhall conſider what he ſaies.

1. Such a ſuppoſed excluſion of their babes had been, to lay an occaſion, and addition of more cumbers and trouble to the darkened diſquieted ſpirits of his hearers, then to clear and eaſe them, ſuppoſing, as is undeniably evident that their wiſh againſt their poor children, preſſed them ſore, as well as other guilt. It was all along thitherto, a received truth, that God was a God to their ſeed externally, by vertue of *Abrahams* covenant they were his adopted children, *Ezek.* 16. 21. and the churches children, which ſhe bare to the Lord, v. 20. ſee *Deut.* 29. 29. and it was evident, by Gods own appointment of circumciſion, to be the initiatory ſeal, not to a blanck, but to his covenant of being a God to them whileſt babes, and before circumciſed in heart, ſo as actually to repent, *Deut.* 30. 6. this their babes had external right unto whileſt theſe their parents were convinced or unwrought upon, remaining uncut off by cenſures from the church, as of old, *Ezek.* 16. 20, 21. is mentioned of thoſe Idolaters. Now if not ſo when their Parents are wrought upon by *Peters* Sermon, as the parents were thus far loſers, by Chriſt and his Goſpel, and the efficacy thereof, loſing that precious parental priviledge which they had before this of their childrens federal iniereſt, and priviledge of *Abrahams* covenant, ſo alſo their children are loſers too, by their Parents coming ſo far on to Chriſt, coming now thus to be excluded their former Covenant-right and neither Parents nor children to have any Covenant-right and priviledge in lieu hereof. How ſuch doctrine might well ſtumble, and trouble ſuch Parents, let any ſober and judicious mind judg; to be ſure they have a load of guilt, and given a deadly wound unto their poor Babes, by that curſe of theirs: now if they are as Pagans, ſtrangers from the covenant, then there is no hope, in reference to ordinary and revealed grounds and wayes of hope and life, *Epheſ.* 2. 11, 12, 13.

Anſ. This long tale hath more of childiſh affection then manly reaſon, ſetting aſide the new language of initiory ſeal ſet to a blanck, childrens federal intereſt, precious parental priviledge, cavenant right, and ſuch like gibberiſh according to the Pædobaptiſts ſuppoſitions about the imagined covenant to father and child, right of infants to the firſt ſeal thereby, and this a great priviledge without which no revealed grounds ordinary of hope and life, this is the

ſub-

ſubſtance of the tale, that if *Peter* had told them their infants were not to be baptized, who before were circumciſed he had added more grief to the ſpirits of the Jewes preſſed with the ſenſe of their wiſh againſt their children, *Matth.* 27. 25. and therefore he is to be conceived, *Acts* 2. 39. to have told them of their infants right to baptiſm. Now ſurely in my apprehenſion if *Peter* had told them ſuch a tale, as Maſter *Cobbet* imagins he did; even then when ſo great perplexity of ſpirit was upon them by reaſon of the horrid ſin of crucifying Chriſt, and their imprecation on them and their children, they being then indiſpoſed to laughter, muſt in all likelyhood have been much moved either with grief, or anger againſt ſuch a Doctor, as would mock them with ſuch a receipt, as was no more to their diſeaſe then the promiſe of a feather to weare is to revive a man almoſt dead with the pain of the collick. For what comfort could this be to them concerning themſelves, who expected the heavieſt wrath due to them for their ſin, or concerning their children on whom they wiſhed a moſt heavy curſe, to be told of a priviledge for them and their children, which as it was to them before, was painfull in the uſe, ſo was it a heavy yoke in the obligation, to be continued in an other rite which of it ſelf was but waſhing with cold water, and in the fruit of it before God yielded no benefit without faith and repentance, and in the church yielded at beſt but a tjtle of church-membership, by which they had no benefit, but what they might have without it, nor would ſtand them in any ſtead for church-communion without their actual believing? It is clear, *Acts* 2. 39. is an encouragement to the duties, and expectation of the good mentioned, v. 38. Now what encouragement is it to repent, to be told that the promiſe was already to them in external right and adminiſtration, and to their infants, though not as yet penitent or believers? ſuch a motive might rather have tended to keep them in impenitency being in ſo good caſe already in the eſtate they were in. And for baptiſm into the Name of Chriſt, ſuch a motive tended rather to diſſwade them from it, as might fill their mindes with high conceits of their and their childrens covenant-right, even by vertue of their being in the Jewiſh church without faith in Chriſt, or joyning to the chriſtian church. And for the good of remiſſion of ſins before God which they needed, what aſſurance could they have of it by telling them of their and their childrens having the promiſe already as Jews, without perſonal faith and repentance in external right and adminiſtration before men? As for the falſity of the ſpeech as expounded by Maſter *Cobbet*, it is ſhewed before, what he would burden his oppoſites with, as if denyeng infant-baptiſm, they counted them as Pagans, ſtrangers from the Covenant, without hope, in reference to ordinary and revealed grounds and ways of hope and life, *Epheſ.* 2. 11, 12. 13. is a meer Calumny. For ſetting aſide their talk of initiatory ſeal, and external covenant (which they cannot ſay aſſure life to the infants of believers without election) we aſſure as much by the covenant of grace, juſtification by Chriſts bloud, and ſanctification by his Spirit, which is effectual calling, and they can in trueth aſſure no more, nor any other way, though to uphold their credit, and to win the affections of credulous parents, they befool them with idle talk of a covenant which the Scripture never mentions, and of ſealing that covenant by baptiſm, which the Scripture is ſilent of. The texts *Ezek.* 16. 21, 20. *Deut.* 30. 6. will be examined afterwards. Why he bids ſee *Deut.* 29. 29. I know not. unleſs it be that we may diſcern his weakneſs in alledging the Scriptures

imper-

pertinently, sith it cannot be meant of infants to whom the revealed things do not belong, that they may heare them and do them in infancy.

The second consideration is in brief this, that the Apostles who as yet preached not for the abolishing of Mosaical rites, but were indulgent to the Jewes, *Acts* 21. 20, 22, 23, 24. would not give such manifest and just offence to them as to hold forth an exclusion of their babes from right in that covenant of *Abraham* it self, whereof circumcision was a visible seal, as the places quoted in *Gen.* 17. 11, 13. and *Acts* 7. 8. declare.

To which I answer, By my exposition there is no exclusion of babes from the promise, *Acts* 2. 39. though it be restrained to those who are effectually called, sith babes may be said to be effectually called by the Spirit of God according to election: nor doth my exposition exclude the Jewes infants from the Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 7. or circumcision, or in the least manner meddle with that point. Nor do I think the promise, *Gen.* 17. 7. to be the same with that, *Acts* 2. 39. If it were, yet how it may be understood otherwise then Master *Cobbet* conceives is shewed above.

The third consideration, setting aside his phraseology is this, that if *Peter* should intend to exclude infants from baptism, it were to be cross to *Pauls* doctrine, *Rom.* 15. 8. who makes it Christs end not to evacuate, undermine, or abolish by his coming, [the promises] indefinitely made to the fathers whether in, *Gen.* 17. 7. or *Deut.* 30. 6. or the like, or respecting parents or children, but to confirm the same, Ibid. But how this consequence is made good I cannot conceive, but do deny it, and expect a proof of it *ad Græcas Calendas*.

Master *Cobbet* concludes the chapter with an answer to the objection, that if this were granted of those Jewish children, what is this to our childrens federal interest in the daies of the Gospel? and he answers, 1. That it proveth that by the Apostles since Christs ascension, this tenent of the children of visible members of the church are visibly interessed in the covenant of grace is of divine authority, and is no humane invention.

Answ. 1. In the objection, the concession was that those Jewish children were never before denyed to be visibly in *Abrahams* covenant, which Master *Cobbet* alters, thus [are visibly interessed in the covenant of grace] now it may be granted those Jewish children were visibly in *Abrahams* covenant, and yet denyed, that they are visibly interessed in the covenant of grace, the covenants being not the same every way, and it being certain, as in the case of *Saul* and others, a person may be visibly interessed in the covenant of *Abraham*, and yet not in the covenant of grace. 2. Infants visible interest in the covenant of *Abraham* I know no otherwise, then by circumcision, and this sure the Apostles taught of no other then the Jewish children. 3. The text, *Acts* 2. 39. speaks not of visible interest in the covenant of grace by external administration. 4. If it did, yet it speaks of none other children, but Jewish, and so not of ours, and therefore the tenent may be an humane invention notwithstanding this text and the concession of the objectour.

2. Saith Master *Cobbet*, these Jewes are eyed by the Apostles, as persons to partake of priviledges of a Church of Christians, as was baptism; and therefore what extent of federal right and priviledge is granted by the Apostles to them and their in that way is equally belonging to Gentiles in a like way.

Anſ. the Jewes were not tyed by the Apoſtles to partake of baptiſm without the repentance of each perſon to be baptized, nor is it by the Apoſtle made a federal right and priviledge, but a duty to which the promiſe did encourage, nor is the promiſe ſaid to be to them or any of their children, but the effectually called, ſo that were the concluſion granted Maſter *Cobbet*, yet his purpoſe is not gained that the Gentiles infants are to be baptized.

3. Saith he, to ſuppoſe God by Apoſtolical ratification, to allow to children of Jewiſh parents coming on to Chriſt, &c. a larger priviledge then to Gentile parents, as came on to Chriſt, &c. is to make God a reſpector of perſons.

Anſ. 1. It is not yet proved that the Apoſtle allowes to children of Jewiſh parents the priviledge Maſter *Cobbet* means. 2. the Jewes, *Acts* 2. 39. were not conſidered as coming on to Chriſt, but as guilty of crucifying him, and under horrour of conſcience for it. 3. The priviledge of baptiſm or the promiſe in reſpect of external right and adminiſtration (as Maſter *Cobbets* phraſe is) could not belong to the Jewes at that preſent, & therefore the Apoſtles ſpeech had been falſe in Maſter *Cobbets* ſenſe. For he cannot aſſert they were then come to Chriſt, but coming on to Chriſt, nor is it certain that many of them ever came to Chriſt. But [the promiſe is *de præſenti* in reſpect of external right and adminiſtration, which is Maſter *Cobbets* ſenſe] is falſe of perſons which were not come to Chriſt, except he will have the Apoſtle aſſert a right of baptiſm to them without faith. 4. The Jewiſh parents children had then a larger priviledge then the Gentiles in the firſt offer of the Goſpel, as they had larger priviledges before, *Rom.* 9. 3, 4, 5. and they ſhall have larger priviledges at their calling hereafter if I underſtand the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 11. 24, 25, 26, 27, 28. And herein God is not ſuch a reſpector of perſons as *Peter*, *Acts* 10. 34. denies him to be ſo, as not to accept a Gentile who feareth him and worketh righteouſneſs as well as a Jew. Acts of ſpecial grace undue to ſome perſons, not to others, argue not unjuſt reſpect of perſons in God, but acts of judgment awarding good to one that fears him and works righteouſneſs, becauſe of ſuch a Nation, and not to another, who doeth the ſame, becauſe he is not of that nation, contrary to his declarations, promiſes, lawes, by which he hath bound himſelf; would argue unjuſt proſopolepſy, his declarations, promiſes, and lawes being general, and ſo the being of that Nation extirnſecal to the cauſe.

Saith he, the force of the words ſeem to carry it, that the ſame promiſe which was to thoſe Jewes actually in Church and Covenant-eſtate, was intentionally to theſe afar off, which were ſtrangers actually from a like eſtate, whether thoſe of the ten tribes, or rather thoſe of the Gentiles, and ſhould be actually to them, when they came to be called actually into the fellowſhip of that covenant and Church-eſtate. Now what promiſe was that? verily a promiſe which carried with it a partial reference unto their children: The promiſe is to you, and to your children: And the ſame is unto them afar off, whom God ſhall call; *Scil.* in reference to their children alſo.

Anſ. There is no colour from the words that, *Acts* 2. 39. the promiſe is meant to be actually to thoſe Jewes, and intentionally to thoſe afar off, nor doth this conceit agree with Maſter *Cobbets* expoſition, who will have it to be *de præſenti* to belong to the perſons recited, and conſequently actually to all there named; Nor do I know how to make true ſenſe of this his ſpeech. For the promiſe is either ſaid to be in reſpect of the act of the promiſer, or of the

thing

thing promised. In the former sense the meaning of Master *Cobbet* should be this, that God had made the promise to the Jewes already actually, but he had not made the promise to those afar off, but intended to do it afterwards. But this sense agrees not with Master *Cobbets* and other Pædobaptists conceit, who would have the promise to be that to *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 7. But that promise was made almost 2000 years before, not made to those Jewes then, nor to any afar off afterwards that can be shewed. In respect of the thing promised, whether it be (as I say) Christ manifested in the flesh for the remission of sins before God, it is not true that it was actually then to the Jewes mentioned, *Acts* 2. 39. For they were not yet repenting believing persons, or it be meant of remission of sins in respect of external right and administration, it is not true that the promise was actually then to them, in external right, they had no right then to claim baptism, being not then believers, neither had they the promise in external administration *de præsenti*, for they were not actually baptized (which I think is the external administration meant, I cannot imagine Master *Cobbet* would be so vain as to conceive *Peter* told them, they were circumcised) but *Peter* exhorts them to be baptized, and therefore the promise was no more actually to the Jewes then present, then to those afar off. Nor is it true that the Jewes present were then actually in Church and Covenant-estate, if it be meant of the Christian Church, and Covenant of grace in Christ, for they were not repenting believers; and if it be meant of the Jewish Church, and Covenant-estate which they had as descended from *Abraham* by natural descent, and by reason of circumcision, so the Gentiles were never called or to be called actually into that fellowship of that Covenant, and Church-estate, but rather out of it: Nor if they had been called into it, had that Church and Covenant-estate at all conduced to their interest into the Christian Church and Covenant of grace, but rather to the contrary. And for the promise it is true, there is a reference to their children, but not because they were believers children or their children, but by vertue of Gods call, and it is true the promise is to Gentiles children and Jewes when called of God, and no otherwise, and consequently no Birth-priviledge to either intitling to baptism. And thus is that magnified chapter of Master *Cobbet* abundantly answered.

SECT. XXIII.

Master Sidenhams *notes on Acts* 2. 39. *in his exercitation ch.* 5. *are considered.*

I Shall adde a consideration of what Master *Sidenham* notes on *Acts* 2. 39. that I may at once shew the impertinency of its allegation for connexion between the covenant and baptism, and infants of believers as covenant-interest upon that consideration. I agree with him that the promise is of remission of sins and so of salvation. Nor do I deny it to be suitable to what is promised, *Gen.* 17. 7. understanding it not, as Pædobaptists and among them Master *Sidenham* conceives, as a promise to each believer and his natural seed, but as a promise

miſe to *Abraham* as the father of believers, and his ſpiritual ſeed by the following of his faith of righteouſneſs before God repeated at large, *Jerem.* 31. 34. Nor do I miſtake his making it the ſame with the promiſe of Chriſt, and the Spirit, as, *Gal.* 3. 14. is meant including juſtification, ſanctification, and all graces. And his words I conceive very oppoſite to overthrow Maſter *Cobbets* and others conceit of external right and adminiſtration, when he ſaith, it would be but a poor comfort to a wounded ſoul for to tell him of a promiſe of gifts, not of ſpiritual grace, and the Holy Ghoſt is a better Phyſician then to imply ſuch a raw improper plaiſter to a wounded heart, which would hardly heal the skin, this promiſe is brought in as a Cordial to keep them from fainting, and to give them ſpirits to believe, and lay hold on Jeſus Chriſt. And truly no other promiſe but that of Free-grace, in order to Salvation, can be imagined to give them comfort in that condition. And after, and it muſt needs have been a mighty low, and diſproportionable way of perſwaſion, to put them upon ſuch high things in the former verſe, and to encourage them onely by the narration of ſome temporary gifts in the following, when their eye and heart was ſet on remiſſion of ſins, and ſalvation by Jeſus Chriſt; and nothing but a promiſe holding forth theſe mercies could have been conſiderable to them. Nor do I deny that the children as well as the Parents are included in this promiſe, nor do I deny but that the children are invited to baptiſm by the promiſe as well as the parents. But I deny, 1. That the mention of the promiſe to them and their children was alluſive to the expreſſions in the Old Teſtament, when God ſaid to *Abraham* I will be the God of thee and thy ſeed, *Gen.* 17. 7. or that, Iſai 44. 3. and ſuch like, nor hath Mr. *Sidenham* proved it, and there is this reaſon againſt it. For in thoſe expreſſions the Fathers are mentioned as righteous perſons, and believers: but here the parents could not be conſidered as righteous and believing perſons, for they were not ſuch, but then charged by *Peter*, and at that time under the ſenſe of the great ſin of killing Chriſt, and admoniſhed to repent of it, and therefore the words have clearly this ſenſe, The promiſe is to you, and your children as bad as you have been, and the mention of their children is not alluſive to Gods expreſſions in the Old Teſtament, but to their own curſe on them and their children, *Matth.* 27. 25. and ſo cannot note a priviledge to them and their children as perſons better then others, bnt an aſſurance to them of that good which they feared their ſin debarred them of, by telling them of Gods inrent for good according to his promiſe, though they meant it for evil, as the ſame Apoſtle doth, *Acts* 3. 17, 18, 19. and *Joſeph* did, *Gen.* 45. 5. and 50. 20. 2. I deny that the children are invited to baptiſm by the promiſe as giving title to baptiſm of it ſelf, for the promiſe is urged as a motive to a duty, not as a plea whereby they might claim, nor was their intereſt in the promiſe the antecedent to baptiſm, but the conſequent on it. For the promiſe whether it be of remiſſion of ſins, or of the ſaving gift of the holy Ghoſt allowing Maſter *Sidenhams* obſervation that it is δοθεισα not χαρισμα it is certain that *Peter* did aſſure them of it not as yet already attained, but as attainable, not before, but upon their repentance and baptiſm, neither to them, nor to their children as their children; but to them and their children, and all afar off as many as the Lord ſhould call. 3. He doth not invite them to baptiſm, but ſo as that he firſt puts them in minde of repentance. Now if the promiſe had been alledged as giving title

of

of it self to baptism, he had left out repentance: But putting it in first, he plainly shewes, that the alledging of the promise was as well to move them to repentance as to baptism, and first to repentance, then to baptism; nor is any other course taken with the children then the parents, the promise and duty are declared in like manner to both. And therefore Master *Sidenhams* talk of *Peters* speaking in the known dialect of the Old Testament, that if he had not meant upon their believing and baptism without any other consideration of Gods calling or their repentance the children to be in the promise, he had deceived them, and that there was no other intent in mentioning the promise but to intimate that as the Jewes and their infant males were circumcised by vertue of the promise, so it should be to them in baptism, is but vain without proof, and without truth.

But Master *Sidenham* affirms that the words [as many as the Lord shall call] can in no sense be referred to the former part of the verse, either to parents or children; which if true, then according to his own interpretation of the promise the Apostle asserts, that the promise of remission of sins and of the Spirit including justification, sanctification, and all graces, was to them and their children, whether called or no. But let's view his reasons for this audacious assertion. For, saith he, 1. He changes the sense in both parts of the verse; in the first part unto the Jewes, he speaks *de præsenti*, of the present application of the promise; repent you and be baptized ——; for the promise is to you and your children: even now the promise is offered to you; and they were then under the call of God; But when he speaks of the Gentiles, because they were yet afar off, and not at all called, he speak *de futuro*, as many as God shall call, even of them also; which is the first hint of the calling of the Gentiles in all the Acts of the Apostles.

Ans. The Apostle changeth not the tense of the same verb in either part of, v. 39. For there are but two verbs in the verse ἐστὶν and προσκαλέσηται, and neither used above once, so that he might have said, he useth two verbs in two teases, but neither changeth in one or both parts of the verse the same verb or the same tense of the same verb. But what if he had changed the tense, and had said, the promise is to you and your children whom he now calls, and the promise shall be to all that are afar off as many as God shall call even of them also, did it follow that in no sense the words (as many as the Lord shall call) can be referred to the Former part of the verse, either to parents or children? Surely if I have any understanding, the contrary followes, that if the meaning were, the promise even now is offered to you, and they were then under the call of God, but not yet called, the words may be referred to the former part of the verse to parents and children, thus the promise of remission of sins is now offered to you and your children under the call of God to be attained by as many as the Lord our God shall effectually call at this time, and hereafter. But how stands it with other Pædobaptists applications of this Scripture, as if the promise did *de præsenti* belong to the children in external right and administration, and a covenant-right in them, and title to the initial seal, and yet the promise onely offered to them, and they not called, but under the call of God. If the offer of the promise, and a call *in fieri* which is not *in facto esse* be sufficient to intitle men to the promise in external right, and to the initial seal, then had those Jewes which believed not, *Acts* 28. 24. and the *Athenians*

ons, *Acts* 17. 32. such right and title. Master *Sidenham* will have infants by the words [your children] will he say the promise was then offered to them, and they then under the call of God? If he did, he should tell how that we might understand it. And there is need he should shew some reason and proof of thathisparaphrase, which is not yet done, ere his Reader (if he be wise) will receive it. And for what he saith that in that verse there is an exact distribution of the world into Jew and Gentile, the Gentiles being usually those afar off, it requires better proof then this, sith neither is the term Jew expressed, nor the term [afar off] used of the Gentiles that I know but, *Ephes*. 2. 13. where it is ὁι ποτὲ ὄντες μακρὰν, which may be questioned whether it be the same with πᾶσι τοῖς εἰς μακρὰν, in the text. But Master *Sidenham* addes.

2. How unequal would the distribution be of this verse, not suitable to the lawes of expression among rational men? If as many as the Lord shall call, should be a limitation to the former part of the verse, the word children, must needs be redundant and superfluous; for Jewes and Gentiles comprehend all the world. Now children must either be one part of the world, or comprehend under one or both names, or be a distinct world by themselves, neither Jewes nor Gentiles: And this must needs follow on such a reading of the words; for the design of the Apostle is to hold forth the freeness of the promise to Jew and Gentile, and their children, to these Jewes at present, to the Gentiles and their children when God shall call the parents, as he did these Jewes.

Ans. Master *Sidenham* hath printed here such a toy as might please himself, but is fit for nothing but to be slighted. For, 1. He supposeth that [you and those afar off] is as much as Jewes and Gentiles, which is not proved. 2. He supposeth consequently [you and those afar off] to comprehend all the world, because Jewes and Gantiles comprehend all the world. But this followes not, though the term [you] note Jewes, if it note onely some Jewes, to wit, those to whom *Peter* then spake. 3. That if [as the Lord shall call] should be a limitation to the former part of the verse, the word children, must needs be redundant and superfluous, for Jewes and Gentiles comprehend all the world. Which indeed followes on his conceit that here is an exact distribution of the world into Jew and Genrile. But this is manifestly false, for though [they afar off] should be the Gentiles, yet all the Gentiles are not therein comprehended, but those that are called; and if the term [you] note the Jewes, yet in notes not all the Jewes, but such as were parents, and therefore the term [children] is necessary being not comprehended under the term [you] and it is alike necessary to expres them distinctly, whether the limitation [as many as the Lord shall call] be applyed to the former part of the verse or to the latter onely, so that I can yet see no reason of Master *Sidenhams* conceit, that such a referring of the limitation [as many as the Lord our God shall call] to the first part of the v. as I make, would cause the distribution of this v. to be so unequal as not to be suitable to the lawes of expression among rational men. And to what he addes further I say [children] were one part of the world, and comprehended under Jewes, but how this must needs follow on such a reading of the words as puts [as many as the Lord shall call] to the first part of the verse any more then to the latter onely I see not? nor if it did, do I know any absurdity in it, no nor any opposition to what he makes the Apostles designes. But let's see what he

he makes of all this to his purpose. He tels us, now put children by themselves a third party, and add, whom the Lord shall call, and you exclude them from being either Jewes or Gentiles, and so excommunicate them from any hopes of calling, or being saved. To which I say, if I doated like Master *Sidenham*, making [you and those afar off] synonymous to Jewes, and Gentiles in general, when the terms note onely some in particular, and put [children] by themselves as a third party, I should exclude them from being Jewes or Gentiles, whether I added to the first part of the v. the words [as many as the Lord shall call] or did otherwise. And if I made all that are called and saved to be comprehended under [you and those afar off] as Synonymous to Jewes and Gentiles in General, and excluded [children] as neither I should excommunicate them as he saith. But that either any such thing followes on the limiting of the former part of the v. by those words [as many as the Lord our God shall call] or any other of my sayings, is neither proved by Master *Sidenham* nor any other, nor ever will.

But Master *Sidenham* goes on: Now this is, 1. Contrary to that known rule in Logick, That *Omnis bona distributio debet esse bimembris*; onely of two members, and those opposite one to another; to bring in a third marres all. This then he imagines that if [your children] be a third party, and not either [you or those afar off] a Logick rule would be broken. But whose Logick rule is that he mentions? I confess there have been Logicians who have affected dichotonie, but when they have tyed themselves to it, they have been censured as guilty of accurate vanity by *Burgersdicius Inst. log. l. 2. c. 5. Keck. Syst. Log. l. 1. part. 2. c. 3.* and others. *Scheibler Top. c. 29. n. 36.* bounds it with sundry cautions. And indeed we must cashier many received divisions if that rule hold as e. g. in morality of good into honest, pleasant and profitable, in divinity of the law into moral, ceremonial and judicial, of the divine persons into the Father, Son and holy Ghost, of the Bookes of the Old Testament into *Moses*, the Prophets and the Psalmes and so blame Christ himself. What Master *Sidenham* infers, so that it is most clear the words must be understood, as they are translated, is not denyed by me, and yet the words, [*Acts* 2. 39. as many as the Lord our God shall call] limit the first part of the v. Nor do I deny the promise is to you Jewes, and your children at present, to express the Apostles meaning in the sense I have given, nor do I gainsay what he addes, and to those afar off also and their children, when God shall call them, if he mean it of the calling the chileren as well as the parents; though withall it is to be noted, that in the text there is no mention of the children of those afar off. But what he saith further, else (that is, if the promise be not to the children of those afar off when God shall call the parents) calling can with no sense be applyed to any tittle of the former part of the verse, without you make it monstrous, and unlike it self, is either false or unintelligible by me. For though the promise should not be to the children of those afar off, when God called the parents, yet this is in my apprehension good sense, The promise is to you being called, and to your children being called, nor is any monstrosity or unlikeness to it self more in this sense then if the term [called] were applyed onely to the latter part: But there would be non-sense, if the distribution were reduced to dichotomie as Master *Sidenham* would have it, and the proposition would be false, that the promise (which Master *Sidenham* makes to be of remission

miſſion of ſins, Chriſt and his Spirit, juſtification, ſanctification, and all graces) is to them or their children without calling, or though God ſhould not call them.

There is ſome more of the like ſtuff in that which followes. 2. It's againſt another rule about diſtribution which is, that *partes diviſionis ambulent equali paſſu*, that the parts of a diſtribution ſhould be equally ſet together. Now here will be a mighty inequality, as to the communication of the promiſe; if the words ſhould be taken in their ſenſe, the Jewes will have a greater priviledge then the Gentiles, if children be not equally added to both, the Jewes had the promiſe made to them, and their children at preſent, theſe afar off ſhall onely have the promiſe to themſelves, but not their children.

Anſ. It is one of the vexations that befals men that write bookes that they are neceſſitated to anſwer ſuch ſilly ſcriblings: But ſo we muſt do or elſe the world will be befooled with that which is moſt vain. The objection to which this Author anſwers is, that the latter clauſe, as many as the Lord ſhall call, is a limitation of the verſe, and no more are under the promiſe, and ſo children, if God ſhall call them, ſhall alſo enjoy the promiſe; now that which he contends for is, that [children] is to be added equally to both parts of the v. (which was not in queſtion) but ſhewes not the promiſe to be to the children if God call them not, which is the thing in queſtion. And as he ſhootes beſides the mark, proving what was not to be proved, ſo his argument is nothing to that he takes on him to prove. He ſets down a rule in Logick, which I find in *Scheibler, top. c.* 29. *n.* 39. with this explication, *hoc eſt, ſumentur ex eodem genere.* But in this ſenſe it ſeemes this Author meant it, that the thing divided be communicated equally to the parts of the diviſion, it is not true. For then the diviſion of being into ſubſtance and accident, God and the Creature, with many more, were not right diviſions. But were his rule right, as he means it, (as it is not) yet it is nothing to his purpoſe. He would prove, if children be not equally added to both parts of the v. *Acts* 2. 39. then the Jewes will have a greater priviledge then the Gentiles (which might be granted without abſurdity) for there would be a mighty inequality, as to the communication of the promiſe, which is againſt the rule of Logick he mentions, as if the promiſe or the communication of the promiſe were a whole divided into parts, and one part were the Jewes and their children, and the other were the Gentiles and their children, which were ridiculous; nor do I know any other way he can underſtand his arguing from this Logick rule, but that it will appear alike frivolous. But the Reader (I doubt) will think I inſiſt too much in anſwering ſuch trifles. I go on therefore.

3. Saith he, conſider, how comes this word (your children) to be kept in, for what end and uſe, if it were not to ſhew ſome ſpiritual priviledge they have with their parents, when God calls or converts the parents? what ſtands it for but a ſtone of offence to conſciencious hearts?

Anſ. 1. he aſſerts in this paſſage that (your children) is kept in to ſhew ſome ſpiritual priviledge they have with their parents, when God calls or converts the parent? but a little before he obſerved a change in the tenſe in both parts of the verſe; in the firſt part unto the Jewes, he ſpeaks *de præſenti*, of the preſent application of the promiſe, and ſuppoſeth under the call of God already; here (your children) is to ſhew a ſpeciall priviledge, when God calls

or

or converts the parent, which intimates that he had not then called or converted the parent. and therefore the one passage crosseth the other.

2. He had said before, that (*as many as the Lord shall call*) *can in no sense be referred to the former part of the verse either to parents or children*, and yet here he refers it in a necessary sense, as he conceives, to the parent.

3. If the special priviledge to the children doth suppose the parents call, why not also the childrens call?

4. Yea the special priviledge in the Text to the father and child is *the premise*, and that Master *Sidenham* makes to be *of justification, sanctification, and all graces*, and can he imagine this promise to be to a child barely on the parents call without his own personal calling by God? I think he durst not assert it: If he did, I am sure it is false as being contrary to *Rom.*8.30. and therefore of necessity to make his own exposition good, we must limit the former part of the verse, in what is said both of parent and child by the words [*as many as the Lord our God shall call*]. As for his questions, why [*your children*] is in the verse, it hath been answered, because of their imprecation, *Matth.*27. 25. to which he replies thus:

To see the sad shift of errour is wonderful: Can any man imagine, that the parents could doubt more, or so much of their childrens being accepted, and saved, when God should call them who were innocent, and only under the sudden rash curse of their parents, when they saw that the promise was to themselves, who were the actual murtherers of the Lord Jesus.

Answ. To me who am so well acquainted with the shifts of Pædobaptists, it is not wonderful to see the shifts of errour. This very reply what is it but a vain shift? For he supposeth *the children were innocent*, which he cannot prove, and that *the curse was sudden and rash*, which seems rather to have been deliberate, and that *they saw the promise was to themselves, and Christ offered pardon to themselves*, when there was nothing but horrour on their consciences for crucifying Christ till after *Peters* speech to them, and that *if the parents were not imagined to doubt more or so much of their childrens being accepted and saved as themselves, then there was no reason to insert* [*your children*] *by occasion of the imprecation, Matth.* 27. 25. whereas if they doubted any whit, yea if for the present they did not think on that curse, yet might afterwards as there was cause they should, there was reason enough for *Peter* to insert those words whether they tended to take away a present, or possible fear in them concerning their children. But there is more of his trifling yet behind.

2. Saith he, *Such a consideration would rather sadden them then refresh them, to mention the calling of their children: For they might more doubt of that, then of any thing, whether God would call them or no, and be as far to seek as ever they were, that they would have but cold comfort upon this account; this was enough to break their hearts if that were in their eye.*

Answ. The phrase [*and be as far to seek as ever they were*] intimates the Jews had attained some comfort before this speech of *Peter* (which is manifestly false from the Text) and that *telling them that the promise was to their children if called by God would rather sadden them, then refresh them,*

it was cold comfort, enough to break their hearts if that were in their eye: which is in effect all one as if a man should say, when a man is in a swoon hot water will rather sadden him then refresh him, or when a man is sad, it is cold comfort enough to break his heart to give him a cup of Sack. But Mr. *Sidenham* will not be thought *sine ratione delirare*. For, saith he, *they might doubt more of that, then of any thing, whether God would call them or no.* What? was it likely they should doubt more of their childrens calling and pardon, if they were called, then of their own pardon, who were then under horrour of soul for their own grand crime of killing Christ? or if they did thus doubt, would it break their heart to be told that there was a possibility and hope that the promise was to their children, who might be called? I have heard that if it were not for hope the heart would break: but I never heard that the telling of a person of a thing of which there was hope, though he might doubt of it, would break his heart. But Master *Sidenham* addes.

The old way of conveying the promise is cut off, no promise but to called ones: our poor children are uncalled, and God knows whether ever they may be called of God: thus might they reason.

Ans. Its true, they might thus reason: But that they did, or by *Peters* words, as expounded by me, were likely to reason thus, is against reason to imagine. The old way of conveying the promise I imagine he means the giving the initial seal to their infants, that is, Circumcision. Now will any sober man think that in that perplexity they were in through conscience of their guilt, and danger of wrath impending on their children by reason of their impious curse, when *Peter* tells them to stay them from despair, that yet in Christ sent the promise was fulfilled for remission of sins to them and their children, if each of them were called of God, that is, did repent and believe, that they would repel this comfort by questioning the losse of Circumcision, and bemoaning the want of it to their infants? I know the Jews were zealous after for Circumcision and the Law, even those who became Christians, yet sure in that perplexity there was not the least thought of such a poor privilege as an initial seal, but of the freedome of themselves and children from their guilt and curse. But I would know where this doctrine is, that *Circumcision conveys the promises, or is the old way of conveying them*, and what Scripture saith *the promise* (of remission of sins here meant, as Master *Sidenham* himself expounds it) *is to any but called ones. Paul* saith, *Rom.* 8. 30. *whom he hath called, them he hath justified. Hos & non alios*, saith *Augustine*, and Orthodox Protestants, as from the Text may be evinced, saith all these agree to the same persons to be predestinate, called, justified, glorified. Is this such doctrine as were enough to break their hearts? But let's hear him out.

But when he includes them in the same promise with parents, and exhorts the parents to repent upon this ground, that the promise is to them and their children; this savours like a Gospel comforting-exhortation, and could not be but of great efficacy upon their spirits.

Answ. Me thinks it should be comfortable to them, that the promise was to them and their children upon condition of calling, that is, sanctification, repentance,

repentance, believing: It is Antinomian doctrine, not Gospel, to say, justification is to a person uncalled, that afore he believes he is justified actually before God, even while he lives in the height of sin. It is true the promises of the land of *Canaan* and other benefits were to *Abrahams* natural seed: but the Gospel-promises of remission of sins and everlasting life in Christ, were never to *Abrahams* or any believing parents natural seed as such, but only to *Abrahams* spiritual seed, elect and true believers. Master *Sidenham* addes.

4. *What strange mysterious tautologies would be in this one verse? if that last sentence should refer to all the former expressions, we must read it thus to make out their sense. The promise is to you parents of the Jews, when God shall call you, (and they were then under call) and to your grown children, when God shall call them; and to all which are afar off, when God shall call them: Can any man with his understanding about him think the holy Ghost should faulter so much in common expression of his minde, when there was no need of adding of calling to any part, but to those that are afar off, who never were yet under Gods Gospel call?*

Answ. There's neither tautology, nor mystery in limiting the promise to the called of the Jew parents and children, nor doth any thing make it seem strange, but ignorance. Tautology is not, sith the Propositions are three distinct ones in words and sense, it is not the same to say, the promise is to you called, the promise is to your children called, the promise is to all that are afar off called you, your children, all that are afar off being different tearms. Mystery is no more, if it be added to the former part of the verse then to the latter. The calling in the latter part of the verse can be understood of no other than effectual calling, whether inward onely, or both inward, and outward, for to none other of the Gentiles is the promise of remission of sins. And for the same reason the limitation is necessary to be added to the former part of the verse; nor can any good reason be given why the promise should be to the Jews and their children without calling by God, and not to those afar off without it; The Jews were then under call, but were not then called, nor doth Mr. *Sidenham* say they were, and therefore *Peter* might aptly enough say to them, The promise is to as many of you as the Lord our God shall call. The manner of expression is usual to put after a distribution of persons the limitation in common. There is the like, *Acts* 3.24. where *as many as have spoken* limits *the Prophets from Samuel, and those that follow after.* Had Mr. *Sidenham* understanding in him of these things, he had not charged my exposition with making the *Holy Ghost faulter in common expression of his mind.* Such censures ill become such a smattering scribler. But who so bold as blinde bayard? It follows

Lastly, saith he, *the word, children, may and must be understood of little ones, infants, not of adult and grown persons, for these reasons.*

Answ. Boldly said like a young horspur. Belike then when persons are ten, twelve, or more years old, they cease to be their parents children and seed. But I am willing to hear reason: 1. saith he, *the word here (τέκνοις) properly signifies an off-spring, any thing brought forth, though it be but of a day, of a moment old: Thus when a woman is said to be in pain, and to bring forth, this word is used, John* 16.21. *Luke* 1.31. *Matth.* 1.16. *Luke* 1.57.

Answ. How heedlesly did this Authour scribble when he said, *this word* (which can be no other then τέκνοις) *is used*, John 16. 21. Luke 1. 31. Matth. 1, 26. Luke 1. 57. when it is used in none of those places, though the verb whence it comes is used in them. But were it used there, yet the reason is frivolous: τέκνον signifies a thing brought forth, *ergo* τέκνοις children, *Acts* 2. 39. may not, must not be understood of adult and grown persons. He might as well have said, it must be understood but of those that are in this moment brought forth, not of an infant of a day old, and that the person brought forth is only the mothers τέκνον, or child, because she only brought him forth, not the father. I did think till I met with this new Master, that the Holy Ghost spake properly when he called persons grown to ripe age their fathers τέκνα or children, *Ephes.* 6. 1. *Col.* 3. 21. *&c.*

2. Saith he, *Its an indefinite word, and therefore may not be restrained to grown children, except God had expresst it in a peculiar phrase.*

Answ. Mr. *Sidenham* alters the conclusion he undertook to prove, and concludes that which he findes not denied: His reason is as well against his own conclusion: Its an indefinite word, and therefore may not be restrained to infant-children except God had expresst it in a peculiar phrase. And indeed the reason is good only thus, Its an indefinite word, therefore its to be restrained as the subject matter directs. But Mr. *Sidenham* shifts as it may serve his turn. His conclusion set down at first excluded adult children, because he knew the promise had not then been to them without calling, and so his project of drawing thence a priviledge for infants intituling them to baptisme had failed, but here his proof coming short he alters the conclusion into that which might be granted him without detriment to the cause.

3. Saith he, *It must needs be especially meant of little ones, because they are distinguished from themselves, who were men of years. Now when we distinguish between men and children, we suppose the one adult, the other under age, and not grown up; and it is contrary to all ways of expression to think otherwise.*

Answ. Belike then we must think that where it is said, *Matth.* 10. 21. *the fathers shall deliver the children to death, and the children shall rise up against the parents, and* Luke 1. 17. *to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children,* it must be especially meant of little ones, because they are distinguished from themselves who were men of years, and to think otherwise if the Dr. of *New-Castle* say true, is contrary to all ways of expression, which you may imagine he knew.

4. Saith he, *It cannot be rationally conjectured otherwise, because the Apostle doth join them with their parents in the same promise, and not leave them to stand by themselves, as grown persons must.*

Answ. Belike then if any understand the promises to *Abraham*, and his seed, to *David* and his seed of any other then infants it is not rationally conjectured. I have done with this Writer about this Text, of which he vainly talks, as he doth in the rest; *so that all things weighed, this text of Scripture if there were no more, holds forth* (not to be seen) *the sameness of the promise to believers of the Gospel, both Jew and Gentile and their children, as ever it was to Abraham and his natural seed.*

SECT.

SECT. XXV.

Mr. Marshal's *Reply to my* Examen *about his first Conclusion is reviewed, and the Covenant* Gen.17. *still maintained to be mixt, and that Gentile self-justiciaries though reputed Christians are not termed* Abraham's *seed, nor* Gal.4.29. *proves it, and that the distinction of outward and inward Covenant is not right.*

1 Now reassume the Review of Mr Ms. Reply to my Examen of his Sermon; Next, saith he, come we to examine the truth of the Antecedent, which I manifested in those five Conclusions opened in my Sermon. But I supposed he had intended to prove by his five Conclusions not onely his Antecedent, but also his Consequence. If I apprehend him rightly, there are none of his five Conclusions but the two first that are for proving of the Antecedent. But let's view what he writes.

The first whereof is this, That the covenant of grace for substance hath always been one and the same both to Jews and Gentiles. The first Conclusion you grant, and therefore there were no need to have stayed the Reader any further about it, were it not that some of your Exceptions do almost recall your grant. If it be in substance the same, though you should reckon up a thousand accidental and local differences, it were nothing to the purpose.

Answer. It is true, I granted this Conclusion understanding it according to the Explication in his Sermon, pag.9,10. in these words, That the new and living way to life was first revealed to *Adam* immediately after his fall, and that blessed promise concerning the seed of the woman often renewed, and the Patriarchs faith therein, and salvation thereby plentifully recorded in Scripture: But the first time that ever it was revealed under the express name of a League or Covenant was with *Abraham*; who because he was the first explicite Covenanter is called the Father of the Faithfull; and ever since clearly hath all the world been divided into two distinct bodies and families, the one called the Kingdom, City, Houshold of God, to which all who own the way of life were to joyn themselves; and these were called the children of God, the sons of *Abraham*, the children of the Kingdom; all the rest of the world, the Kingdom of the Devil, the seed of the Serpent, strangers from the covenant of grace, without God in the world, &c. The substance of this covenant of grace on Gods part was to be *Abraham*'s God, and the God of his seed, to be an all-sufficient portion, an all-sufficient reward for him, to give Jesus Christ to him, and righteousness with him both of justification, and sanctification and everlasting life, Gen.17.1, &c. Gal.3.15. Rom.4.3. John 8.56. On *Abraham*'s part the substance of the covenant was to believe the promised *Messiah*, to walk before God with a perfect heart, to serve God according to his revealed will, to instruct his family, &c. Gal.3.16. Gen.17.1. & 18.19. Gal. 3.17,19. In which passage I did conceive that Mr. M. meant by the substance of the covenant of grace the promise as it is purely evangelical, which I conceived to be the same with the new covenant mentioned Heb.8.9,10,11,12. & 10.16,17. And this I was sure was not made with all *Abrahams* natural posterity, much less with any believing Gentiles natural posterity as such, but

onely

onely so many of either as are elect and believe, as Rom.9.6,7,8. Gal.3.29. is determined, and so none of a believing Gentiles children are in this covenant, but they that are believers, or elected to faith in Christ. But then this would not serve Mr. Ms. turn. And therefore notwithstanding those words in his Sermon, yet in his Defence pag.90. he saith, The covenant of grace contains not onely saving grace, but the administration of it also in outward ordinances and Church-privileges: but in what sense he means it contains them he declares not. That which is contained in a covenant is either the promise or the condition. The seal, writing, writer, pen, and such like adjuncts are never called the covenant, nor contained in it, though they be instrumental to hold forth the covenant. Now where any promise is of outward ordinances and Church privileges, or how they should be a condition of the promises I understand not. He distinguisheth pag.106. of the covenant of grace thus,

The covenant of grace is sometimes taken strictly, sometimes largely: as it is considered strictly, it is a covenant in which the spiritual benefits of justification, regeneration, perseverance, and glorification are freely promised in Christ. Secondly, as the covenant of grace is taken largely, it comprehends all evangelical administrations, which do wholly depend upon the free and gracious appointment of God, and this administration is fulfilled according to the counsel of Gods will; sometimes it was administred by his appointment in types, shadows, and other legal ordinances; this covenant of administration God said *Zachary* 11.10. he did break with the people of the Jews, and at the death of Christ he did wholly evacuate and abolish, and in stead thereof brought in the administration we live under, where also he rejected the Jews, or broke them off from being his people in covenant, and called the Gentiles and grafted them *in ramorum defractorum locum*, into the place of the branch, and broken off as your self, pag.65. do with *Beza* rightly expres it.

But herein Mr. M. confounds what in his Sermon he distinguished the covenant of grace and the administration of it. He saith, The covenant of grace largely taken comprehends all evangelical administrations; and saith, This administration is fulfilled. By the evangelical administrations he means the old legal ordinances afore Christs death, and the administration we live under which is baptism and the Lords Supper, pag.126. he saith, Our Divines own the outward administration of the covenant under the notion of *fœdus externum*, the outward covenant.

Now if there be sense in these passages, I must needs charge my self with dulness, who cannot discern it. Is it sense to call that a covenant without a Tope, which is neither a promise nor a condition of a covenant? to say that the covenant contains or comprehends evangelical administrations, and yet to call it the administration it self? to say, this administration was administred, and not something by the administration administred?

But let us consider what others make of this distinction of covenant strictly and largely taken, or which is all one, the inward and outward covenant. I have met with none that speaks more distinctly than Mr. *Anthony Burges* in his Book entituled Spiritual Refining, Sect.8. Serm.64. pag.393. who was one of the Assembly.

The external covenant is that whereby in an outward visible manner God doth own a people, and they externally profess their owning of him; but yet in

in their hearts and ſouls they do not ſtedfaſtly cleave unto God, and faithfully keep this covenant in the conditions thereof. The internal or inward covenant is that whereby God doth in a ſpiritual powerfull manner take a people to him working in their hearts all thoſe gifts and graces promiſed in the covenant as regeneration, remiſſion of ſins, adoption, and the like. And in this ſenſe onely the truly godly are in the covenant, and they are onely Gods people, and he their God. This diſtinction of a covenant into outward and inward is not a diſtinction of a *genus* into its *ſpecies*, ſo much as a diſtinction of a thing into the ſeveral adminiſtrations and diſpenſations of it.

In this paſſage there is want of clearneſs as well as in M. *Marſhals*. He tels us negatively, that it is not a diſtinction of a *genus* into its *ſpecies*, yet with ſome mincing of the matter (ſo much) as if it might be the diſtinction of a *genus* into its *ſpecies*, though not ſo much, which is an expreſſion of a man who would ſay ſomewhat bnt cannot well tell what to ſay. But if it be not a diſtinction of a *genus* into its *ſpecies*, what diſtinction is it? Is any man the wiſer for a meer Negative? It is, ſaith he, a diſtinction of a thing into the ſeveral adminiſtrations and diſpenſations of it.

But this tells us not what ſort of diſtinction this is, whether *nominis* of the word or *rei* of the thing. If he had meant to be a diſtinction of the word he ſhould have ſhewed where the word is ſo taken, if of the thing, what kinde of diviſion or diſtribution it is. To me it ſeems againſt all Rules of Logick to divide thus. A covenant is either the outward or the inward adminiſtration and diſpenſation of it or the inward, which without Trope of ſpeech (which ſhould be abſent from men that ſhould rationally explain things) is non-ſenſe, affirming one covenant to be one adminiſtration and another another, whereas the covenant is one thing and the adminiſtration another thing. But his meaning is this, one covenant is outward being outwardly adminiſtred, or adminiſtring outward things, another inward adminiſtring inwardly or inward things. But neither is this right ſith the covenant doth not adminiſter but the covenanter, nor doth he do it by the covenant but by ſome other act according to the covenant, the covenant is onely an agreement and promiſe to do it, the adminiſtring is the keeping of the covenant, not the covenant it ſelf.

But let that be yielded that the covenant doth adminiſter, yet the deſcription of the external covenant as made by Mr. *Burges* doth not include adminiſtration. For God may in an outward viſible manner own a people, and they externally profeſs their owning of him, and yet neither adminiſter one to another any thing promiſed, or if the owning be adminiſtration, the people adminiſter to God as well as God adminiſters to them. Beſides his deſcription makes an external profeſſion of owning God requiſite to the external covenant. If that be right, no infant is in the external covenant till it profeſs owning God, and in what outward viſible manner God doth own infants except by baptizing them (which God doth not but the Miniſter, nor ever commanded or declared his approbation of it) I know not, and then the outward covenant is nothing elſe but baptizing, and an infants being in covenant is his being baptized or to be baptized, and the argument from the covenant comes to this ridiculous tautology, all infants of believers are in the outward covenant (for they dare not ſay they are all in the inward) that is, they are in the outward adminiſtration, which is no other than baptiſm, and ſo the antecedent is equipollent to this,

they

they are or are to be baptized; and the conclusion is, *ergo*, they are to be baptized.

But Mr. *Marshal* it seems conceives the outward Covenant, as he describes it, meant *Zach.*11.10. where the Prophet saith, And I took my staff even Beauty, and cut it asunder, that I might break my Covenant which I had made with all the people. And he interprets it thus, that at the death of Christ God brake his covenant with the Jews, wholly evacuating and abolishing the legal Ordinances, and bringing in the administrarion we live under.

But if this be the sense, then this Prophesie doth not foretell any thing penal to the Jews; for the abolishing of legal ordinances was a mercy to them, they being a yoke intolerable, Acts 15.10. whereas the Text speaks of it as an evil that should befall them.

Piscator in his *Analysis*, *Eventus fuit desertio Judæorum*, *v.*9,10,11, *&* 14. *Diodati* and after him the *New Annotations* in *Zech.*11.10. My Covenant] the peace which I had granted to my Church, that she should not be assaulted no more, nor be molested by any strange Nation, which was verified from the Maccabees time, untill a little before the coming of Christ.

Grot. Annot. in locum. Abstuli protectionem illam specialem. Irritum facere fœdus suum Deus dicitur, cum ruptis a populo fœderis conditionibus, ipse quoque a sua parte promissa non implet.

Mr. *Ms.* conceit is, as if by the Covenant were meant legal Ordinances, and so the breaking off is meant either *de jure* onely, and then it is not a Propheste of what should happen; or else *de facto*, in the event, but then it is not true; for the Jews retained the legal Ordinances of the Covenant he made with them, and do still at this day even circumcision, and as many other of the legal Rites as they can in their present dispersion. It is true, God brake off the Jews from being his people in Covenant, and called the Gentiles and grafted them *in ramorum defractorum locum*, and how this is to be understood I have shewed before at large in the first part of this Review. But without a Trope to call outward Ordinances Gods Covenant is without example of Scripture (the Covenants Rom.9.4. say *Beza*, *Piscator*, *New Annot. &c.* are the Tables of the Covenant) and can hardly be acquitted from non-sense. Onely perhaps it seems Mr. *M.* for a shift, as *v. g. pag.*103. he saith, God makes good his promise sealed in baptism in which he engageth himself to be the God of believing Christians and their seed; which in his Sermon pag.10. he makes the promise of saving grace, yet when it is proved that cannot be true of Gentile believers and their children he runs to this vain shift, that the outward Covenant belongs to them (which is nothing to the promise Gen.17.7. in which outward administrations are not promised) though not the inward. Nor is it Mr. *Ms.* manner alone but the common course of Pædobaptists in their writings to play fast and loose with the ambiguity of the term Covenant and Covenant of grace, as hath been formerly shewed, and may appear more in that which follows. But to keep to Mr. *M.*

He tells me, If the Covenant of grace be in substance the same, though you should reckon up a thousand accidental and local differences it were nothing to the purpose.

To which I reply; Though I grant the Covenant of grace be always the same in substance, meaning thereby that the elect are saved in all Ages by the same

ſame promiſes of evangelical grace, that is righteouſneſs, regeneration, adoption in Chriſt, and the promiſe Gen.17.7. hath an evangelical ſenſe, which is this, that God will be a God to *Abraham* and his ſpiritual ſeed by election and faith, and am unjuſtly charged of ſpoiling all infants of all intereſt in the Covenant of grace, and confining the Jews promiſes to earthly and temporal bleſſings, of which I have acquitted my ſelf in my Letter to Mr. *Baily*, Sect. 1.2. yet I never granted that the Covenant with *Abraham* did contain no other than evangelical promiſes of grace in Chriſt, nor that theſe very promiſes Gen.17 4,5,6,7,8. were all evangelical promiſes, nor any of them in that ſenſe, which is obvious to the underſtanding, according to common Rules of Grammar, but onely according to the Apoſtles Expoſition, who never ſo expounded the promiſe, Gen.17.7. as if it were made to any mans ſeed but *Abrahams*, not to every believing Gentile and his natural ſeed. And certainly this difference between the covenant Gen.17. and the covenant of grace will be much to the purpoſe to ſhew the Covenant, Gen.17 not to be to a believing Chriſtian and his ſeed; and that though circumciſion of male infants ſhould have its reaſon barely from the intereſt of the circumciſed in that Covenant; yet ſuch a Covenant-intereſt not belonging to our children who are of the Gentiles cannot be a reaſon to entitle them to baptiſm though it ſhould be granted (which is not) that our baptiſm ſucceeds their circumciſion, and ſeals the covenant of grace as theirs did that made with *Abraham*.

This mixture of the Covenant, and the inference thence, that Circumciſion did not belong to all believers and their children, but as in *Abrahams* family is obſerved by Mr. *Allen* and Mr. *Sheppard* in their Defence of the Anſwer to the nine Poſitions, chap.8. and becauſe their words are appoſite to my purpoſe, though otherwiſe applied by them, I ſhall recite them.

Now that we hold the right proportion in the perſons may appear, firſt, in that (as was granted) Circumciſion ſealed the entrance into the Covenant, but this Covenant was not ſimply, and onely the Covenant of grace; but that whole Covenant that was made with *Abraham*, whereby on Gods part they were aſſured of many ſpecial bleſſings (whereof *Lot* and others not in this Covenant with *Abraham* were not capable) and whereby *Abraham* and his ſeed, and family were bound for their part to be a people to God, and to obſerve this ſign of the Covenant, which others in the Covenant of grace were not bound to. Secondly, (as is granted) it was *Abraham* and his houſhold and the ſeed of believing Jews that were to be circumciſed, and therefore not viſible believers, (as ſuch) for then *Lot* had been included; ſo by right proportion not all viſible believers as ſuch, but ſuch as with *Abraham* and his family are in viſible Covenant to be the people of God, according to the inſtitution of Churches when and to which the ſeal of Baptiſm is given; and therefore as all family-churches but *Abrahams* being in a new form of a Church were excluded, ſo much more ſuch as are in no viſible conſtituted Church at all.

In which it is expreſly yielded, that the Covenant with *Abraham* was mixt in my ſenſe, that Circumciſion did not belong to all viſibly in the Covenant of grace, that it belonged peculiarly to the Church in *Abrahams* family, that Baptiſm follows the Chriſtian Church conſtitution (which ſure is much different from the Jewiſh) and therefore not the Covenant made with *Abraham*. But Mr. *M.* ſeems to be ſenſible of this, and endeavours to prevent it in that which follows.

But, saith he, the first doth almost recall it, wherein you charge me to carry the narration of the Covenant made with *Abraham*, *Gen.*17. as if it did onely contain the Covenant of grace in Christ; whereas it is apparent (say you) out of the Text, that the Covenant was a mixt Covenant consisting of temporal benefits, the multiplying of *Abrahams* seed, possession of *Canaan*, the birth of *Isaac*, besides the spiritual blessings.

To which I reply, I meant so indeed, and so I plainly expressed my self, that all the difference betwixt the Covenant then made with *Abraham*, and the Covenant made with us, lies onely in the manner of administration of the Covenant, and not in the Covenant it self. The Covenant it self in the substance of it holds out the same mercies both spiritual and temporal to them and to us.

Answer. By mixt Covenant I mean a Covenant consisting of some temporal blessings proper onely to *Abrahams* natural posterity and some spiritual blessings common with him to all believers whether Jews or Gentiles. And I say, those promises of temporal blessings were of the substance of the Covenant made with *Abraham*, that they cannot in any fit sense be called the manner of the administration of the Covenant, that the Covenant it self in the substance doth not hold out the same mercies both spiritual and temporal to them, and to us. And all these things I thus prove.

1. Those promises were of the substance of the Covenant, which are in Scripture called the Covenant it self, without mention of the spiritual promises; but this is true of the promise of the Land of *Canaan*, *&c.* *Psalm* 105. 8,9,10,11. *Nehem.*9.8. *Gen.*26.3. *&* 28.3,4,13,14. 1 *Chron.*16.15,16,17, 18, *&c.* In which places the Text expresly saith, God made a Covenant with *Abraham*; and then recites the Covenant, that it was to give the Land of the *Canaanites*, *&c.* which were temporal mercies not now promised or performed to us. *Ergo*, To deny those promises to be of the substance of the Covenant, and to call them administrations, which the Scripture calls the Covenant it self so often, if it be not to thwart the Scripture, sure it is unwarrantably to alter its expressions: God himself so expresly calling the giving of *Canaan* his Covenant, *Exod.*5.45.8. refutes this conceit.

2. Those promises are of the substance of the Covenant made with *Abraham*, which are integral parts of the Covenant. But those promises of temporal blessings are integral parts of the Covenant made with *Abraham*. *Ergo*, the *major* is in it self manifest, for the Covenant is nothing but a promise or an aggregate of promises; and so if a Covenant have any substance in it, it must be the integral parts. The *minor* is apparant from the very words, *Gen*,17.4, *&c.* where God having in general terms told *Abraham*, My Covenant is with thee, he expresseth to the 9. verse, wherein his Covenant was with him, and that is set down in those peculiar blessings to *Abrahams* natural posterity, Verse 6. 8.

3. The promise of *Canaan* can be called no other way the administration of the Covenant of grace than in that in the hidden sense under that promise spiritual good was intended to be shadowed. But this very thing shews that the promise of an earthly inheritance was in the first place thereby intended to *Abrahams* natural posterity, and the other onely as an additament or appendix to the promise in its first meaning. Now then if the promise of *Canaan* in the

first

first sense be not of the substance of the Covenant, neither is the promise onely implied mysteriously in the more hidden sense, which is but an appendix to it, of the substance of the Covenant.

4. The Covenant made with *Abraham*, holds not out the same mercies both spiritual and temporal to *Abrahams* natural posterity and to us. *Ergo*, there is more difference than in the administration. The Antecedent is apparant; for the promise of the Land of *Canaan*, the birth of *Isaac*, Christ to come of him according to the flesh, *&c.* are not made to us. *Ergo*,

But Mr. *M.* thinks to prevent this by telling us, Godliness having all the promises both of this life and that which is to come; and that they and we have our right to all these promises upon the self same condition.

Answer. Thes things are manifestly false; for though godliness have the promise of this life and that which is to come, 1 *Tim.*4.8. yet the promises, *Levit.*26.6, *&c.* are not made to every godly man, that he shall ly down and none shall make him afraid, that he shall chase his enemies, *&c.* but rather assurance is given that he shall be persecuted, 2 *Tim.*3.12. *Mark* 10.29,30. Nor have they promises upon the same condition; for *Exod.*34.24. it is promised, that none should desire the *Israelites* Land while they did appear thrice in the year before the Lord, but to us there is not that promise nor upon that condition.

But, saith he, earthly things indeed were to them promised more distinctly and fully, heavenly things more generally and sparingly than they are now to us; and on the contrary, spiritual things are more fully and clearly promised to us than to them; and earthly promises more generally and sparingly.

Answ. This is not all the difference; for I have shewed that to us an earthly rest is not promised at all, but the contrary assured to us, to wit, suffering persecution.

Mr. *M.* adds, And that these temporal benefits which you mention, *viz.* multiplying of *Abrahams* seed, the birth of *Isaac*, and possession of *Canaan*, were all of them administrations of the Covenant of grace, they were figures, signs, and types of spiritual things to be enjoyed both by them and us. These things I not onely asserted, but proved in my Sermon. If you mean no more than this, that all these temporal blessings were promised and given as flowing from the promise of Christ, and were subservient to it, or were types and shadows of it, you mean no more than what we all grant, who yet deny any more mixture in the Covenant made with *Abraham* for the substance of it, than there is in that made with us; and that the difference lies onely in the manner of administration.

Answer. I deny not but that the possession of *Canaan*, birth of *Isaac*, multiplying *Abrahams* seed were figures, signs, and types of spiritual things to be enjoyed by elect Jews and Gentiles according to the mystical hidden sense of the words; nor do I deny that they were subservient to the promise of Christ, whether it be to be said they flowed from the promise of Christ, or tended to the fore-signifying of Christ to come, the grace of the Gospel, and the heavenly inheritance and rest is a doubt. Surely they flowed from Gods special love to *Israel* above any other people, *Deut.*7.6,7,8. And I grant that Circumcision ratified spiritual blessings chiefly, that is as the chief thing promised; yet in the sense in which I think *Cameron* meant it, *Thes* 78. *de triplici fœdere* primarily,

rily, that is according to the first and manifest sense of the words it sealed earthly promises peculiar to *Abrahams* natural posterity, and that Ciacumcision of infants was specially for that reason, to wit, the peculiar promises to *Abrahams* natural posterity; nor do I see cause to mislike *Grotius* his speech *Annot. in Luc.* 1.59. *Infantium autem circumcisio ostendebat fœdus esse gentilium.*

And this mixture of the Covenant with *Abraham*, to wit, that it contained not onely promises common to all believers, but also promises so peculiar to *Abrahams* natural posterity, that all of them were not according to the Law to be made good to any Gentile though a Proselyte circumcised, namely, the inheritance of the Land of *Canaan*, of which none but the natural progeny of *Israel* were to be inheritours, is so manifest, that the denial of it I can hardly impute to any thing but dulness or meer pertinacy. Yet why these promises so peculiar to them should be denied to be of the substance of the Covenant made with *Abraham*, I see no reason they being integral parts. Christ it is true is the substance of the things promised as they were Types; yet the things promised in respect of their natural being had a substance besides, and in relation to the Covenant were as much the substance or substantial parts of it as the spiritual promises; yea, sith those spiritual promises (if I may so speak) did subsist in the expressions of temporal blessings, it follows in my apprehension, that if the promises of the spiritual blessings were of the substance of the Covenant, then surely the promises of temporal blessings, which those very promises did express, and under the shadow of which they were made should be much more of the substance of the Covenant. Nor do I conceive any grosness in it to imagine of God, that he should in a Covenant of grace founded in Christ intend in the seal of it to ratifie temporal blessings, when he intended to assure spiritual blessings under the covert of words in the first sense importing onely temporal. As for the terming of the administration of the Covenant of grace it is neither according to Scripture, nor is it very handsom sense, specially according to Mr. *Ms.* doctrine, who calls Circumcision the old administration of the Covenant, and if it were an administration of the promises, which were administrations of the Covenant of grace, then Circumcision was an administration of an administration.

But Mr *M.* speaks to me thus. *I desire to know of you what Scripture ever made circumcision a seal of* Canaan; *we have express Scripture that it sealed the righteousness of faith whereby he was justified, but I no where reade that it sealed the Land of* Canaan.

Answer. To gratifie him I tell him, that I read Circumcision called *a token of the Covenant*, *Gen.*17.11. which Covenant was the Covenant mentioned before in that chapter, and in that v.8. the promise of the Land of *Canaan* is made, and *Acts* 7.8. *Stephen* calls it *The Covenant of Circumcision*, which he shews not how it was otherwise fulfilled in that speech but by bringing them out of *Egypt*, and placing them in *Canaan*, in which he fulfilled his promise to *Abraham*, *vers.*6,7,16. It is true, the Apostle calls *Abrahams* Circumcision *A seal of the righteousness of faith which he had yet being uncircumcised*, *Rom* 4.11. But I finde not this said of any ones Circumcision but *Abrahams*: surely it cannot be said truly of any ones Circumcision but a believers. As for what he saith, *That we have now carnal promises, and therefore our covenant may be as well mixt as that with* Abraham.

I

I answer it is true, *We have promise of the life that now is and that which is to come*; and so our Covenant is in a sort mixt of spiritual and temporal promises: but these promises are common to all godly persons both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, not proper onely to *Abrahams* natural posterity inheriting, in which sense I called it a mixt Covenant, *Exercit. pag.2. Sect.1.* I grant, *we have outward privileges and ordinances, as Baptism and the Lords Supper, and that many now are members of the visible Church, and partake of them who are not elect nor true believers.* But none but elect persons have the promises of the new Covenant made to them; none but an elect person hath the promise, that *God will write his Laws in his heart, be his God, &c.* And therefore none but such in truth are in the covenant of grace, though others may be in shew in it and accounted so by us.

Mr. *Josiah Church* in his Book forenamed *pag.41.* interposeth thus, 1. *Spiritual and temporal promises may be said to make a mixt Covenant, but not a mixt Evangelical Covenant; for a mixt Gospel Covenant is a Covenant partly of works, and partly of grace, and the Covenant of which Circumcision was the initial Sacrament was not mixed after that manner; for the Law was not given untill four hundred and thirty years after it, and then it was not mixed with it, but onely annexed to it, Gal.3.17.*

Answer. Mr. *Church* his Confession, that spiritual and temporal promises may be said to make a mixt Covenant, is as much as I need to justifie my speech *Exercit. pag 2.* who did not call the Covenant made with *Abraham* mixt in any other sense.

But, saith he, 2. *the difference was onely in the dispensation, and not in the substance of the Covenant: the Covenant of which Circumcision was the initial Sacrament was as purely Evangelical as this, whereof Baptism is the initial Sacrament: for the Gospel is said to be preached unto them as well as to us, and the temporal promises were Evangelical and belonged to believers, as such; for because of unbelief many obtained them not, Heb.3.19. Also there are temporal promises in this dispensation, and the people of God have Christ and all other things by the same charter, Matth.5.5. & 6.33. Rom.9.32. Ezek.36. 25,30.*

Answer. If there were difference in the promises, there was difference in the substance of the Covenant made with *Abraham* and ours. It is proved from *Gal.3.8.* that the covenant made with *Abraham* was Evangelical, but not purely Evangelical. It is not true, that *the temporal promises Gen.17.4,5,6,7,8. belonged to believers as such.* For though many through unbelief entered not into *Canaan*, *Heb.3.19.* yet neither all nor onely believers entered in. *The Gospel was preached to them as well as to us*, *Heb.4.2.* but not either by so purely Evangelical a covenant, nor in so perspicuous a way. *We have temporal promises now*, but not the same, nor by the same charter.

As for what he adds, *that the promises sealed in the former dispensation were principally spiritual.* I grant it, but deny it any absurdity, to say, that no promise was sealed to many circumcised infants, that their souls were not profited, nor any benefit to them by circumcision, though there was profit by it attainable and attained by many; more than which to the present purpose is not gathered from *Rom.2.1,2.*

I return to Mr. *M.* I take his grants *pag.99. That Circumcision was comprehended*

bended in his, &c. as belonging to the manner of administration of the Covenant together with sacrifices, and that the Covenant of grace was administred by sacrifices and other types before Circumcision was instituted; and so blot out my second exception against his first conclusion, onely it is to be observed that *pag.*187. he doth cross himself. For whereas here he grants it to belong to the manner of administration, not to the substance of the covenant, there he will *have it to belong to the substance of the Covenant not as a part of it, but as a means of applying it.* And this is in effect all one as in his language to say, it belongs not to the substance of the covenant, for of it onely are the parts, but to the administration. For how doth it administer it but as a means of applying it?

But my third Exception requires more reviewing. Mr. *M.* in his *Sermon pag.*14. had mentioned besides Christ and true believers a *third sort of* Abrahams *seed not born* Jews, *but made Proselytes, who were* Abrahams *seed by profession who sought justification by the works of the Law did not submit themselves to the righteousness of God*; and alleged *Gal.*4 29. for it.

Against this I excepted 1. that I thought he could not shew where in Scripture such are called *Abrahams* seed.

To this he replies, 1. *That he named not Proselytes to add any strength to the argument, it had been enough for his purpose to have said, Some in the Church of the* Jews *were visible members, yet not inwardly godly, and these were called* Abraham's *seed as well as others.*

Answ. I should have yielded to call such, if they were *Jews* by birth or nature, *Abrahams* seed; but not so of any Proselyte, and so Mr. *M.* had not his purpose, of applying the term [*Abrahams* seed] to *Gentiles* who were believers onely in profession, much less to *Gentiles* who did not so much as profess faith in Christ, but sought righteousness by the works of the Law.

2. He saith, *He never expected to have met with a quarrel for calling them, who joyned to the Church by that common name whereby the Church-members were called*, viz. *the seed of* Abraham *or the children of* Israel.

Answer. There was no quarrel in my words: but if Mr. *M.* did not expect that, his sayings in that Sermon would be sifted to the bran; it was his oversight. They that doubted of the divine warrant of Pædobaptism had very great cause to discuss that Sermon being preached and printed at that time by such a man, and taken to be the sense of the Assembly of Divines then sitting at *Westminster.*

He says, *The seed of* Abraham *or the children of* Israel *were the common name by which Church-members joyned to the Church of* Israel *were called*: but he proves it not, and till he do prove it, I reject it.

3. Saith he, *And could no place of Scripture be produced where Proselytes are expresly called by this name, the matter were not* Tanti.

Answer. It would follow then that the promise *Gen.*17.7. of being *God to* Abraham's *seed* is not meant of *Gentile* Proselytes, who were onely by profession Gods people, not in reality; much less of their natural seed, and this would make most of the infants baptized unbaptizable by Pædobaptists own principles; for sure the do not take the natural infant-children of them that are not *Abrahams* seed to be in the covenant, *Gen.*17.7. and therefore must confess them unbaptized.

4. Saith

4. Saith he, *But if it were a thing of any moment, it would be no hard matter to produce evidence sufficient to prove that Proselytes were called* Israelites *and the seed of* Abraham, *as Acts* 2.10. *&* 22. *compared Acts* 13.26. *compared with* v.43. *but I forbear.*

Ans. Of what moment it is, hath been said. I think it would be a very hard matter out of those Texts to prove any Proselytes, much less such as were onely visible Church-members of the *Jews*, seeking justification by works, not submitting to Gods righteousnes, *Abrahams* seed. In the former of the Texts is not the term *Abrahams* seed, which was the term in question, nor do the Verses compared prove that the *Proselytes* mentioned *v.*10. are called *v.*22. *Men of Israel*, any more than *Men of* Judea *and dwellers at* Jerusalem, *v.*14. nor doth it appear they were called *Men of* Israel, *v.*22. in any other sense than as *Israelite* by generation.

The later Text mentions *the children of the stock of* Abraham, *v.*26. but so called by natural generation opposite to the *Gentiles*, as *v.*46. shews, not Proselytes called *Abrahams* seed, *though self-justiciaries and Gods people onely, so far as outward profession*, yea, *children of the stock of* Abraham are there distinguished from *those among them that feared God*, that is, Proselytes.

I told Mr. *M.* that he joyned with *Arminius*, in calling *self-justiciary Proselytes* Abraham's *seed*: which Mr. *Bayn* denied.

He saith, *He joyned not with* Arminius, *that I miss-allege* Arminius, *joyn with* Servetus.

To which I reply no more than I have done in my *Apology*, *pag.*22. *Sect.*5.

To acquit himself from what I charge him with, that Mr. *Bayn* opposeth him, he brings words six lines before of Mr. *Bayns*, that say [*children of the flesh*] *in some other Scripture doth note out justiciaries, and that these words clear him, and that I was guilty of negligence or falshood.*

But sure I must continue still this charge against Mr. *M.* and add further an imputation of negligence at least, if not of falshood, who heeded not that the words of Mr. *Bayn* which I alleged say as much, *that the term* [*children of the flesh*] *elsewhere signified self-justiciaries though not there; yet the seed of* Abraham *without any adjoyned is never so taken.* Now I did not charge with this that he had no Scripture to prove self-justiciaries to be called children of the flesh; but that he had no Scripture to prove self-justiciary Proselytes called *Abrahams* seed, which Mr. *Bayn* saith, *is never so taken*, and therefore Mr. *Bayns* words clear him not but condemn him.

Mr. *M.* says, *I speak of* Abraham's *seed by calling, and that the promise* [*I will be the God of thy seed*] *was made good in the calling the* Gentiles, *all which were not partakers of an inward calling, and therefore yield a seed of* Abraham *onely by profession.* But that which I say I mean not of a meer outward calling, nor of all the *Gentiles* who are outwardly called.

I excepted also against Mr. *Blake* for making *some* Abraham's *seed in the bosom of the Church now, who are born after the flesh, and thereby have a Church-interest or a birth-right to Church-privileges*: and that he grosly alleged for this *Gal.*4.29.

And Mr. *M.* in his *Sermon pag.*14. saith, *We have also some* (meaning in the Church) *who are onely a holy seed by external profession, Gal.*4.29.

What Mr. *Blake* replied hereto in his *Answer to my Letter* is answered in the *Postscript.*

Postscript to my *Apology*, *Sect.*5. what he hath said in his *Vindic. Fœd. cap.*11. is answered in the second part of this *Review Sect.*18.

Mr. *M. wonders at my calling those passages very gross*, and tells me,

1. *That it is apparant* Ishmael *and the civil justiciaries, of which he was Type, had a visible standing in the* Jewish *Church, and were the same of whom* Paul *speaks*, Rom.10.3. *and that in the same place* Paul *himself saith, Even so it is now (even in the Church of* Galatia *it was so) and* Paul *by his doctrine laboured to make them better) I see not why Mr.* Blake *might not use this as an argument, that some have a visible Church-membership, and ought to partake of outward Church-privileges, notwithstanding they will not have the inheritance of children unless they repent.*

Answer. If this had been all Mr. *Blake* inferred from *Gal.*4.29. I should have granted the conclusion, though I deny his Exposition, and the proposition he raiseth from the Text.

But it is another thing that Mr. *Blake* and Mr. *M.* in his *Sermon pag.*14. would have. Mr. *M.* that *Gal* 4.29. *There is mention of some who are onely a holy seed by external profession, and here expounds* [*even so it is now*] *in the Church of* Galatia, *there is a different seed of* Abraham, *one which is holy onely by external profession, seeking righteousness by the works of the Law, and have thereby a visible Church-membership, and ought to partake of outward Church-privileges*, which is clean besides the meaning of the Apostle, who doth not say, Even so it is now in the Church of *Galatia*, but simply [*Even so it is now*] that is, it so happens in the world, they that seek the righteousness by the works of the Law *persecute them that are born after the spirit*, that is, *who through the spirit do wait for the hope of the righteousness which is by faith*: which was true in the *Jews*, who persecuted the Apostles and other Christians out of zeal for the Law. Now these had no visible standing in the Christian Church, nor is the term [*born after the flesh*] taken in the better part so as to import a privilege a holy seed by external profession, but in the worser part, for an unholy seed by external profession and practice persecuting the Christian faith and hope.

Mr. *Blake* exponds [*being born after the flesh*] as if it imported a privilege, whereas it imports a cursed estate opposite to [*being born after the spirit*] and would have derived a title to Church-interest of some in the bosome of the Christian Church, particularly believers infants: whereas *to be born after the flesh* is applied there to persecuting unbelievers, who were not in the Church, but cast out, nor had any Church-interest by virtue of being *born after the flesh*, but had an opposing enmity to it thereby. Nor is it said of infants that they were *born after the flesh*, but of such as persecuted them that were *born after the spirit*; nor is there a word intitling them that were *born after the flesh* in that respect *Abrahams* seed, though *Ishmael* their Type, and the *Jews* his Anti-type were *Abrahams* natural seed. So that M.*M.* is mistaken in conceiving that which offends me in Mr. *Blakes* expression is, that he thinks *there is a fleshly seed of* Abraham; for I grant the *Jewish* self-justiciaries were such. But I conceive a gross absurdity in Mr. *Blake*, that he takes [*being born after the flesh*] in the better part, as importing the privilege of Church-interest to infants of believers, and calling such as are born after the flesh *Abrahams* seed by way of privilege derived from that birth, importing the seed of such to be visible

ble members in the Christian Church, of which I still conceive I passed a right censure in my *Examen* for the Reasons given, however Mr. *Blake* and his Seconds take it.

SECT. XXVI.

The mixture of the Covenant Gen. 17. *as by me asserted is vindicated from Mr.* Blake's *Exceptions*, Vind. Fœd. c. 26.

But I am necessitated to have more work with Mr. *Blake*, of whom I may say, (whatever his worth be, and how excellent soever his Treatise be accounted of by those who have commended it in their Epistle, and others in other respects) that not onely in his Preface to the Reader he doth unchristianly accuse me *of scorn, and disrespect, of falsifications such as a man might think I had at once cast off all regard either of conscience or reputation without either cause or shew of proof, but also of a high spirit, of bloudy revenge, of uttering reviling words against the Church of Christ, having the same spirit with the Jesuits*, from those things which were innocent of any such spirit, and one grain of charitable candour with a little heed of my carriages and speeches might have freed me from, who do not any where charge him or my Antagonists with such kinde of accusations, though I censure their arguings somewhat more freely than they think meet, who are not to be judges in their own cause.

And for the Book throughout there are so many misconstructions of my words, and so many satyrical quips and taunts instead of any clear disputing, that I can discern little or nothing of any brotherly affection to me, or study of truth in that part of his *Vind. Fœd.* wherein he opposeth me. In his Preface to the Reader after those hard speeches of me forementioned, after his venting his conceit, as if that wherein he opposeth me *were of least use in regard that point to great satisfaction hath been spoken to at large*: of which I wish he had told in what part, and by whom such satisfaction is given, that I might have found it in his, Mr. *Bs.* or others writings, who yet finde no cause to recede from this opinion, that they have perverted the truth, and insufficiently handled the argument of infant-baptism) and having contemptuously mentioned me, *As one generally looke upon low enough under hatches*, saith thus, *I must assert the spirituality of the old Covenant, and maintain that the Gospel was preached as well to them as to us, that they ate the same spiritual meat and drank the same spiritual drink, and here by him I am opposed.*

To which I answer, In this charge I may say truly in words of meekness, having answered this very crimination in my *Addition* to my *Apology* in *answer* to Mr. *Baily*, *Sect.* 2. that I am impudently belied, supposing that by the old Covenant he means the Covenant made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. which is termed *the promises, the Covenant that was confirmed of God in Christ before the Law four hundred and thirty years after*, and distinguished from it *Gal.* 3. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. And this Mr. *Blake* might have discerned, yea, I conceive did discern, when he from my words *Exercit.* pag. 2. conceived my *meaning to be that* Abraham *had promises of bliss and in reference to eternal salvation,*

Vind. Fœd. cap. 26. pag. 181. But that I may vindicate my self and the truth more fully from Mr. *Blakes* injurious dealings I shall take a view of that Chapter.

First, Mr. *Blake* saith falsly of me, *that I am loth to yield to so much truth as to confess the old Covenant* (meaning that *Gen.* 17.) *to be a Covenant Evangelical*, when as I grant *Exercit. pag.* 2. some of the promises were Evangelical, and that the Covenant hath denomination from the promises. Then he calumniates me in his spitefull fashion to make me odious and my writing suspected, as if *I went in company with Jesuits*, whom he calls *my old Friends* and saith untruly *I glean so much from them in this controversie*; and adds that *I cast infants out of the Covenant and Church-membership, and so exclude them from Baptism*: whereas I have often acknowledged they are many of them in the Covenant of grace truly so called, and the invisible Church of the elect, which Protestants assert against Papists to be most properly termed the Church of Christ; nor do I exclude infants from baptism because they are cast out of the Covenant and Church-membership, but because they are not Disciples whom Christ appointed to be baptized, *Matth.* 28. 19.

Next he excepts against me for saying, The Covenant made with *Abraham* is not a pure Gospel-covenant, but mixt; concerning which, 1. Mr. *Blake* saith, *This expression of Mr. T. is very untoward, and such that will bear no sain sense without the utter overthrow, even of that difference between the Covenants, which he would build on this distinction. The untowardness is in denying purity of Gospel the first Covenant and affirming a mixture. That which is not pure but mixt, is a compound of pure and impure; such that hath some ingredients such as they ought, and others such that make all adulterate; as silver mingled with dross, or wine with water, Isai* 1. 22.

Answer. Mr. *Blake* me thinks should know that there are mixtures which do not adulterate. There's a natural mixture defined by *Aristotle, The union of bodies miscible altered*, as in mixt bodies compound of the four Elements reduced to a just temperament, without adulterating all. There's an artificial mixture in Medicines, of Wine and Sugar, of divers Metalls in Bells cast, in which and many more there's no such impurity as that there are some ingredients, such as they ought, and others such as make all adulterate; and therefore there's no untowardness in the expression; yea, the expression is so usual in morality, as when voluntary is divided into purely voluntary and mixt, in Divinity the state of grace is either pure or mixt, *&c.* that I presumed none would have quarrelled with it, if my meaning be right. Let's see what Mr. *Blake* saith of my meaning.

He tells us, *that the false Teachers* (*St.* Paul's *Adversaries*) *preach such a mixt Gospel, a compound of that which was pure and impure, when they urged with such vehemency a mixture of works.* But do I call any where the Gospel mixt? or do I preach any such mixture? Mr. *Blake* himself acquits me, when he saith, *This sure is not his meaning.* What then doth Mr. *Blake* take my meaning to be? I will set down his own words, that the Reader may judg of his dealing with me. *What then can be his meaning but that* Abraham *had promises, not onely of bliss, and in reference to eternal salvation, but he had promises also of earthly concernment, as that of the Land of Canaan, and his plantation there? This seems to be his meaning by the words that presently follow:*

low: The Covenant takes its denumination from the promises, but the promises are mixt; some Evangelical, belonging to those to whom the Gospel belongeth; some are domestick or civil promises, specially respecting the house of Abraham, *and the policy of* Israel, *to this I readily agree.*

Answer. If Mr. *Blake* readily agree to that which in his own conceit seemed to be my meaning, with what conscience or with what face could he so falsly charge me, as *opposing him* in these things, *that spirituality of the old Covenant, the preaching of the Gospel as well to them as to us, their eating the same spiritual meat, and drinking the same spiritual drink,* as he doth in his Preface, and here of *untowardness in my expression, and such as will bear no fair sense without the overthrow, even of that difference between the Covenants which I would build on this distinction.* But let's consider his Reason of this last Speech.

To this, saith he, *I readily agree, and then his distinction falls to nothing.*

Answer. I should rather have imagined that the contrary follows, that if Mr. *Blake* do readily agree to my explication of the mixture of the Covenant, that my distinction comes to somethtng, being confirmed by Mr. *Blakes* suffrage, unless he take it for nothing.

But let's follow Mr. *Blake, Seeing in Gospel-times, in New Testament days, this will denominate not a pure but mixt Gospel, we are under such a Gospel.*

Answer. 1. Mr. *Blake* alters the term distinguished. I did not distinguish of a pure Gospel and a mixt Gospel, as he intimates I did, but of a pure Covenant and a mixt Covenant, and asserted not the Gospel preached to *Abraham* to be mixt, but the Covenant made with *Abraham.* 2. It is false, *that we are under such a mixt Gospel,* as he imagined I asserted; but Mr. *Blake* confirms his Assertion thus.

I know not how we could pray in faith, Give us this day our daily bread; in case we were without a promise of these things, or how man could live by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God, in case we had no word from God.

Answer. A believer may pray for daily bread in faith trusting on Gods goodness, as he is a Creatour, as our Saviour argues *Matth.*6.26. as he is a Father in *Christ, Matth.*7.11. as he hath made general promises, *Mark* 10 30. *Matth.*7.7.8. as he hath made special promises, *Prov.*10.3. *Psalm* 34.10. confirmed by constant experience, *Psalm* 37.25. by the great assurance of the gift of *Christ, Rom.*8.32. though the special promises domestick or civil specially respecting the house of *Abraham* and the policy of *Israel,* belonging not to him The *word, Deut.*8.3. I take to be his word of power or command, such as that *Psalm* 33.5. not his word of promise; yet if it be meant of his word of promise, there are other promises by which the Patriarchs afore *Abraham,* and the believers since have lived without the domestick or civil promises specially respecting the house of *Abraham,* and the policy of *Israel.*

But Mr. *Blake* adds, *The Apostle tells us, Godliness hath the promise of this life, and that which is to come, 1 Tim.*4.8. *It would trouble many a perplexed man in case he could not make good, that those words, Verily thou shalt be fed, Psalm* 37.3. *did not at all belong to him. There is no believing man in any relation but he hath Gospel-promises in concernment to that relation, as appears in that speech of* Paul's *encouragement of Servants, Ephes.*6.8. *It were ill*

with all sorts, had not they their domestick relation-promises.

Answer. All this is true, and yet it is true also that the special promises domestick or civil specially respecting the house of *Abraham* and policy of *Israel* belong not to every believer.

Mr. *Bl.* saith, *I place great confidence in my proof this mixture of the Covenant.* And sets down my words *Apolog.* 127. averring my proof so full as that I wonder Mr. *M.* Mr. *Blake*, and others, are not ashamed to except against it, that what I deliver is plain according to Scripture, that there were some peculiar promises made to *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. which are not made to every believer, that the words 1 *Tim.* 4. 8. is not to the present purpose, for it doth not follow therefore that godliness hath the promise of the Land of *Canaan*, or that *Christ* should be every godly mans seed. And then adds, *I think I shall more gratifie the Reader in leaving this to his smile, than in giving any refutation of it; if he could assume that there is no earth but that of* Canaan, *or at least that no other promise of earth but that will serve to make a mixture, then he spake somewhat to the purpose; otherwise it will be believed, that our promises under the Gospel of things of earth as well serve to make up a mixture as* Abraham's *promise of the Land of* Canaan.

Answer. Whether Mr. *Blakes* talk or mine be ridiculous the Reader may judg. My speech is to purposes aimed at by me, to wit, the enervating the arguings from *Abrahams* Covenant and Circumcision for infant-baptism, by shewing that the Covenant *Gen.* 17. was not a pure Gospel-covenant, that is, having no promises but what belongs to every believer, and consequently Baptism not sealing the same covenant every way which circumcision did, and therefore there is not the same reason from the covenant why infants should be baptized though they were circumcised. And this purpose I doubt not to attain though I grant there is other earth than that of *Canaan*, and that there may be other promises of earth besides that which will serve to make a mixture, and yet the promises of things of earth as now extant under the Gospel do not as well serve to make up the mixture I assert in *Abrahams* covenant, promising the Land of *Canaan* to be in the covenant of pure Evangelical grace as now it stands, sith those promises of earth and this life are made to every believer or godly man now, whereas the promises of *Canaan* and other things specially respecting the house of *Abraham* and policy of *Israel Gen.* 17. and elsewhere were not made to *Lot* and other godly believers it is likely then living, nor to Gentile-believers now under the Gospel. Mr. *Bl.* goes on thus.

2. *As his expression is untoward, so taking him at the best his proof is weak, that the Covenant takes its denomination from the promises; but the promises are mixt. The most eminent promises (which contain the marrow of all) give the denomination, and not such that are annext as appendants to them.*

Answ. Though the most eminent promises may give the denomination of the covenant to be an Evangelical covenant, yet to denominate it a pure Evangelical covenant it is necessary that not onely the most eminent, but also that all the promises be Evangelical: as though a man may be termed a Saint from the habitual purpose and bent of his heart, and the constant course of his actions, yet he is not denominated purely a Saint but from the entire and universal purpose, bent, inclination of his heart, and entireness of holiness in his actions without the least inconformity to it.

Mr. *Bl.* proceeds thus, *Such as is the promise of the Land of* Canaan, *an*

ap-

appendant to the great Covenant made of God with Abraham, *as* Chamier *with good warrant from the Text* Gen 17.7,8. *calls it* lib. de baptiſ. cap. Sect. *The Covenant being made of God to be a God of* Abraham *and his ſeed (which might have been made good whereſoever they had inhabited or ſojourned) the promiſe of* Canaan *is over and above added to it. The reaſon given by* M. T. *for his diſlike of* Chamier's *expreſſion, calling it an Appendix to the Covenant, is little to purpoſe,* Pſalm 105.10,15. *The gift of the Land of* Canaan *is called a Covenant, and therefore not an appendant to it. By the ſame reaſon Circumciſion muſt be the Covenant, and not a ſeal appendant to it; ſeeing Circumciſion is called a Covenant,* Gen.17.10. *Mr.* T. *is not ignorant of theſe Scripture* Metonymies.

Anſw. I finde *Chamier lib. de baptiſ. cap.*10. *Sect.*23. ſaying, *That the promiſe of* Canaan *is not the Covenant, but an Appendix to the Covenant.*

But I finde not that he produceth any warrant from the Text *Gen.*17.7,8. to call it ſo, nor that he doth any other way go about to prove it, but that the words Gen.17.7. I will be thy God and of thy ſeed. Which he calls the covenant, is ill explained of earthly happineſs, either as the chief or onely happineſs, there meant which he proves from *Matth.*22.32. Nor is there any force in this Reaſon, The promiſe of *Canaan* is added, *v.*8. over and above the promiſe *v.*7. therefore it was an appendix and not the covenant. For if this reaſon be good, it might be ſaid, The promiſe *v.*7. is not the covenant, but an appendix to it, cauſe it is added over and above the promiſe, *v.*4. Add as for me, behold my covenant is with thee, and thou ſhalt be a father of many Nations, which is termed Gods covenant with him, Gen.18.8. yea, me thinks the argument is good to the contrary, the promiſe Gen.17.8. was added over and above the promiſe *v.*7. and cloſed with this Epiphoneme, And I will be their God; therefore it was a part of the covenant, yea a main part of it. Nor becauſe the promiſe *v.*7. might have been made good whereſoever they had inhabited or ſojourned. Doth it follow that the promiſe *v.*8. was not a part of the covenant, for by the ſame reaſon neither the promiſe *v.*4. that *Abraham* ſhould be a father of many Nations, had been a part of the covenant, ſith the promiſe *v.*7. might have been made good though he had been father of one Nation onely.

Mr. *Blake* doth not rightly form my Reaſon from *Pſalm* 105.8,9,10,11. thus, The gift of the Land of *Canaan* is called a covenant, and therefore not an appendant to it, but thus it is in my *Examen part* 3. *Sect.*2. the Pſalmiſt calls the promiſe of *Canaan* the covenant made with *Abraham, Pſalm* 105.8,9, 10,11. therefore it is a part of the covenant, and not onely an appendix. Nor doth it follow that then circumciſion muſt be the covenant, for it is confeſſedly called the covenant Gen.17.10. by a Metonimy, and *v.*11. ſhews it where it is ſaid, And it ſhall be the token of the covenant between me and you. But it cannot be expounded by a Metonimy *Pſalm* 105.8,9,10,11.

For, 1. The gift of the Land of *Canaan* was not a ſign of the covenant, nor can with any good ſenſe be called the covenant according to any other ſort of Metonimy beſides that of the thing ſignified for the ſign.

2. If it could, yet the phraſes uſed ſhew it cannot be underſtood Metonimically; For it is called as well, the word which he commanded to a thouſand generations, the covenant which he made with *Abraham*, the oath unto *Iſaac*, which he confirmed to *Jacob* for a Law, and to *Iſrael* for an everlaſting covenant,

nant; and when it is recited the Psalmist prefixeth v.11. לאמר which our Translation reade, saying, *Junius, Piscator, dicendo*, which doth directly tell us wherein it was that the covenant he made did formally consist, which he is said to remember v.8. which thing is so clearly expressed Nehem.9.8. Gen.26.3. & 28.3,4,13,14, &c. that I should wonder Mr. *Bl.* should persist in this wrangling course to question a thing so plain, but that I see him tenacious of absurdities he vents though never so gross, as from his exposition and inference from *Gal.*4.29, and other passages hath been made appear.

Mr. *Bl.* adds, 3. As his proof is weak, to make the covenant not a pure Gospel-covenant, but mixt; so in the third place, he is not constant to himself, pointing that out which he makes pure Gospel, (Gen.17.5. Gen.12.3. Gen. 18.18. illustrated by some New Testament Scriptures Rom.4.17,18. Gal.3 8,9,16. Acts 3.25.) he observes, yea it is to be noted, that those promises which were Evangelical according to the more inward sense of the Holy Ghost, do point at the privileges of *Abrahams* house in the outward face of the words, and thereupon raises a doubt, whether any covenant made with *Abraham* be simply Evangelical? And so he can finde out Evangelical promises in the inwards of that covenant, which is non-evangelical in the outward face; so *Bellarmine*, with whom he so much (to speak in his own language) symbolizeth, can finde out spiritual Evangelical promises in that which he concluded to be of another nature; denying that the promise made to *Abraham* in the letter, was any promise of forgiveness of sins, but of special protection and government, and earthly happiness; yet confesseth that in a mystical sense they were spiritual promises, both of pardon of sin and life eternal, and that they belong to us, *Bellar. de Sacram. Bapt. lib.*1. *cap.*4. whereof *Chamier* observes, that which is promised mystically God in covenant doth promise; but Heaven is here promised mystically; therefore in this covenant here is a promise of Heaven; so the inward and outward face will be all Evangelical.

Answ. Mr. *Bl.* mis-recites my words; 1. in saying, That I point out in the Texts Gen.17.5. & 15.5. & 12.3. & 18.18. that which I make pure Gospel; for my words are, that was Evangelical which we reade Gen.17.5, &c. not that it was pure Gospel.

2. That I raise a doubt whether [any] covenant made with *Abraham* be simply Evangelical? whereas my words are, whence it may be well doubted, whether [this] covenant made with *Abraham* may be called simply Evangelical, not whether [any] which is the same with that speech forecited Sect.25. of Mr. *Allin*, This covenant was not simply and onely the covenant of grace. But what inconstancy to my self giving and taking, not knowing what to determine, is in those speeches, or in that other which he most excepts against: yea, it is to be noted, &c. I am yet to learn. Do I either by saying that the promises were Evangelical say that they were purely Evangelical not mixt) or by doubting whether they may be called simply Evanglical revoke what I said, that they were Evangelical? I think Mr. *Blake* will as soon extract water out of a Flint as such inferences from my words. Young Logicians do know that to argue *a dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter* is fallacious. As for my speech which he saith symbolizeth with *Bellarmine*, if it be true, it is not the worse for that: nor did I blame Mr. *M.* for symbolizing with *Arminius* in a truth

truth, but for agreeing with him in that explication which doth undermine the true explication of *Rom.*9.8. which the *Contraremonstrants* prove from the Text. If *Bellarmine* did by *mystical* sense mean the same which I did by the more inward sense of the Holy Ghost, and by the Letter what I express by the outward face of the words, I see not that either *Chamier* or Mr. *Bl.* have or can prove it false. The sense in the outward face of the words I call that which a Linguist who knows what words signifie wou'd conceive upon reading without any other revelation from the Holy Ghost. But I cannot believe that any Linguist without other revelation than what the bare words hold forth would ever have understood these promises, *A father of many Nations have I made thee, I will be a God to thee and thy seed.* Thus Gentiles as well as *Jews* shall believe in *Christ*, I will justifie, raise thee up, and all that are my Elect, or who believe as thou dost to eternal life. I grant *Chamiers* conclusion, *In this Covenant here is a promise of Heaven*, and yet deny that the outward face of the covenant *Gen.*17. is all Evangelical, nor is there a word in Mr. *Blakes* that proves it.

Mr. *Blake* proceeds thus, *Lastly, Mr. T. yet knows not how to bring any thing home (were all granted) to serve his interest.* And then sets down what he conceives to be my meaning, which he thus opposeth.

First, that orthodox Divines both ancient and modern have made Circumcision to be of the same signification and use as Baptism, and till Anabaptists closed they had no Adversaries, but Papists, who to advance their opus operatum *in the Sacraments of the New Testament will have them as far to exceed the Old, as Heaven doth Earth, and the substance doth the shadow*; and then cites a speech of *Chamier Panst. Cath. tom.*4. *lib.*2. *cap.*9. *sect.*58. and prosecutes his calumnies of my borrowing my weapons I use against infant-baptism from the Jesuits, to all which I answer.

1. That I grant that Circumcision and Baptism are in part of the same signification and use, nor did I ever deny it; but in as many and more things they differ, which I have shewed *Exercit. Sect.*2. *Examen part.*3. *Sect.*9. in this part of the *Review, Sect.*11. and those disparities I prove out of Scripture and the best learned and approved Protestant Writers. Nor do I agree with the Jesuits in holding Baptism to confer grace *ex opere operato*, nor do *I undervalue the Covenant with* Abraham *and his seed as no Gospel-covenant*, nor do *I deny Circumcision to have been the seal of a Gospel-promise.* As Mr. *Blake* doth calumniate me, and to make odious doth falsly and injuriously suggest I took from the Jesuits. But this I confess I hold *Exercit. Sect.*1. that there is not the same reason of Circumcision and Baptism, in signing the Evangelical Covenant; nor may there be an argument drawn from the administration of the one to the like manner of administring the other, of both which speeches I have given an account in that place which I finde not yet invalidated; and if they hold, the analogy between infant-circumcision and infant-baptism is evacuated, there being difference between the covenant made with *Abraham* and the new covenant though both be in some sort Evangelical; and therefore the mixture of the covenant will serve my interest in this point.

2. It is false which Mr. *Blake* saith, *That my conformity with the Jesuits about the difference between Circumcision and Baptism to maintain the* opus operatum *of the one to the disparagement of the other, as if Baptism exceeded Circumcision*

cumcision as far as the substance the shadow, did put me upon it to affirm, that what all Protestant Divines defend against the Papists must be truth undeniable is no undeniable axiome: for neither do I conform to Jesuits in that point, nor was such conformity any reason of that speech, but the words of Mr. *M.* in his *Sermon*, as the reading of the words of my *Examen pag.*113. shew. And I say still that speech is a truth, and necessary to be avouched by all those who ascribe onely authentick authority to the holy Scripture. Nor is it reasonable to require that I should shew any such errour as is maintained by all Protestant Divines against Papists.

For, 1. it is not possible for me to shew what all Protestant Divines hold against Papists.

2. Nor is it necessary to verifie my speech which avoucheth not any such errour in act, but onely the possibility of it, which is sufficiently made good by proving them not infallible.

And to the demand *how Popery should be known if that be not Popery which all Protestant Divines defend against the Papists.*

I answer. 1. it may be counted Popery and yet perhaps a truth which all Protestant Divines oppose.

2. What is Popery which we have engaged our selves to extirpate is better known in the ways I set down *Ap.p.*133,134. *Sect.*13. than in Mr. *Blakes* way.

For, 1. it is not possible for any man no not the greatest Reader in Controversies to know what all Protestant Divines defend against Papists.

2. If that be the Rule to know Popery by, many things will not be taken for Popery which are, there being many Tenents which are counted Popery which Protestants Divines and those of good note have not opposed, but have granted many things favourably to them, as not onely the Collections of *Brerely* and such like Papists, but also the Treatises of the *Cassandrian* writers, and late Episcopal Protestant do shew, which yet I do not approve of.

I agree with Mr. *Blake* that there is less likelihood that the truth should be with the Papists than with the Protestants, and yet there may be some truth which some Papists may discern which many Protestants do not. It is the saying of Doctor *Twisse Vind. Grat. lib.*1. *part.*2. *sect.*25. *digress.*8. *num.*3. *But I would not that those things should be rejected of us, because the Schoolmen hold them; for neither do the* Cretians *fain all things. Augustines* judgment was esteemed better than the *Pelagians* as being the oracle of his time, yet he is censured as the hard father of infants for maintaining their damnation if they died unbaptized. *Calvin* was in high esteem as the great Light of the Protestant Churches, who have many of them followed him in the point about usury, yet the Popish and Prelatical Divines are generally counted by our most zealous Preachers more right in that point than the transmarine *Calvinists*.

It is a wicked calumny which Mr. *Blake* vents whe he saith of me, *that I step in upon the party of these sons of* Anak, meaning the Jesuits. Had he any other than a malignant spirit towards me, he would have judged that not to side with Jesuits, but to keep my Oath which I took in the solemn Covenant I did oppose infant-baptism, in maintaining of which he and the rest of the Pædobaptists have broken the covenant, whereby they bound themselves to reform the worship of God after the Word of God. And for what he chargeth me with, *that I borrow my weapons from the Jesuits*, though my denial is enough to acquit

quit me from it, there being none but knows my actions better than my self, and with men not malevolent to me I think my words at least deserve as much credit concerning my own actions as Mr. *Blake*, yet as I said so I repeat it, it appears to be a loud calumny in that all along in my *Examen*, and now in my other writings almost in every point I produce Protestants of good note concurring with me, not onely in the point about the extent of the covenant *Examen sect.4. part.3.* and the holiness of children, 1 *Cor.7.14. Exam. part.3. sect.8. Exerc. sect.5. Review part.1. sect.22.* but also about the institution, *Mat.28.19. Review part.2. sect.5.* even in this point of the mixture of the covenant in the *section* next before this. Yea, the Principle upon which I found all my dispute is that which Mr. *Cotton* in his *Preface* to his *Dialogue* for *infant-baptism* confesseth to be *a main principle of purity and reformation.* And though Protestant writers do many of them oppose my conclusion, yet they do agree with me in the premisses on which I build it, to wit, that Baptism is to be after the institution, and that neither the institution nor practice in the *New Testament* was of Pædobaptism, and all Pædobaptists whether Presbyterians or Independents who do hold that infants belong to the visible Church as the posterity of *Abraham* to the *Jewish* Church do injuriously keep them whose Baptism they avouch to be good, and to be visible Church-members, from the Lords Supper for want of knowledg; as for what he tells me, *He can trace me out of some Jesuit in what I deliver about the Covenant and Seal*, though I do not yet believe it, yet there is no reason therefore to reject it, as Doctor *Twisse* saith truly.

Bishop *Morton* in his *Apology* hath produced Popish writers and many of them Jesuits who deliver the same things which the Protestants do; yet this is so far from discrediting their cause that it is justly counted a good plea for them, and why should not the like plea be good on my behalf, sith Jesuits are Adversaries to me, as well as others? But enough if not too much in answer to these calumnies sufficiently answered before, *Postscript. Sect.13.*

Mr. *Blake* proceeds thus, *Secondly, if Circumcision have respect to those promises that were no Gospel-mercies, but civil, domestical, restrained to* Jews, *and not appertaining to* Christians; *How could it be a distinction between* Jew *and* Gentile *respective to Religion, it might have made a civil distinction, and the want of it have been an evidence against other Nations, that they had been none of the multiplied seed of* Abraham *according to the flesh, and that their interest had not been in* Canaan. *But how could it have concluded them to have been without* Christ, *strangers from the Covenant of promise, having no hope and without God in the world, as the Apostle determines upon their uncircumcision, Ephes.2.11,12. cannot be imagined.*

Ans. 1. Circumcision did not make such a distinction between *Jew* and *Gentile* respective to Religion, as that every circumcised person was of the *Jewish* Religion: for if the posterity of *Ishmael* and *Esau* were not circumcised as *Mahometans* at this day (which some Historians say of them at least for a time that they were) yet *Ahab* and other worshipers of *Baal* were of the posterity of *Jacob*, and the *Samaritans*, as Mr. *Mede* in his *Discourse* on *John* 4.23. *were circumcised*, yet were not of the *Jewish* Religion, or at least there was a distinction in Religion between them *John* 4.22. Nor every one that worshipped the same God with the *Jews* was circumcised. *Cornelius* and many other Proselytes of the gate owned the God and spiritual worship, and moral Law of the *Jews*,

 though

though they were not circumcised, as Mr. *Mede* proves in his *Discourse* on *Acts* 17.4. nor doth the Apostle *Ephes.*2.11,12. *determine upon their uncircumcision*, that is, conclude them *without hope, without God*, barely from their uncircumcision, as if he held all uncircumcised were without hope, without God: but he onely sets those things down as concurrent, not one the certain cause or sign of the other.

2. Circumcision did distinguish between *Jew* and *Gentile* respective to Religion, not because it sealed Gospel-mercies, nor because it sealed promises of civil or domestick benefits. but because it bound to the observance of the Law of *Moses*, in respect of the observation of which the distinction in Religion was known by Circumcision not by its sealing the covenant-promises, either Evangelical, or civil and domestick.

3. If the distinction between *Jew* and *Gentile* respective to Religion were made by Circumcision as sealing the covenant, *Gen.*17. it might have made a religious distinction by my Tenet, who hold it signed the spiritual promises, though not them onely, as well as by Mr. *Blakes*.

The next thing which Mr. *Blake* urgeth against me from *Jerem.*4.4. *Rom.* 2.28. *Deut.*10.16. *Deut.*30.6. *Ezek.*44.9. is that Circumcision had relation to promises spiritual, which is not denied, nor any thing against the mixture I hold in the covenant, nor to evacuate any inference I make from it.

In like manner the fourth tends to prove, that Circumcision did not respect alone the civil interest of the *Jews*, which I grant. But the fifth thing urged by Mr. *Blake* needs some examination.

Fifthly, saith he, *How is it that the Apostle giving a definition of Circumcision refers it to nothing rational, civil or domestick, but onely to that which is purely spiritual, speaking of* Abraham, *he saith, he received the sign of Circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised? The righteousness of faith is a promise purely Evangelical, Rom.*3.22. *&* 3.30. *&* 10.3. *Phil.*3.8. *and this Circumcision sealed, the self-same thing that our Sacraments seal.*

Answer. The Apostle doth not give a definition of Circumcision, *Rom.*4. 11,12. For, 1. that which is to be defined is, say Logicians, a common term, but Circumcision *Rom.*4.11. is not a common term, but a singular, or individual, to wit, that which *Abraham* had in his own person, it is that which he received, and the time is noted to be after he had righteousness by faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised, for a singular privilege to be the father of believers.

Ergo 2. There is no *genus*, nor difference of Circumcision from other things, therefore no definition. No *genus*, for the term [seal] cannot be the *genus*, it being a meer Metaphor, and so not declaring what it is, but what it is like, in respect of the use. Besides, Circumcision is an action, but Seal is in the Predicament of relation, as being a sign, or a figure in the Predicament of quality, or an aggregate compound of a material substance, having a figure for signification. But the *genus* is in the same Predicament with the *species*, and so is not [Seal] with [Circumcision] *Ergo*. For doth *Seal of the righteousness of faith* agree to all Circumcision, nor difference it from the Spirit of God; nor according to the Pædobaptists *Hypothesis*, from the Pass-over, Baptism, or the Lords Supper.

Mr. *Blake* adds, *So that their extraordinary Sacraments are expresly affirmed*

to

to be the ſame with ours by the Apoſtle, 1 Cor.10.3. They eat all the ſame ſpiritual meat, and did all drink the ſame ſpiritual drink, ſo are their appointed eſtabliſhed Sacraments, Circumciſion and the Paſs-over.

Anſwer. 1. The extraordinary Sacraments are ſaid to note the ſame thing with ours, not expreſly affirmed to be the ſame with ours.

2. It is no where ſaid in Scripture that Circumciſion and the Paſs-over did note the ſame thing with our Sacraments, much leſs that they are the ſame Sacraments with ours.

Mr. *Blake* adds, *Will Mr.* T. *with his old friend* Bellarmine lib.1. cap.17. de Saramentis in genere, *and Mr.* Blackwood *in his Reply to the tenth Objection, deny that Circumciſion was an univerſal ſeal of faith, but was onely an individual ſeal of the undividual faith of* Abraham, *and ſo all falls to the ground which is ſpoken from that Text of the uſe of Circumciſion to the* Jews. *All that is there ſpoken, having reference onely to* Abraham *in perſon.*

Anſwer. Mr. *Blake* tells me of an old friend of mine whom I never knew, and have hitherto made him mine adverſary, although perhaps we may agree in ſome things, and I think Mr. *Blake* and he agree in more than I do with him. It ſeems not to me to be *Bellar.* opinion, or Mr. *Blackwoods* that circumciſion was onely an individual Seal of the faith of *Abraham*, but *Bellarmines* opinion is, that his circumciſion did teſtifie not his individual faith, but his individual privilege to be father of the faithfull, which Mr. *Blake* agrees with him in, when he ſait h, *This priority of receiving the faith and the ſign and ſeal, is proper to* Abraham. And then he is as much his old friend as mine.

Mr. *Blackwood* in his *Reply* to the *ſecond part of the Vind. of the Birth-privilege, pag.*47. ſaith thus, *So that Circumciſion was a ſeal of the righteouſneſs which* Abraham *had, not* in perſona propria, *but* in perſona relativa, *it ſealed unto him not his own perſonal righteouſneſs, which he had long before, but the righteouſneſs of all believers.* In which I diſſent from him, conceiving it ſealed both: however his opinion ſeems to be otherwiſe than Mr. *Blake* repreſents it. For my ſelf I do not make it any ſeal of faith either univerſal or individual, nor know I well what ſenſe to make of either, but this is my opinion, that *Abrahams* individual Circumciſion, and no others is made *Rom.*4.11,12. the ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith to *Abraham* as the father of believers, and to all believers of all Nations as his ſeed. Now to this opinion of mine I finde nothing oppoſite, but againſt another point that *Abrahams* Circumciſion was a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith and of the Covenant to him onely, which I diſclaim, and therefore let his arguments paſs without gain-ſaying, onely I requeſt the Reader to take notice that Mr. *Blake* hath many ways miſ-repreſented my opinion in this *Ch.* but hath not at all overthrown the mixture in the Covenant *Gen.*17. which I aſſert; but where he ſets down my opinion rightly ſaith *pag.*181. *To this I readily agree*, nor hath at all ſo much as brought one reaſon to ſhew that my diſtinction ſhews not my turn for which I bring it, which he undertook to do, but leaves that thing and runs out in calumnies of me, and proving that which I deny not.

SECT. XXVII.

The four first Chapters of Mr. Sidenham's *Exercitation are examined, and his vanity in his conceits about consequences proving Infant-baptism, the purity of the Covenant* Gen. 17. *Infants of Believers being* Abraham's *seed and in Covenant, is shewed.*

I Think it necessary for many Reasons afore I review the dispute about Mr. *Ms.* second conclusion to consider what Mr. *Cuthbert Sidenham* hath said in the four first Chapters of his *Exercitation.*

1. He forestalls his Reader with things palpably false, that *there is nothing in all the New Testament against the baptizing of Infants, not one hint from any expres word dropt from* Christ *or his Apostles; not one phrase, which though never so much strained doth forbid such an act.* The contrary whereof is abundantly proved in the second *Part* of this *Review, Sect.* 5. *&c.* nor can any Pædobaptist finde so much against infant-communion, Bell-baptism, baptizing of dead persons, Baptism of Midwives, the Cross in Baptism, and many other Prelatical and Popish usages as there is in the *New Testament* against infant-baptism.

2. That *all his Opposites have onely this to say, that they can finde no syllabical precept or word of command in terms, saying, Go baptize Infants, or any positive example where it is said in so many words Infants were baptized, all that they say besides is to quarrel with and evade their arguments, and that this argument is built on this false principle, that no direct consequences from Scripture are mandatory:* the contrary whereof is so manifest out of my *Examen part.* 3. *sect.* 12. *Apol. sect.* 11. (which Mr. *Sidenham* often quotes, and therefore cannot be ignorant of unless wilfully) and throughout all my writings, that a man can hardly conceive but that he shamelesly vented these things against his own knowledg. And therefore I need not answer his Reasons to prove the use of consequence. Let any Pædobaptist give me one good consequence whereby infant-baptism is proved, and I shall yield: the consequences of Mr. *Baxter* and others I finde to be meer fallacies, and have, and doubt not with divine assistance to shew them to be so.

That which he saith, *pag.* 6. *That where we have a promise laid as the foundation of a duty that is equivalent to any expres command; for as commands in the Gospel do suppose promises, to encourage us to act them, and help us in them; so promises made to persons do include commands, especially when the duties commanded are annexed to the promises, as all New Testament Ordinances are as well as old;* is ambiguous, and in what sense, it is true it serves not Mr. *Sidenhams* turn to prove infant-baptism. By *foundation* of a *duty* may be understood either a motive to encourage to a duty named, as when it is said, *Him that honoureth me I will honour,* this promise doth suppose it a duty to honour God, and is a motive to encourage to it, and so is a foundation in that sense of the duty: or by *foundation* of a *duty* may be understood the Rule according to which that duty is to be performed, and this may be understood either thus, to whomsoever there is a promise of that thing by which a duty is urged on others they are bound to do that duty, and then it is false: for *Christ* promised *Matth.* 28. 19, 20.

28.19,20. to the Apoſtles whom he bid *preach the Goſpel and baptize, that he would be with them*, and *Matth.*18.20. *to two or three gathered together to be in the midſt of them*, doth it therefore follow that every two or three gathered together in his Name are commanded to preach and baptize? or it may be underſtood thus, that he to whom the promiſe is upon the doing of that duty is bound to do it; and this I grant to be true: but this will not ſerve Mr. *Sidenhams* turn: for there is no promiſe to infants that upon their baptizing themſelves they ſhould have remiſſion of ſins, nor is Mr. *Sidenham* ſo abſurd as to make baptiſm infants duty, but their right: now as Mr. *Sidenham* would have it, that becauſe there's a promiſe to infants, therefore others are in duty bound to baptize them, as having right to it, it is falſe, ſith the inſtitution of Baptiſm is not to whom God hath promiſed to be a God, for that is according to his election which is unknown, *Rom.*9.6,7,8. but to them who are Diſciples or believers in *Chriſt*, *Matth.*28.19. *Mark* 16.15,16. There are ambiguities in the ſpeeches that *commands in the Goſpel do ſuppoſe promiſes*, that *promiſes made to perſons do include commands*, that *all the* New Teſtament *Ordinances are annexed to promiſes*, which would be too tedious and unneceſſary to unfold, it is ſufficient to ſhew they will not ſerve Mr. *Sidenhams* turn in the ſenſe they are true, and will as well ſerve to prove infants right to the Lords Supper, as to Baptiſm.

That which he ſaith, *We have as much in the* New Teſtament *to prove infant-baptiſm, from the true principles of right to Ordinances, as they have for thoſe whom they baptize; for they baptize grown perſons on ſuch and ſuch conſiderations; and we ſhall hereafter ſhew we baptize on as ſtrong and equivalent grounds*, is notoriouſly falſe: for we baptize according to the qualification required in the inſtitution of *Chriſt*, and the Apoſtles and other Preachers baptizing and directing the uſe of Baptiſm in the *New Teſtament* which are acknowledged the true principles of right to Ordinances, and it is acknowledged even by Pædobaptiſts that they have neither precept nor example in the *New Teſtament* of infant-baptiſm, and therefore cannot have as ſtrong and warrantable grounds as we who are Piſtobaptiſts, that is, baptizers of believers. Nor is it true that *it is requiſite we ſhould ſhew them expreſs command againſt Infant-baptiſm*, it is enough that they cannot prove in its inſtitution. Infants never by *divine warrant enjoyed* Baptiſm, and for *Circumciſion it was more* unlike than *like to Baptiſm*, and of it an *authentique repeal* is eaſily ſhewed *Acts* 15. and elſewhere.

In the reſt Mr. *Sidenham* ſhews not why infants ſhould not have been baptized at firſt, as well as grown men if it had been *Chriſts* minde; *Iſhmael* and all *Abrahams* males were circumciſed *the ſelf ſame day* in which *Abraham* was, *Gen.*17.26,27. and therefore if Pædobaptiſts *Hypotheſis* were right, infants as well as perſons of years ſhould have been baptized by the Apoſtles, which they did not, for in that it is not expreſt, it is enough to ſhew it was not done, unleſs we make the Spirit of God defective in what was needfull to have been ſet down, and to ſay as Mr. *Sidenham* doth, *There is enough to ſhew it was done though not written*, is with the Papiſts to maintain unwritten traditions Rule of manners. There is no hint left by *Chriſt* or the Apoſtles to deduce as a infant-baptiſm from. And it is falſe which he ſaith, *God hath always ordained ſome Ordinances in the adminiſtration of which, for the moſt*

part,

part, the subject hath been purely passive. He names nor can name any till the institution of Circumcision, which was not till after the world had been above two thousand years. The rest of his speech savours of this corrupt principle, that what we conceive fit in Gods worship is to be accounted his minde. This is enough in answer to the first Chapter.

In the second he saith untruly, that *the Covenant* Gen.17. *was first made with* Abraham *and his seed in the name of all believers and their seed, both* Jews *and* Gentile; *nor is it true that if he should finde the same Covenant reaching* Gentile *believers and their children as* Abraham *and his they cannot be denied the new external sign and seal of the same Covenant,* that is, Baptism.

And for what he saith, the Covenant *Gen.*17. was a Covenant of pure grace, I grant it so far as it was Evangelical, but deny it to be a pure Gospel-covenant, nor do any of his Reasons prove any more than I grant, that there were Gospel-promises meant by God under promises of temporal mercies proper to *Abraham* and his natural posterity, and those that joyned with them in their policy; which I have proved before, out of Scripture to be termed the Covenant it self without a Metonymy, and God is said to keep that Covenant by establishing the *Israelites* in *Canaan*, and therefore it is but vain talk that the promise of *Canaan* was but an additional, appendix, added *ex superabundanti*, if he mean it of the Covenant Gen.17. if he mean it of the Gospel-covenant it is more true that was added to the other as a more hidden sense under the promises of civil and domestick privileges. I do not make a mixture in the Gospel-covenant, but in the Covenant made with *Abraham*, Gen.17. nor by mixture do I understand any other than a composition of various parts, not a mixture in the nature of it, or substance or circumstances: but that the Covenant made with *Abraham* had promises of two sorts, some promises in the first obvious sense of the words proper to *Abrahams* natural posterity, some spiritual common to all believers in the more hidden sense of the words, which with what hath been said before is enough to answer that Chapter also, proceeding upon mistakes of my meaning in the term [mixt] in many passages, and the rest if not answered before, I let pass, because dictates without proof.

In the third, after he hath allowed the distinctions of *Abrahams* seed into carnal and spiritual, natural aud believing, he sets down six considerations.

1. *That* Abraham's *spiritual seed were as much his fleshly seed also,* Isaac *as* Ishmael *except Proselytes and Servants:* which may be granted with these limitations.

1. That it be not understood universally, for *Christian* believing *Gentiles* neither Proselytes to *Israel*, nor servants to them, are *Abrahams* spiritual seed, yet not at all *Abrahams* fleshly seed.

2. That *Isaac* was as much *Abrahams* fleshly seed as *Ishmael* according to the meaning Rom.9.8. as fleshly seed is called from natural generation simply considered: but not as *Gal.*4.23. it is meant of fleshly seed called so from natural generation in some respect, to wit, as begotten in a baser way.

The second consideration of Mr. *Sidenham* is this, [The Covenant was administred to all *Abrahams* natural and fleshly children, as if they had been spiritual, and before they knew what faith was, or could actually profess *Abrahams* faith.]

If

If he mean by the Covenant onely Circumcision I grant it of all *Abrahams* natural male children: if he mean the covenant of grace which is Evangelical, though I deny not that it was administred by the mediation of *Christ*, and the work of the Spirit, to many elect infants afore believing, yet I deny that it ever was or shall be administred to any but the elect of God, who have the denomination of *Abrahams* spiritual seed. For I know not how the Covenant which promiseth remission of sins, justification, regeneration, adoption, eternal life is said to be administred but by giving these, which are given onely to the elect, not to *Abrahams* meer natural or fleshly seed. Meer outward Ordidances and outward gifts and privileges as they are not promised in the Gospel-covenant, which we call the covenant of grace, either as made to *Abraham*, or confirmed by *Christs* bloud, so neither are they administrations of it, but arise from Gods command or providence without the Covenant as Evangelical.

His third consideration is, *It's no contradiction in different respects to be a seed of the flesh by natural generation, and a childe under the same promise made with the parent; for they both agreed in* Abraham's *case:* which I grant, if meant of *Isaac* and *Jacob*, and such other *Heirs of the promise*, as the Scriptures term them. But I reject that which follows, *that none was a childe of promise, but as he came of* Abraham's *flesh:* for believing *Gentiles* are children of the promise though they come not of *Abrahams* flesh, yea it is not onely true to the contrary, but expressly avowed *Rom.*9.8. *That none are children of the promise as they come of* Abraham's *flesh.* Nor is it true, *that as he came from* Abraham's *flesh, so every one had the seal of Gods Covenant on his flesh*; for this is not true of males under eight days old, or females, and therefore this inference is vain: *Thus a spiritual promise was made with* Abraham *and his carnal seed.*

His fourth consideration is, *There was no distinction of* Abraham's *fleshly seed and his spiritual seed in the* Old Testament, *but all comprehended under the same Covenant, untill they degenerated from* Abraham's *faith, and proved themselves to be meer carnal, and rejected the promise.*

But this is manifestly false, *Esau* was *Abrahams* fleshly seed, but never his spiritual seed. The Apostle determines *Rom.*9.11. afore he had done good or evil he was rejected, and with the Apostle a childe of the promise, and an elect person are the same. No man is *Abrahams* spiritual seed but an elect person, or true believer: Scripture makes none else his seed spiritual *Rom.*4.12,16. & 9.7,8. *Gal.*3.29. *John* 8.39. This very Authour makes the distinctions of fleshly and spiritual, believing and natural taken out of *Rom.*9.7,8 *Gal.*4.23. & 3.16. most true. And if a person may be *Abrahams* spiritual seed a while, then the degenerate the elect, and true believers may fall away finally and totally, and if they that be *Abrahams* fleshly seed be under the same covenant with the spiritual till they degenerate, then a person may be in the covenant of grace, and be meerly carnal, having not the Spirit of God, then a man may be in the covenant of grace and not abide in it, then the covenant of grace may be defective, mutable, and if there be no distinction of *Abrahams* fleshly seed and his spiritual in the *Old Testament*, untill they rejected the promise, then there is no distinction of elect and reprobate till in time they embrace or reject the promise contrary to *Rom.*9.11. He that holds this position must become an *Arminian.*

His fifth is, *There is a carnal and spiritual seed of* Abraham, *even under the*

New

New Testament, *as our Opposites must acknowledg, as well as Infants; so are the most visible Professours which they baptize; which may have no grace; and many prove carnal indeed, through the predominancy of their lusts and corruptions.*

Answer. It is ackdowledged that there is a carnal seed of *Abraham* under the *New Testament* in the *Jewish* Nation: but visible Professours of the *Gentiles* which are baptized although they be many of them carnal men (and so are many of the congregational Churches not baptized) yet they cannot be termed the carnal seed of *Abraham*, being not his seed either by nature or by believing as he did.

His sixth is, *when there is mention of* Abraham's *carnal seed in opposition to spiritual seed, it cannot be meant primarily or solely of those that descended from* Abraham's *flesh; for then* Isaac *and* Jacob *were the carnal seed, yea* Christ *himself, who as concerning the flesh came of* Abraham; *it must be therefore of those of* Abraham's *seed which degenerated and slighted the Covenant of the Gospel, and these were properly the carnal seed.*

Answer. The distinction of *Abrahams* carnal and spiritual seed is as the distinction of the Church into visible and invisible, in which the members may agree to the same persons, though on the other side also they may not agree. The same persons may be of the Church visible and invisible, and yet some persons may be of the Church visible who are not of the invisible, and some of the invisible who are not of the invisible: so some are *Abrahams* carnal seed who are also his spiritual, as *Isaac, Jacob, Christ*; some are his spiritual seed but not his carnal, as *Gentile* believers; some his carnal seed but not his spiritual, as unbelieving *Jews*; some neither his carnal nor spiritual seed, as unsound Professours of faith of the *Gentiles*, who are no way *Abrahams* seed, nor ever called his carnal seed in Scripture.

There are but two places I know in which the term of *Abrahams* fleshly seed or childe is used *Rom.*9.8. *Gal.*4.23. in both which is meant of his seed by natural generation, though in the later in a worse way. In the former way, those that embraced the Covenant without degenerating from *Abrahams* faith, being descended from *Abraham* by natural generation, are as properly termed *Abrahams* carnal seed as those *Israelites* that did backslide.

I grant, Abraham *was a natural father* to many *of these to whom he was a spiritual father, as to* Isaac *and* Jacob *and the godly of their posterity*, but not to all. He was a spiritual father to believing *Galatians*, though not a natural, *Gal.*3.29.

But what Mr. *Sidenham* saith, *That all to whom* Abraham *was a natural father were under the Covenant, and had the seal untill they rejected themselves*, is in no part true: not the former, for *Ishmael* was never under the Covenant, whether it be meant of the spiritual promises or temporal, unless Mr. *Sidenham* means by being under the Covenant being circumcised, which is all one with having the seal, and then he useth an inept tautology in his speech without good sense. Nor is the latter true of females and males under eight days old.

I grant that both *Abrahams* natural and spiritual children were circumcised, which Mr. *Sidenham* means when in the Pædobaptists gibberish he saith, *The promise took in both relations, as to outward administration:* but *Rom.*3.1,2,3,4. speaking of the spiritual childe of *Abraham* but the natural.

And

And for what Mr. *Sidenham* saith, *And if men truly state things, you may argue as much against* Abraham's *natural seed from enjoying these privileges, as believers natural seed now, and with as much evidence of truth.*

I know not what he means by truly stating things, the privileges mentioned *Rom.*4.1,2,3,4. are Circumcision, and the commission of the oracles of God to them, and this later is reckoned as the *Jews* advantage; and though it be true, that we have the benefit of the oracles of God, yet it is not true of our children in infancy, nor of any of us or our children, that to them were the oracles of God committed as to the *Jews*. And for Circumcision it is true, we may argue as much against *Abrahams* natural seed from enjoying it as believers natural seed now, and with as much evidence of truth, since *Christ* is come, Circumcision the shadow is to cease, both to *Jews* and *Gentiles:* and me thinks Mr. *Sidenhams* arguing should be the same with ours if he were a *Christian* (as I doubt not he was) and not a *Jew*. But that which Mr. *Sidenham* would have is, that a believers natural childe should be *Abrahams* seed, and this is the true stating of things, which perhaps he means. But afore I state things after Mr. *Sidenhams* minde, I must see some proof, as yet I see no one proof to make good any of his (inconsiderate) considerations.

He takes upon him *to weigh the Scriptures* brought by his opposites to prove, that they onely are *Abrahams* seed meant in the Covenant as it was Evangelical *Gen*,17.7. to be true believers or elect persons.

The first is *Rom.*9.6,7,8. in the setting down of the occasion of which words he saith, *Here (Rom.*9.4,5.*) is a catalogue of high privileges which belonged to the* Jews, *which they were to be cut off from, which lay on* Paul's *heart, and was like to sink him.* But this is a frivolous conceit, for the privileges there reckoned are all or most of them of things already past, such as they could not be deprived of, for that which is already done cannot no not by God himself be not done, for it would imply a contradiction: so those that were *Israelites, whose were the fathers, who had the giving of the Law, of whom as concerning the flesh* Christ *came,* could not be cut off from these privileges which were things past, yea to imagine that the *Jews* should be deprived of those privileges is to overthrow the faith of the *Christians,* who believe that *Christ* came of the fathers of the *Israelites* according to the flesh, of which the *Jews* could not be deprived but by making it false. And for the rest of the privileges though our Translators reade [*to whom pertains the adoption and the glory,* not as Mr. *Sidenham, the adoption of glory*] yet the *Greek* being ὧν ἡ υἱοθεσία, which leaves out the Verb to be supplied, it is clear that it should be read *whose were the adoption and glory, and the Covenants and the giving the Law, and the service and the promises,* and *v.*5. *whose were the fathers,* as well as it is read *from whom* Christ *came,* though the Verb be not expressed, sith otherwise the speech were not true. For to the present *Israelites* did not pertain *the adoption,* as if they then living were adopted or to be adopted children of God: for the Apostle bemoans their rejection and cutting off. And *the glory* being meant of the Ark, 1 *Sam*.4.21. or the cloud that covered it *Ezek.*10.4. long before lost, and *the Covenants* meant of the two Tables of the Law, being lost, and *the giving the Law,* to wit, the judicial Laws being an act cannot be expounded but of the time past, and so *the service,* to wit, the ceremonial wor-

ship now *Christ* was come was no privilege to the present *Jews*, but a heavy yoke, yet it was a great privilege to their anceſtours, and the Verb is to be read in the Præter-tenſe, and in like manner *the promiſes* were the *Iſraelites*, that is, they had them firſt given to them, and had the benefit of them, and accordingly it is to be expounded thus, whoſe, that is, to which *Iſraelites* were the promiſes firſt made, and they injoyed the benefit of them. The thing then that afflicted *Paul* was, not that the preſent *Jews* were to be cut off from thoſe privileges, but that the people who had formerly ſo great tokens of Gods peculiar reſpect to them ſhould not be broken off from the Olive-tree, rejected from being Gods people, and hardned in unbelief.

Mr. *Sidenham* thinks this Text *a weapon whoſe edg is turned againſt theſe that count it their own.*

1. Saith he, *The Apoſtle is ſadly troubled for his kinſmen after the fleſh, for their rejection; his reaſon is, becauſe of the Covenant and the promiſes made to them, becauſe they were the natural ſeed of* Abraham; *which holds forth that the promiſes and privileges of the Covenant were indefinitely to all the* Iſraelites.

Anſwer. It is true, the Apoſtle was ſadly troubled for the *Jews* rejection, but the reaſon given is ſuch as is ſcarce competent to a ſober minde. For the reaſon, as he makes it, muſt either refer to his trouble or their rejection. If it refer to *Pauls* trouble, the ſenſe is, that *Paul* was troubled becauſe of the Covenant, *&c.* But this ſhould be a matter of rejoycing to him, not of trouble, unleſs he were troubled that God brake his Covenant with them, becauſe they were the natural ſeed of *Abraham*; but ſure God never brake his Covenant with them for that reaſon, nor is it to be imputed to God without imputing unfaithfulneſs to him, which were blaſphemy to affirm. If it be referred to the *Jews* rejection, then the ſenſe is, they were rejected becauſe of the Covenant, *&c.* But ſure they were not rejected becauſe of the Covenant made to them, but becauſe of their unbelief in not being ſtedfaſt in the Covenant, *Rom.* 11.20. There's the like wit in the illation.

For, 1. how were the promiſes made indefinitely, and yet to all the *Iſraelites?* [all] is not an indefinite note but an univerſal.

2. What is the meaning of that expreſſion, the privileges of the Covenant were made to all? The making of privileges is ſomewhat an uncouth phraſe.

3. What were the promiſes and privileges made to all the *Iſraelites*, he tells us not, and ſo the Reader is left to gueſs.

4. How *Pauls* trouble or the reaſon given ſhould hold that forth is another Riddle which needsan *Oedipus*, if ſuch nonſenſe ſcribbling be counted worth ones ſtudy to unfold it.

2. Saith he, *That it's a moſt ſad thing to be excluded from the outward and general adminiſtration of the Covenant. Why ſhould* Paul *thus break out in his affections, for the loſs of outward privileges, if it were not ſuch a mercy to be under them?*

Anſwer. It is I confeſs a ſad thing to be excluded from any mercy of God, much more to be excluded from though but an outward adminiſtration of the Covenant of grace. But it is a ſad thing to me that I finde a Teacher of a Church pretending ſo much zeal for truth to vent in print ſuch a ridiculous conceit, as if *Pauls* great ſorrow and continual pain in his heart, by reaſon of

that

that, for the remedy whereof he could wish himself accursed from *Christ*, were for the exclusion from outward privileges, which they might have and yet be damned, and might want and yet be saved. If the outward privilege were Circumcision they had it, if Baptism they might have it, and yet be damned. And shall we think the Apostle so foolish as to be thus troubled for such a loss?

3. Saith he, *The Apostle holds forth, that persons may be under the outward administration of the Covenant, and yet not get the efficacy of it, vers.6. They are not all* Israel *that are of* Israel; *the Covenant was with* Abraham *and his seed, all that were of him; and yet all were not* Israel, *that is, partakers of the inward life and efficacy of the Covenant.*

An. That which the Apostle holds forth is not, as this man dotingly scribles, *that persons may be under the outward administration of the Covenant*, that is, circumcised, *&c. and yet not get the efficacy of it*, that is, have the Circumcision of the heart, justification and eternal life: for though this be a truth, yet there's not a word in the Apostles answer *v.*6,7,8. which gives any colour for such a Paraphrase, there being no mention of Circumcision or any such rite as they call the outward administration of the Covenant, nor any words equipollent thereto. For to be *of Israel* is to be descended of *Jacob* by natural generation, as in like manner *v.*7. *to be the seed of* Abraham, and *v.*8. *the children of the flesh*: nor could such an Answer have met with the Objection, which was not, if the *Jews* were deprived of the outward administration, how could Gods word stand to be a God to *Abraham* and his seed? But thus, if they were not his people to be justified and saved by *Christ*, how could the word of God stand, *Gen.*17.7. *Jer.*31.36,37. which seemed to promise they should be his people to be justified and saved by *Christ*? And therefore to answer, they had the outward administration, though not the inward efficacy is to confirm the Objection, which is, that they had not that inward efficacy which the Covenant promised: nor doth the Apostle deny that those saving mercies were in the promises, nor think the promises salved by alleging that all had outward privileges though not saving mercies; but by shewing that the saving mercies in those promises were not assured to every natural childe of *Abraham*, or of *Israel*, but to the choice seed distinguished from the rest by promise, and peculiar calling according to election, whether of *Jews* or *Gentiles*, and thereby made *the* Israel *of God*, *v.*7,8,11,24. and so Gods words of promise stands firm to that seed of *Abraham* and *Israel* to whom it was made, though the natural seed of *Abraham*, and *Israel* be rejected from being Gods people. It is therefore expressly cross to what the Apostle saith *v.*7. which Mr. *Sidenham* saith, *that the Covenant was with* Abraham *and his seed, all that were of him.*

And that which he saith, *And so though they were under the outward dispensation of the Covenant, yet God was not mutable, nor his promise, though he rejected them because of their own degeneration*; is directly contrary to the Apostles determination that they were rejected meerly out of the absolute liberty of Gods will, *v.*18. which the Apostle proves in the rejection of *Esau vers.*11, 12,13. *afore he had done good or evil*, yea, *afore he was born*, and the speech to *Moses*, *v.*15. and *the hardening of* Pharaoh, *v.*17. And indeed if this Paraphrase of Mr. *Sidenham* were good then the *Arminian* doctrine of conditional reprobation were here expressly taught, *that their rejection was because of their*

own degeneration, and consequently the election of the other, to wit, the *Gentiles* must be, because of their own believing, and Gods promise to be a God to them must presuppose their believing as the reason of his promise to them, which is the very dregs of *Pelagianism* founding the difference between the called and rejected in mans will and not Gods.

What Mr. *Sidenham* saith, *that the Covenant was made in general with Abraham's seed, to all that came from him*, meaning by natural generation, is contrary to the Apostles resolution *v.6,7,8.* and would make God a breaker of his promise, (which was not of outward privileges, but of saving grace) and supposes the Covenant and the election not commensurate, contrary to the Apostle, yea, to Mr. *Sidenhams* own words where he summs up the Apostles resolution, when he saith, *that none are the children of the promise* (to whom the Covenant was made) *real saints but those that have the true effects of the Covenant in their hearts.*

And what he saith, *to all children of believers the promise visibly belongs to them as to* Abraham *and his seed*, it's a piece of non-sense gibberish, such as Pædobaptists use, according to their false *Hypotheses*, no whit agreeing either with the promise *Gen.17.7.* or the Apostles determination *Rom.9.6,7,8.* so often refelled by me, that it is superfluous to say of it any more now.

As for what he adds, *But here is nothing at all to demonstrate that infants, because children of the flesh, are not under the promise.*

I grant it, but say, there is enough to demonstrate that the promise of being a God *Gen.17.1.* is not made to every believers childe, sith it was not made to all *Abrahams* natural seed, but to the elect of them, which is enough for our purpose.

Mr. *Sidenhams* proceeds to the Text *Gal.3.16.* which he grants not to be meant *barely of* Christ *personal, if*, saith he, *the promises were to* Christ *mystical, then to all the elect as in him, and so to infants as well as grown persons*, [which I grant] *but thus the promise is conveyed under ground as it were, none knows the veins of it*, which I also grant, untill the calling shews who were elect, nor do I count it any absurdity to yield it.

But, saith he, *take the promise to be made to* Christ, *the seed, as the Head of a visible Church, then still it speaks for us.*

Answer. This is doughty disputing, likely to turn the edg of our weapons against our selves, when the Antagonist must yield him what he would have; and me thinks he should have brought some Expositour or some argument for him, and not so pitifully beg what he should prove. To the contrary I urge that by [*Christ Gal.3.16.*] is meant either *Christ* personal or *Christ* mystical, or both, and not as the Head of a visible Church.

1. That *the promises* said to be *made to* Abraham's *seed*, that is, *Christ* are *of the blessing of* Abraham, which is *righteousnes and the spirit, Gal.3.8,9,14. the inheritance v.18. life v.21.* not bare outward privileges. But these things belong onely to *Christ* and his mystical body, not his meer visible Church. *Ergo*, they are not the seed there meant.

2. From the condition or means by which the promise is made good, and that is *faith, v.14,22.* But the meer visible Church may be without faith, therefore the promise is not made to it.

3. By the expres determination of the Apostle *v.7. Know ye therefore, that they*

they which are of faith are the children of Abraham, *verſ.29. And if ye be Chriſts* (that is by faith, *v.26,27.*) *then are ye* Abraham's *ſeed and heirs according to the promiſe:* which a man would think were enough to ſilence thoſe that make the promiſes to belong to unbelievers as *Abrahams* ſeed.

4. The current Proteſtant interpreters of note, ſuch as *Beza, Piſcator, Perkins, &c.* go this way.

But Mr. *Sidenham* thinks to evince his purpoſe from *v.14.* where the *bleſſing* of *Abraham* is ſaid *to come on the* Gentiles *through* Chriſt, *and this bleſſing of* Abraham *was not perſonal, but to him and his ſeed, this very bleſſing is come on* Gentile *believers, as on* Abraham; *therefore it muſt come on believers of the* Gentiles *and their ſeed. For it cannot be called* Abraham's *bleſſing, except it come on the* Gentiles *according to the ſubſtantial terms of* Abraham's *Covenant: now this was the abſolute form of* Abraham's *bleſſing, I will be a God of thee and thy ſeed; and this very bleſſing is come on the* Gentiles *through* Chriſt, *as it came on* Abraham; *and therefore it muſt be to believing* Gentiles *and their ſeed; elſe it will neither be* Abraham's *bleſſing in the form nor fulneſs of it;* Abraham's *bleſſing will deſcend on the* Gentiles *clipt half off, not like it ſelf: and it muſt needs be a very uncouth ſaying to all judicious ears, to ſay, that* Abraham's *bleſſing is come on the* Gentiles *by* Chriſt, *as it was on the* Jews *by* Abraham, *and to exclude half the ſubjects at once from any right to it; for ſo you muſt, if you caſt out the ſeed of* Gentile *believers.*

To which I anſwered, that had not the *Aſſembly* at *Weſtminſter, Confeſſion of Faith, chap.28. art.4.* cited *Gal.3.9,14.* with *Gen.17.7,9.* to prove *infant-baptiſm of a believing parent,* I ſhould not have tranſcribed ſo much of this arguing. *The bleſſing of* Abraham *muſt come on the* Gentiles, ſaith he, *according to the ſubſtantial terms of the Covenant, Gen.17.7.* Ergo, *on* Gentile *believers and their ſeed.* Now what is the bleſſing of *Abraham?* and what the ſubſtantial terms of the Covenant? and what ſeed of *Abraham* did it come on? and how?

1. The bleſſing is plainly expreſſed *v.8,9.* to be juſtification *v.14.* to be *the receiving the promiſe of the ſpirit.* The ſame Apoſtle *Rom.4.6,9.* placeth the bleſſedneſs of *Abraham* in the imputation of righteouſneſs through faith, *Beza Annot. in Gal.3.14. Et ſpiritus nomine benedictionem æternæ ſpiritualis vitæ intelligo. Perkins Comment. on Gal.3.14. That the bleſſing of* Abraham, *that is, righteouſneſs and life everlaſting, Piſcat. Schol. in Gal.3.14. Ut benedictio illa Abrahæ promiſſa (de qua ſupra v.8.) ad Gentes perveniret in Chriſto; quatenus nimirum illæ Chriſto inſeruntur per fidem, Dieſon in Gal.3.14. benedictio Abrahæ, id eſt, juſtitia & vita æterna.*

2. The ſubſtantial terms of the Covenant *Gen.17.7.* are thus ſet down by Mr. *M.* in his Sermon, *pag.10. The ſubſtance of the Covenant on Gods part was to be* Abraham's *God, and the God of his ſeed, to be an all-ſufficient portion, an all-ſufficient reward for him, to give* Jeſus Chriſt *to him, and righteouſneſs with him, both of juſtification, and of ſanctification, and of everlaſting life. On* Abraham's *part the ſubſtance of the Covenant was, to believe in the promiſed* Meſſiah, *to walk before God with a perfect heart, to ſerve God according to his revealed will, to inſtruct his family, &c.* Not one that I know that makes the bleſſing or the ſubſtance of the Covenant to be an initial ſeal, viſible Church-membership and ſuch like meer Eccleſiaſtical privileges.

3. The

3. The seed of *Abraham* to whom the blessing is promised is his spiritual seed, and it onely. *Diodati Annot.* on *Gal.*3.14. *of* Abraham] *namely, promised to* Abraham, *and to his spiritual posterity onely. Trapp. Comment on Gal.* 3.14. *v.*14. *The promise of the spirit*] *that is, the spiritual promise made to* Abraham, *and his spiritual posterity*. The Text it self *Gal.*3.7. *Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of* Abraham.

4. The means is *through faith, Gal.*3.14. *So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithfull* Abraham, *vers.*9. From which I infer, that he that would conclude from hence *that the blessing of* Abraham *comes upon the* Gentiles, fathers and infant-children, and that this is according to the substantial terms of the Covenant, *Gen.*17.7. must hold that all children of *Gentile* believers are elect and believers, and that they are justified as *Abraham* was, which Mr. *M.* and Mr. *G.* disclaim, and indeed is manifestly false being contrary to Scripture and experience. But Mr. *Sidenham* thinks to infer hence a meer Ecclesiastical privilege of right to an initial seal, which is not at all meant *Gal.*3.14. by the *blessing* of *Abraham*, nor ever meant by the Covenant *Gen.*17.7. nor would the promise be true, if meant of it; for many of *Abrahams* seed had no right to Circumcision or visible Church-membership. Surely according to Pædobaptists *Hypotheses* all the posterity of *Abraham* by *Ishmael*, the sons of *Keturah*, *Esaus* were excluded; and therefore the word of Gods promise so expounded had been false.

As for Mr. *Sidenhams* Reasons, there's no force in them. The first may be retorted, *The first is come on* Gentile *believers, as on* Abraham; therefore it must not come on believers of the *Gentiles* and their seed also universally, for it came not on *Abraham* and his natural seed universally, nor is it true *this very blessing is come on* Gentile *believers as on* Abraham, for it is come on *Abraham* not simply as a believer, but as a father of believers, not as father of men, but it comes on no *Gentile* as father of believers, but as *Abrahams* childe by faith.

The next also may be retorted, *if the blessing come on the* Gentiles according to *the substantial terms of* Abraham's *Covenant*, then not in a meer outward Ecclesiastical privilege, for that is no part of the Covenant, *Gen.*17.7. much less the substantial term of it, it is neither Abraham's *blessing in the form nor fulness of it*; yea, if it be meant by *Abrahams* blessing it, *is clipt half off not like it self*, it's made an empty thing, a meer outward privilege without salvation, and so is in a manner reduced to nothing, and *half the seed of* Abraham, all the females and many more *are excluded from any right to it*. For they had no right to the initial seal, to wit, Circumcision.

And to his question, *And to what end should the Apostle say, The blessing of* Abraham, *and not the Promise or Covenant is come to the* Gentiles, *but that he intended it to the* Gentile *believers and their seed, as formerly it came to* Abraham *and his seed?*

I answer, he saith, *The blessing of* Abraham (not the Promise or Covenant of *Abraham*) because he in the Chapter before mentioned it, and it was the proper effect of *Christs* being made a curse for us, though he after mention the Covenant and Promise according to which it is bestowed. But that the use of that term of [*the blessing of* Abraham] should intimate an outward privilege

of

of an initial seal to *Gentile* believers and their natural seed is such a reason as I am out of hope ever to understand. Me thinks the use of that term *vers.*14. compared with *v.*7,8,9. doth overthrow the fond conceit of the *Assembly* and Mr. *Sidenham*, and is so plain a determination, that the Promise of being *God to* Abraham's *seed*, is meant onely of true believers of the *Gentiles*, and not their natural seed, that if there were no more Texts, it seems enough to me to overthrow their interpretation of *Gen.*17.7. and the inference they make thence.

And in this I commend Mr. *Sidenhams* wit and the *Assemblies*, that they let pass *Gal.*3.7. without mentioning, finding perhaps that it is expresly contrary to their conceit of *Gentile* believers children being reckoned for *Abrahams* seed.

I think it not amiss to add the word of Mr. *Stalham Vindic. Redempt.* against *Otes*, *Gal.*3.13,14. *Behold here a Gospel-blessing comes upon all those who are freed from the legal curse, and if then the non-elected by this mans doctrine have the one, he must yield the other also; if freed from the curse they are blessed, justified, and saved ones; this is worse than non-sense, even impure blasphemy against the truth*: which shews all these to be connex to be freed from the curse, to be blessed with *Abrahams* blessing, to be justified and saved, and therefore cannot be interpreted of a meer outward privilege belonging even to believers children who may be, as *Esau* was, non-elect.

There's another Text which Mr. *Sidenham* takes upon him to turn the edg of it against Antipædobaptists who produce it against Pædobaptists, and he speaks thus, *But in Gal.*3.29. *the Apostle* (say they) *describes who are the seed; if you be* Christ's, *then you are* Abraham's *seed, and heirs according to promise; so that now no children born of believing parents can be the seed; for they must be* Christ's, *according to that in v.*26. *we are all the children of God through faith in* Christ Jesus.

Answer. This Text is clear not to prove (as Mr. *Sidenham* represents our conclusion) *that now no children born of believing parents can be the seed*, but that none of the *Gentiles* are *Abrahams* seed but those who are *Christs* by their faith or election, and adoption to be the children of God, for such are all that are *Christs*, and heirs according to the promise. But the children of believing *Gentiles* are many of them not such, nor any of them in that he is the childe of a believing *Gentile*; therefore all the children born of believing parents are not *Abrahams* seed, as Pædobaptists suppose.

To this Mr. *Sidenham* opposeth, 1. *That the* Claromont Bible *hath it, if ye be one in* Christ, *then are ye* Abraham's *seed, and that the Apostles endeavour is to take away all difference between* Jew *and* Gentile, *and to hold forth their unity in* Christ, *where there is no distinction as formerly: but now the* Gentiles *being one in* Christ *are* Abraham's *seed as well as the natural and believing* Jews.

Answer. It is granted, that *the Apostle takes away the difference between* Gentiles *and* Jews *who are in* Christ, and asserts that *now the believing* Gentiles *being one in* Christ *are* Abraham's *seed as well as the natural and believing Jews.* But this makes for our purpose; for as none of the natural *Jews* but the elect and believing were *Abrahams* spiritual seed, so it is concerning the *Gentiles*, none of them either of their children are *Abrahams* seed in the sense in which the *Gentiles* may be termed *Abrahams* seed but the elect and believing.

2. Saith,

2. Saith Mr. *Sidenham*, *The Apostle here hath no intent to shew the distinction of* Abraham's *seed as the subject of the outward privileges, and administrations of ordinances, but to shew that none are spiritually and really* Abraham's *seed and heirs of promise, but such as are* Christ's, *one in him with* Abraham: *for if this should be the distinction of seed as the subject of outward ordinances, it would be as much against professing believers as infants; for there is a carnal profession as well as a fleshly generation, the former more abominable.*

Answer. I confess it is *not the Apostles intent to shew the distinction of* Abraham's *seed as the subject of the outward Privileges and administration of Ordinances:* for neither doth he make there any distinction of *Abrahams* seed, there being in that passage no seed of *Abraham* mentioned but such as are spiritual, nor doth he mention *Abrahams* seed as the subject, meaning the adequate subject of outward Ordinances and Privileges, there being many that were not *Abrahams* spiritual seed, who might be circumcised, baptized, admitted to the Pass-over and Lords Supper, and at least in some of these many who were might not, though v. 26, 27. compared together shew who were wont then to be baptized, to wit, believers, and such as at least in profession put on *Christ*. And I conceive *Pauls* intent was to shew, *that none are spiritually and really* Abraham's *seed and heirs of promise, but such as are* Christ's, *one in him with* Abraham.

Now this manifestly proves the thing we would have, that none of our children are *Abrahams* seed in the Gospel-sense according to which the promise *Gen.* 17.7. is to be understood, but elect and true believers, and so not in that Covenant, and consequently not by virtue of interest in that Covenant baptizable, as Pædobaptists would have it. But I know not any who reason thus, *None but these who are* Christ's *are* Abraham's *seed; and none are* Christ's *but real believers, and therefore none but they must be baptized.* For though it is true, that before God none have right to Baptism but such, yet sith the Minister of Baptism cannot distinguish between a believer in reality and one in profession he is without fault in baptizing a believer onely in profession, whom he takes to be a believer in reality.

If any say, *Baptism knows no flesh*, the meaning likely is that Baptism is not allotted to any for its natural birth though of a believer. So that I need not answer Mr. *Sidenhams* arguments to the contrary, sith I do not assert that none but *Abrahams* seed may be baptized.

Nor is it true, *that we have the same ground of charity to act on in sons of believers as on grown men.* For though infants may be *Christs*, yet we have not the same evidence that they are *Christs* which we have of grown persons, whose words and actions shew that the Spirit of God dwels in them. Nor *would God have us* 1 *Cor.* 7.14. *to account the children to be holy* as visible professours are for the parents faith, but to be legitimate from the lawfulness of their generation. Nor can it be proved that any one infant of the most godly person is taken *into the same Covenant with the parent*: nor doth Christ's *respect to infants when brought to him* give warrant to any to judge better of a believers infant than of a visible professour, or to account of such an infant as baptizable.

Nor is it true, *that a general Scripture-assertion, and the ground of an indefinite promise, is more than all our Reasons to judg a visible Professour* Christ's *or* Abraham's *seed, or a subject of Baptism*, sith the words and actions of such a one do shew more of *Christs* spirit and faith than any speeches of God or promises

miſes do of infants now exiſtent, and he that baptizeth a viſible profeſſor of faith, proceedeth nppon certain knowledge according to a certain rule of baptizing Diſciples, which is more to aſſure the conſcience in the doing the will of God, then any Charitable judgement or any probable likelyhood of an infants being Chriſts, or in covenant for the preſent, or certain revelation of the infants election and being in covenant, and ſo will be a believer hereafter can be to warrant a man to baptize it at this inſtant. Nor is it true that he that baptizeth a viſible profeſſor, *goes by the purblind eye of his probable judgment.* For he baptizeth upon an unerring rule of baptizing manifeſt diſciples, according to an unerring knowledge, that thoſe he baptizeth are ſuch under the Goſpel; the Jewes are *Abrahams* fleſhly ſeed, though they be not viſible profeſſors of faith in Chriſt, no meer Gentile viſible profeſſor is *Abrahams* ſeed, nor any true believers natural ſeed as ſuch, nor doth the covenant make every believer in reallity, or any, except *Abraham*, much leſs every viſible believer *a ſpiritual Father.* I confeſs, *the ſpiritual ſeed of* Abraham *takes its denomination from the covenant*; I mean the future ſeed, and from their believing the actual, but the natural ſeed takes not its denomination from the covenant, but *Abrahams* begetting, nor is it true the Covenant made with *Abraham* and his natural ſeed, is renewed in the new Teſtament with believers and their ſeed, neither formerly nor now are infants of believers non-elect *Abrahams* ſeed, nor is there in the word of God one paſſage either in the old or new Teſtament either of thoſe alleaged by Maſter *Sidenham* or any other, I know, wherein infants of believers *are viſibly owned as we own viſible profeſſors. There will be found viſible ſubjects of baptiſm.* though neither infants of believers, nor meer viſible profeſſors be *Abrahams* ſeed. I conclude my animadverſions on this chapter of Mr. *Sidenhams* with theſe conſiderations, that none but elect or true believers of the Gentiles are the ſeed of *Abraham* with whom the Covenant *Gen.* 17. 7. is made, nor are perſons to be baptized for their intereſt in that Covenant, except it be made manifeſt by their profeſſion of faith, and therefore neither can we ſay of any infant of a believing Gentile that he is in that covenant, nor if we could, were it to be baptized till by profeſſion or other waies, its faith did manifeſt it to be a Diſciple of Chriſt.

In the 4. chapter Mr. *Sidenham* tells us of *a being in Covenant according to the purpoſe of election in Gods heart*, which I allow, *and of being in Covenant in the face of the viſible Church by the perſons own viſible profeſſion*, which I deny not, but for the other ſort *of being in covenant with God as in a political moral conſideration, as in the right of another through a free promiſe to him and his heirs*, it's a meer figment, there being no ſuch kind of being in Covenant in the time of the new Teſtament, nor doth Mr. *Sidenham* bring one text of Scripture to prove it: and for his reaſons they prove it not, 1. Saith he, *If men deny an external as well as internal being in covenant, none can adminiſter an external ordinance an outward ſign to any, for we muſt go by external rules in theſe actings.* But this reaſon is nothing to prove a political moral being in covenant without any act of Covenanting by either of the parties in Covenant. I deny not, but that all the elect are in Corenant with God in his purpoſe and ſo infants are in Covenant with God by Gods promiſe, either to his ſon when he gave them to him, or at ſome other time. And I grant

that visible professors of faith in Christ are in Covenant externally by their own act of covenanting, and such may be baptized they being Disciples of Christ. 2. Nor did I ever say *that no Ordinance must be administred to these which are not internally in Covenant.* 3. Nor do I count it any absurdity to say *we may set a seal to a blank* (though I like not the expression) in this sense a man may lawfully be baptized to whom God hath not promised to be his God. 4. And I have shewed *we have certain evidence of visible professors being in covenant*, for we hear their profession and see their actions, and their rule by which baptism is to be administred, but of infants we have no evidence of their being in covenant by profession of faith, according to which we are to be baptized, yea we have evidence to the contrary, and their being in covenant according to election is uncertain, and if it were certain, yet till they be actual believers or Disciples of Christ we have no rule to baptize them by, nor is there a jot brought by Mr. *Sidenham* to prove they are in Covenant by their parents faith onely in Gospel times. Nor doth any thing Mr. *Sidenham* hath said answer that which he saith *is the great question* : *and we all urge, that if God made the Covenant with believers and their seed, they must be all saved*, &c. But in stead of answering me poseth me thus, *doth God make the covenant of salvation with every visible professor whom they baptize? or with every visible Saint.* Answ. No; *Or do they baptize them out of Covenant?* Answ. Yea; If by being out of Covenant be meant, that the Covenant of salvation is not made by God to them; *then how come any to fall off and be damned? Answ.* None of those God made the Covenant of salvation with fall off and be damned, others though baptized rightly and were visible professors, yet fall off and are damned, because the Covenant of salvation was never made by God to them, *Or what rule have they to baptize by?* Answ. That which is, *Mat.* 28. 19. *Mark* 16. 15, 16. *Acts* 2. 38, 41. and 8. 12, 37, 38. *Why should it be thought more hainous to set a seal on* (i. e. baptize) *infants, as in the covenant, then on these professors which afterwards prove not to be in Covenant.* Ans. because infants are not Disciples of Christ, when visible professors are, though they be not in covenant with God by his promise of saving grace. The being or not being in Covenant is not the reason of the baptizing or not baptizing of them, but their being or not being Disciples of Christ, or do they baptize because that persons are in the covenant? *Answ.* not because they are in the covenant that is Gods covenant to them, but because they covenant to be Christs by their own Declaration and promise, which is certainly known upon hearing their words and seing their actions, nor is it any trick to evade, but a clear truth, that it is not being in covenant (by Gods promise of saving grace to us) but being an actual believer, gives right to baptism; Nor doth it follow *if the covenant be the ground* (i. e. the object) *of faith, it may well be the ground* (i. e. adequate reason on the baptizer and the baptizeds part) *of an outward privilege* i. e. baptism, for the institution is not to baptize men in covenant by Gods act of promise, but Disciples or persons in covenant by their professing of faith. *Nor is there danger of separating the Covenant from the conveyance of actual privilege*; for the Covenant of it self, till it is fulfilled by the making a person a known Disciple of Christ, doth not give right to baptism any more then to the Lords supper. Nor is there reason *why infants without faith should now be baptized because they were*

circum-

circumcised, the institution of the one being different from the other, *neither do we account* Simon Magus, *&c.* Abrahams *spiritual seed*, nor deny elect infants to be so, if God doth administer all his graces by covenant, yet not all outward ordinances by the persons interest in it, and if he did, then infants by this reason should have the Lords supper as well as baptism. *The invisible design of God may be known to us, and is carried on secretly in an outward visible dispensation, and some may be condemned by an outward rule*, and yet persons not admitted into or ejected out of the Church by their being or not being in Covenant through Gods act of promise to them, but by their profession and practise we say not, *none are to be baptized but real believers, the spiritual seed, nor that none are the spiritual seed but visible believers, nor do we conceive infants no spiritual seed of* Abraham *because no visible believers; But we deny that an infant of a believer is as visible by promise as a believer by profession.* For on the one side no infant is of the visible Church barely by Gods promise of regeneration, justification, salvation.

1. Because that promise is according to Gods election, which is secret, so as that no man can know who are they to whom the promise pertaines, till it appear by some others declaration then the promise or act, an infant can ordinarily perform.

2. That which makes a thing or person visibly must be something existent in act, for then a thing or person is visibly when it is the object of sense, but sense is onely of singular things actually existent. But persons may have a promise afore they are in being, as *Isaac* was in Covenant afore he was begotten or born, yet not a visible Church-member, therefore an infant is not visible by promise.

3. On the other side profession makes a person manifestly visible, and therefore Mr. *Sidenhams* speech is palpably false, that an infant is as visible by promise, as a believer by profession.

SECT. XXVIII.

It is proved from Luke 1. 54, 55. *and* 19. 9. John 8. 39. Rom. 4. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. Gal. 3. 7, 16, 29. *and* 4. 28. Rom. 9. 6, 7, 8. Mat. 3. 9. *That the seed of* Abraham *to whom the promise as Evangelical is made*, Gen. 17. 7. *are onely true believers or elect persons.*

TO those texts in the foregoing Section alleaged to prove that the seed of *Abraham* to whom the promise, *Gen.* 17. 7. as it is Evangelical belongs, are only true believers or elect persons, which have been vindicated from Mr. *Sidenhams* answers, I shall adde some more in the new Testament.

1. In *Maries* song, *Luke* 1 54. 55. It is said, *He hath holpen his Servant* Israel, *in remembrance of his mercy as he spake to our fathers, to* Abraham, *and to his seed for ever.*

That seed of *Abraham* is onely meant in the promise, *Gen.* 17. 7. As it was evangelical which he hath holpen by Christ in remembrance of his mercy; this is manifest from the text. But they are onely true believers or elect per-

sons. *Pisc. Schol. in Luk.* 1. 55. *Semini.* [illegible] *id est posteritati nempe spirituali, id est electis; sive sint ex judeis, sive ex gentibus, ut docet Apostolas Rom.* 4. *v.* 16. *and ch.* 9. *v.* 8. *New annot on Luke* 1. 55. *to his seed for ever, that is to the faithfull and holy. See* Gal. 3. 16. 26, 27, 29. They only are holpen by Christ in remembrance of his mercy, which is confirmed from the words of *Zacharias, Luke* 1. 71, 72, 73, 74, 75. 76, 77, 78. *wherein the holy Covenant and Oath God sware to* Abraham *was, that he would grant them that is (Abrahams seed) salvation, deliverance, to serve god in holyness and righteousness before him all the daies of their life, the salvation is expressed to be by remission of sins, through the tender mercy of God, whereby the day Spring from on high visited them,* which shewes, the Covenant as it was Evangelical, promised not outward privileges but saving graces, which are not promised to any but elect persons, therefore by *Abrahams* seed in the promise, *Gen.* 17. 7. As it was Evangelical are, meant onely elect or true believers.

2. It is said of *Zaccheus, Luke* 19. 9. *This day is salvation come to this house, for so much as he also is the son of* Abraham, *for the son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost*; In which words the term [*son of* Abraham] is made to infer salvation, and *Zaccheus* in that he was *the son of* Abraham, proved to be one *that the son of man came to seek and save* which can agree onely to elect persons, therefore the term [*seed of* Abraham] equipollent to [*son of* Abraham] as Evangelically such notes onely elect persons or true believers. *Piscat. Analys. Luc.* 19. 9. *Electio Dei patris significatur v.* 9. *his verbis, eo quod ipse quoque filius Abrahæ est, ubi intelligitur non simpliciter filius secundum carnem, sed filius secundum promissionem Dei, qua promiserat ipsum futurum patrem credentium, schol. filius Abrahæ, nempe filius secundum promissionem, id est electus, vide, Rom.* 9. *v.* 7. and 8. *New Annot on Luke* 19. 9. *Is the son of* Abraham, *to be a son of* Abraham *is to be chosen freely, Rom.* 9. 8. *To walk in the steps and faith of* Abraham. Rom. 4. 11, 12. *And generally to do the good works of* Abraham, John 8. 39. *Whereby we may be assured of Election to eternal life,* Rom. 8. 29, 30. 2 Pet. 1. 10. *Trap com, in* Luke 19. 9. *He also is a son of* Abraham *that is freely elected,* Rom. 9. *A follower of* Abrahams *faith*, Rom. 4. 12. *And a doer of his works,* John 8. 39.

3. It is said by our Lord Christ, *John* 8. 39. *If ye were* Abrahams *children ye would do the works of* Abraham, he granted them ver. 37. To be *Abrahams* seed by nature, but not the seed of *Abraham* according to the Covenant Evangelical, because their practise was unlike *Abrahams*. Whence I inferre, they Onely Evangellically are *Abrahams* children or seed even of those who descended from *Abraham* by generation who are like unto *Abraham* in their Actions. But such onely are true believers or elect persons, therefore true believers or elect persons onely are *Abrahams* children or seed Evangelical. *Diodati. Annot.* on *John* 8. 39. *children, namely true and lawfull imitators of* Abrahams *faith: Father of all believers; wherein consists the true meaning of this name of children of* Abraham, Rom. 4. 16. *and* 9. 6, 7. Gal. 3. 7.

4. With our Lord Christs words accord the words of *Paul*, who doth plainly determine that the seed of *Abraham* to whom the promise, *Gen*, 17. 7. That God would be the God of *Abrahams* seed, as it was Eavngelical be-

longs, are believers or elect persons and no other, *Rom.* 4. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. Is so plain to prove it that the very reading the words is enough to clear it to a heedfull reader. For therein the Apostle doth shew how the promises, *Gen.* 17. 7. Are true of the Gentiles as well as the Jewes. in that *Abraham* is considered therein as the father of believers, v. 11. And the father of circumcision, that is as *Beza* of the circumcised, yet not a father to all of them, nor to them onely, but to those circumcised ones onely, and with them to all other that believe, or walk in the steps of that faith, which our father (of us believing Gentiles) *Abraham* had being yet uncircumcised, v. 11. 12. Now if *Abraham* be considered in the promises as Evangelical onely as the Father of believers of either sort circumcised, or uncircumcised, then the seed of *Abraham* are onely believers or elect persons. And to this purpose doth Master *Dickson* paraphrase the words thus. Abraham *received from God the sign of circumcision to seal the Covenant of grace, or the righteousness of faith, which he had uncircumcised to that end, that he might be father of uncircumcised believers. and in like manner of circumcised, to wit, who are both sons of the flesh, and sons of the faith of* Abraham. *Therefore the righteousness of faith is common to the circumcised, and uncircumcised believers, or them that follow the steps of the faith of* Abraham *not yet circumcised. But* Abraham *is said to be the father of believers, in that he is the first eminent example of faith, and of righteousness imputed by faith, and by his example an Author to all that they may believe.* Beza in his note on *Rom.* 4. 12. For as speaking of the uncircumcised, he said not simply that *Abraham* was the father of them all, but of them onely who should believe, he also hath deservedly kept the same distinction in the Jewes, because (as I said before) it is not simply the Apostles purpose to teach *Abraham* to be the father of both the uncircumcised and the circumcised, but also especially by what reason he is the father of both, which is his scope. For to be a child of *Abraham* before God, and to be justifyed by faith cohere, Again *v.* 13. shewes the same. *For the promise that he should be the heir of the world was not to* Abraham, *or to his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith.* I shall use the words of the same Authors. *Dickson* thus paraphraseth, *v.* 13. *He proves* Abraham *to be Father not but of believers onely, uncircumcised alike and circumcised, and together addes a third argument. The promise made to* Abraham *and his seed, that he should be heir of the land of* Canaan *in time, and of the world and heaven in truth, came not to him by the Law, or by the condition of works, but happened to him by an absolute promise to him already justified by faith, and having the righteousness of faith. Therefore his sons are not they which are of the Law seeking to wit righteousness by works, but they onely who are by faith, seeking righteousness by faith, that is all and onely believers, circumcised alike and uncircumcised, to whom equally the common righteousness of faith and the inheritance is promised.* The argument is of force, for if father *Abraham* be not the heir of the world, nor have righteousness but by faith, certainly none are his sons but believers, who have righteousness by faith, and by righteousness the inheritance. *Beza Annot. ad Rom.* 4. 13. But in these words there is a continuation of the former conclusion, the application of the example of *Abraham* neither to the circumcised, neither to the uncircumcised, otherwise not availing unless two things be shewed: to wit that God made that Covenant not with

Abraham

Abraham alone, but with his heirs also, and that under the name of his posterity, any who shall believe that covenant like *Abraham* are understood. Therefore *Paul* conjoynes the promises of God made to *Abraham*, as it were into one body, and when he had taught all believers whether circumcised, or uncircumcised to be *Abrahams* sons, he verily deservedly calls *Abraham* the heir of the world, by the term world understanding all Nations, and therein following the Lords steps. For when the Lord had said to *Abraham* that he would be the God of him and his seed, after he expounded what he understood by the term seed; to wit all the nations of the earth, when he said that it should be, that in him he would vouchsafe them all his grace. The next *v.* also confirms it, *v.* 14. For if they which are of the Law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect, which Mr. *Dickson* thus paraphraseth, if they which are of the Law, or which seek righteousnes by works, were the sons of *Abraham*, and heirs of life, and partakers of righteousnes, then faith should be made void, and the promise vain: But this is absurd. Therefore they which are of the law are not heirs, but alone believers are sons of *Abraham*, and heirs of life and righteousnes. The 16. *v.* doth yet more plainly express that the seed of *Abraham* to whom the promise, *Gen.* 17. 7. As Evangelical is made are believers onely. *Therefore it is of faith that it might be by grace, to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed, not to that onely which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of* Abraham, *who is the father of us all.* Upon which saith Mr. *Dickson* with that very counsel God appointed that the inheritance should be of faith; that it might appear to be of grace or by grace. Therefore onely and all believers uncircumcised, and circumcised alike, are heirs. The inheritance is of faith and by grace by the Counsel of God, that the promise might be sure to all the seed, not onely to that which is the seed of *Abraham* by the law of nature and hath faith also, that is the circumcised Jewes believing, but also to that seed which is not by the law of nature or the flesh, but onely by the faith of *Abraham*, that is the uncircumcised believing Gentiles.

Therefore, unless suspending the promise of righteousnes, and the inheritance upon the condition of the law to be performed, we would make it unsure and uncertain, the whole seed of *Abraham*, or all and onely believers circumcised and uncircumcised, are heirs by faith with father *Abraham*, who according to faith is father of all us believers of Jewes and Gentiles. *Beza Annot. ad Rom.* 4. 16. *Paul* manifestly devides into two members that which in general he had said of the whole seed of *Abraham*, that is believers both circumcised and uncircumcised, *Pisc. Sch.* to all the seed] that is of *Abraham*, to wit all believers, *Diodati*, to all, namely to the spiritual seed according to the faith, of which God intended to speak in that excellent promise, I will be thy God and of thy seed after the, *Gen.* 17. 7,

Lastly the Apostle interprets the promise, *Gen.* 17. 5. That *Abraham* should be the father of many Nations, thus that the Gentiles should be his seed by faith, *v.* 17. as it is written, I have made thee a father of many Nations, on which Master *Dickson*. By force of the divine promise, promising that he should be the father of many Nations. *Abraham* embraced for sons all believers to be ingrafted into his seed, and so in vertue of the promise, as it were begat or conceived believers to himself as sons promised. The new

Anni.

Annot on *Rom.* 4. 17. I have made thee a Father, *See Gen.* 17. 5. Not of those only that should issue from him according to the flesh, but also of those among all nations that by faith should be adopted and received into his spiritual family.

5. The texts also which are; *Gal.* 3. 7, 16, 29, and 4, 28. Are very pregnant to the same purpose, that the seed of *Abraham* to which the promise, *Gen.* 7. 7. as Evangelical is made, are only true believers, or elect persons. The rst of these places is that which is asserted in terms. Know ye therefore that ney which are of faith the same are the children of *Abraham*, where the peech is equipollent to an exclusive. For having, *v.* 2. 5. told them they must have the spirit, and be *Abrahams* children either by the works of the law by faith, and determined that they had not the spirit by the works of the w, but by faith, supposing that they who are children have received the spirit as it is, *v.* 14. it plainly followes that they only are the children of *Abraham* which are of faith, even as Protestant divines conclude from *Gal.* 2. 16. that justification is by faith only, because the disjunction being sufficient, justifycation is either by faith, or by works, and works excluded, it followes, we are justified by faith onely. And so Mr. *Dickson* conceives that the Apostles argument is, *Gal.* 3. 7. They onely who are of the faith, or who seek to be justified by faith, and not by works, are the children of *Abraham*, therefore the only reason of justification is by faith. *Diodati Annot.* on *Gal.* 3. 7. yet you know (that is to say) this doctrine is clear and resolved upon amongst Christians, that the true children of *Abraham* comprehended in the covenant which God made with him and his posterity are not the carnal Jewes, which are borne of him, or joined to him by circumcision, and by professing of their ceremonies; but all such as according to *Abrahams* example do renounce all confidence in their own proper works, and put it wholly in Gods promises and grace in Christ; as *Abraham* was made a father, example and paragon of faith, to all those to whom the covenant made with him was to appertain. The like is the determination of Mr. *Perkins* (that I may omit others) who in his com. on *Gal.* 3. 7. Saith the promise and election of God makes properly children of *Abraham*, and that the true mark of the child of *Abraham* is to be of the faith of *Abraham*, and that profession of *Abrahams* faith, and descent from *Isaac* are not sufficient to prove men children of *Abraham* without following of his faith.

The texts, *Gal* 3. 16, 29. have been considered before, and our inferences vindicated from Mr. *Sidenhams* evasions. The other to wit, *Gal.* 4. 28. Speaks to the same purpose to which the fore alleaged texts do. Now we Brethren as *Isaac* was, are children of the promise, that is we of whom the Jerusalem which is above is mother, that is as *Beza Annot.* adde *v.* 26. we who embraced Christ, adde *v.* 27. he shewes the true sons of *Abraham* are born spiritually by the Gospel, adde *v.* 28. are children of the promise, that is that seed to which pertaineth that promise, I will be a God to thee and thy seed, out of all which it appears that as the promise, *Gen.* 17. 7. I will be a God to thee, and to thy seed after thee was Evangelical, it was made only to the elect of God and true believers, and they only are *Abrahams* seed there meant.

6. I shall next adde the consideration of that text, *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. Where the

the Apostle speaks thus; not as though the word of God hath taken none effect. For they are not all *Israel* which are of *Israel*; neither because they are the seed of *Abraham* are they all children; but in *Isaac* shall thy seed be called, that is, they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God, but the children of the promise are counted for the seed. I suppose it will not be denyed, that this passage is an answer to an objection occasioned by the intimating of the rejection of the Jewes from being Gods people, *v.* 1. 2, 3, 4, 5. If any should deny it yet the matter and form of expression, *v.* 6. shewes it to be opposed to something which might be objected against what was before implyed. For the speech, the word of God hath not fallen, or not taken effect; intimates that there was some word of God which seemed to be without effect, or to fall if the Jewes were cast off from being Gods people. And it appears by the answer that the word of God was some promise concerning *Israel* as, *v.* 6. shewes, and *Abrahams* seed as *v.* 7. 8, 9. shewes. The word of God concerning *Abrahams* seed which might be conceived to fall, appears upon inquisition to have been that, *Gen.* 17. 7. either only or chiefly *Piscat. Sch.* in *Rom.* 9. 6. that word of God, to wit that promise made to *Abraham*, I will be thy God and of thy seed after thee. *Dickson expos. annalyt. Rom.* 9. 6. the word of God hath fallen, when he said to *Abraham*, I will be thy God and of thy seed, I conceive it needless to adde any more, it being so manifest and so conceived by interpreters of note. Hence it appears also that the objection answered by the Apostle is this, God promised to be a God to *Abraham* and his seed after him in their generations in an everlasting covenant, therefore if the Jewes who are *Abrahams* seed are rejected, the word of God falls.

To this the Apostle answers. 1. By denying that every Jew who was descended from *Abraham* by natural generation, and so a child of the flesh is meant by the seed there named, who should be the child of God, and so the promise of being God to them is not meant of all *Abrahams* natural posterity.

2. By asserting that they who are counted for the seed and were children of the promise, that is those to whom that Evangelical promise, *Gen.* 17. 7. belonged, were a peculiar number whether of Jews, or Gentiles, according to Gods own choice and calling distinguished by no other discriminating reason but Gods will, as he proves in *Isaac* and *Ishmael*, *v.* 9. *Esau* and *Jacob*, *v.* 10, 11, 12, 13. and otherwise in that which followes.

Whence it appears 1. That the promise, *Gen.* 17. 7. was not made to *Abrahams* natural posterity as such, and if so, then it is not made to every child of a believer.

2. That only the elect whether of Jews or Gentiles are the seed of *Abraham* to whom the promise, *Gen.* 17. 7. is made, and consequently to no other of a beleivers children, but the elect: nor any other in covenant with God by vertue of that promise but they.

This to be the Apostles determination I confirmed, *Exam. part.* 3. *sect.* 4. by the speeches of *Beza*, *Twisse*, *Ames*, *Bayn*, *Walæus*, *Dounam*, *new Annot*, *Ainsworth*, *Parcus*, *Estius* (who though a Papist, yet is reputed more solid and right about the the point of grace, then the Jesuits are) and added in my *Praeursor* pag. 36. the words of Mr. *Rutherford* of *Scotland*, and

Mr.

Mr. *Norton* of *New England*. To which I have added more testimonies of *Beza*, *Chamier*, and the *Belgick* Professors at the Synod of *Dort* in my *Refutation* of Dr. *Savage* his *Position* in *Latin*, *Sect* 5. And because Mr. *Blake* seeks so much to possesse people as if I drew this from the Jesuits, I will add Mr *Dicsons* words on *Rom.* 9. 7, 8. *Neither doth it follow because the Jewes are the seed of Abraham according to the flesh, that therefore they are all sons in the Scripture sense or the seed promised. For so even the Ismaelites should be accounted for Abrahams seed contrary to Scripture, which hath restrained the right of sons to Isaac and his family, by saying, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. The sons of the flesh are to be distinguished from the elect sons of God, for this God would, when Ismael being secluded, he called Isaac the seed of Abraham, that not all are the elect sons of God, but onely the children of promise (or whom God determined of grace to make with Isaac sons of the faith of Abraham) are the children of God, and that seed to whom the promise is made.* Dr. *Owen* of *Perseverance*, Chap. 5. Sect. 10. *The Apostle, Rom* 9 8. *calleth the elect the children of the promises, or those to whom the promises to Abraham and his seed were made.* Chap. 7. Sect. 23. *The persons to whom this promise (Isai.* 59 21.) *is made, are called thee and thy seed, that is all those and onely those, with whom God is a God in Covenant. God here minds them of his first making of this Covenant with Abraham & his seed,* Gen. 17. 7. *Now who are this seed of Abraham? Not all his carnall posterity, not the whole nation of the Jewes. Our Saviour not onely denies but also proves by many Arguments, that the Pharisees and their followers, who doubtless were of the nation of the Jewes, and the carnall seed of Abraham, were not the children of Abraham in this sense, nor his seed, but rather the Devils,* John 8. 39, 40, 41. *And the Apostle disputes and argues the same case,* Rom. 4 9, 10, 11, *and proves undeniably that it is believers only (whether circumcised or uncircumcised, whether Jewes or Gentiles) that are this seed of Abraham and heirs of the promise. So plainly,* Gal. 3. 7. *Know yee therefore that they which are of the faith, are the children of Abraham. and then concludes again as the issue of his debate,* verse 9 *So then they which be of faith, are blessed with faithfull Abraham.* Mr. *Marshal himselfe in his Defence,* pag. 102. *saith, secondly by the word* [*Seed*] *was meant the children of the promise, the Elect,* Rom. 9 8. *as Mr. Bayne, nay Arminius himselfe confesses: onely Arminius saith, that they were elected upon foresight of their faith.* And indeed so far as I discern in the reading of *Arminius* his *Analysis* of the ninth of the *Romanes* the *cited Remonstrants Defence of their opinion at the Synod of Dort* on the first Article, Mr. *John Goodwin* his late *Exposition* of the ninth to the *Romans* it is agreed, that in the mystical sense the promise *Gen,* 17. 7. is determined by the Apostle, *Rom* 9 6, 7, 8. to belong onely to the elect, though the *Remonstrants* would have them elected upon consideration of believing, and the *Contra-remonstrants*, according to the Apostles determination, verse 11 &c. assign no other reason of the election of some & refection of others, but Gods will. All do agree that the Apostle determines, that every child of *Abraham*, much lesse of every believer, is not a child of the promise, or the seed of *Abraham* to whom the Promise is made, *Gen.* 17. 7. but the elect or true believers, whether Jewes or Gentiles.

7. It is proved that the promise *Gen.* 17. 7. as it was Evangelicall, or as the Apostle speaks, *Gal.* 3. 17. *the Covenant προκεκυρωμένην ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς*

χεισὸν, *fore-confirmed of God unto Christ*, was not to every believers naturall seed, but to the true believers or elect persons, who are meant by *Abrahams seed*, because it can be true onely of them. For in the Evangelical sense to whom God promiseth to be God he promiseth to justifie them, to regenerate them, to raise them up to eternall life, as appears by our Saviours own reasoning, *Luke* 20. 37, 38. where he infers from Gods avouching himselfe to *be the God of Abraham*, his *living to God*, & *rising from the dead to eternal life*, bythe Apostles inference *Rom.* 4. 16. from thence that righteousnes is by faith, *Rom.* 9. 7, 8. determining them to be elect people of God, to whom he hath promised to be God, *Heb.* 8, 10. &c. But God doth not promise to every believers child, to justifie, regenerate, and raise him to eternal life for if he did promise it he would perform it, to say he makes a promise to any, and to say they have not the efficacie of it, is to make God a lyar, whereas many children of believers are never justified, regenerated, nor shall be raised to eternall life. He performs it to all true believers and elect persons, and to none other, therefore none others are meant there by *Abrahams* seed in the Evangelical sense.

8 Lastly, the words of *John Baptist Matth* 3. 9. *When he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadduces come to his baptism* saying to them, *And think not to say within your selves, We have Abraham to our Father: for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham*, do evince 1 that repenting and believing persons though raised by God of stones without naturall generation, are the children of *Abraham* to whom the promise is made, *Gen.* 17. 7. 2. That it was not their naturall descent from *Abraham* without repentance and Gospel faith, which did entitle them to Gods favour, or to his baptism, and therefore it follows thence, that the children of *Abraham* to whom the promise is, *Gen* 17. 7. are onely the elect or true believers. 3. That to be the child of a believer is not a sufficient title to Gods favour, or baptism. To this purpose *Paræus Com. in Matth.* 3. 9. " He " teacheth also that the promises of God are not tied to fleshly birth, but pertain only to believing & spiritual posterity. For they are not sons of *Abra-* " *ham* who according to the flesh are of *Abraham*, but who are according to " the spirit. *Piscat. Sch. in Mat. h.* 3. 9. His sentence is, although ye come " from *Abraham* according to the flesh, yet ye are not therfore those sons of " *Abraham* to whom pertains the promise of eternall life made to " *Abraham* and his seed: For this belongs to them who imitate *Abrahams* " faith and piety. *Diodati Annot. on Matth.* 3 9. And think not, do not dally with your selves to think that because you are issued from *Abraham* according to the flesh, you are in Gods favour and free from his judgement: for with him the imitation of *Abrahams* faith and piety is the only thing " which demonstrates and causeth to be the children of *Abraham*, and not " the corporall generation, *Rom* 4. 12. Now such children may be brought " forth of all Nations, yea and out of these stones. Neither do you perswade your selves, that by your perdition Gods people shall perish: for " Gods people shall always subsist in these spiritual children of *Abraham* towards whom Gods covenant and promises shall be verified.

This then is the constant Doctrine of the New Testament, that the promise *Gen.* 17. 7. as Evangelicall, is made onely to the elect and true believers, that

they

they onely are *Abrahams* seed spirituall, and so onely in the covenant of grace by Gods promise, and therefore if it be true that they onely who are in covenant, which Pædobaptists say when they say *the Seal follows the Covenant*, are to be baptized, not any one because he is the child of a believer, but the elect and true believers are to be baptized, and so their own argument for Infant-baptism overthroweth it.

SECT. XXIX.

The Allegation of Rom. 9 6, 7, 8, Matth. 3. 7, 8, 9. *to prove that the seed to which the promise* Gen. 17. 7. *as Evangelicall belongs, are true believers, or the elect onely, is vindicated from Mr.* Blakes *Answer* Vindic. Fœd. ch. 36. *and Mr.* Sidenhams Exercit. ch. 6.

TO my Allegation of *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. in my *Examen, part* 3. *sect.* 4. Mr. *Blake* undertakes to give an answer, *Vindic. Fœd. ch.* 36. And first having belied me *as borrowing from Stapleton the Jesuit*, and *learning to a hair to follow him*, though to my remembrance I never read that passage in him, which he alleged, nor made any use of his exposition of the Epistle to the *Romans*, or any other of his works in that Book of mine, he proceeds thus in his scoffing calumniating fashion, like a Satyrist rather than a Disputant. *We have drunk up the Protestants poyson, and Mr. T. his great care is, to preserve his party by the Jesuits Antidote; he is wholly beholding to them for the Receipt.* Which is Mr. *Blakes* manifest calumny, as the quotations in my *Examen part* 3 *sect.* 4. in which he might see that I received it from the most eminent Protestants, and alleged but one Papist, and he no Jesuit, but one of the better note, and since, the quotations in the foregoing Section do fully prove, and it were easie to produce treble the number if need were. But I find it in vain to endeavour the satisfying of such eager and through prejudice selfe-blinding Antagonists, as Mr. *Blake* is, I could (if I liked such Arts as Mr. *Blake* useth) tell Mr *Blake* he borrows from the Jesuit *Bellarmin*, who *against Peter Martyr saying the promise Gen.* 17. 7, *is not universall concerning the children of believers, but hath place onely in the predestinate*, replies, *This is said without proof, for the words of the Scripture are absolute, nor is there any mention of predestination in that whole chapter.* But Mr *Blake* promiseth me *square dealing in the examining my Argument*, and *sets down my words at length, and then* in stead of answering it, *puts divers Quære's to me, yeelding first to me, that the Text Gen.* 17. 7. *was in that place Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8, *brought into question by the Apostle.* I saith he, *How Bain and Ames come to the name of Remonstrants? I had thought they had been on the party that are called Contra-remonstrants?* Answer. And so also did I, and therefore called them the answerers of *Arminius*, and the *cited Remonstrants*, not *Remonstrants*, as Mr. *Blake* not heeding my words suggests, as one not willing to omit any thing whether right or wrong which may render me odious or contemptible.

" 2. saith he, Where it appears that *Arminius* conceived that the Covenant " there spoken to was the word of the Law and not of Promise. I am sure in-

" In his Analysis on this chapter to the *Romans* (of which Mr. T. should not " be ignorant, little lesse than vapouring of his examination of it in *Oxford* " *Apolog. page* 131.) he spake in another manner, even in Mr T. his own Dia- " lect, as though the ones Comment had been spit out of the mouth of the " other. The sons of the flesh with the Apostle (saith he) are those who by " the works of the Law follow after righteousnes and salvation. The sons of " the Promise are those that seek after righteousnes and salvation by faith in " Christ, and he thus frames the principall Syllogism of the Apostle for con- " futation of the Jewes arguing from the rejection of the Jewes, Gods fai- " ling in his promise. If the word of God comprehend onely the sons of " the promise, shutting out the sons of the flesh, then it follows that the word " of God doth not fail, though the sons of the flesh be rejected: But the word of " God comprehends onely the sons of the promise, shutting out the sons of " the flesh: Therefore the word of God doth not fail though the sons of the " flesh be rejected. *Armin. Anal. cap 9. ad Rom. pag.* 781, Let any now " judge whether he can interpret this of the Law and not of the Pro- " mise.

Answer 1. The mention of my examining of *Arminius* his *Analysis of Rom.* 9. is little *less than vapouring*, as Mr *Blake* in his spitefull *fashion* terms it, but a necessary allegation with modesty to clear my self from his false charge, *That I had lately preached this as a Gospel truth, that this is one of the promises of the Covenant of grace, that God will be the God of beleivers and their seed, and that now I was suddenly otherwise perswaded.* If the Reader view my words, he wil discern a spirit of malice or waywardnes in Mr *Blakes* misrepresenting of my actions. 2. To his *Quære* I answer, That I have not now *Arminius* his book, to discern whether it was *Arminius* his conceit or not, nor need I prove it was, not alleging it as of my own search, but upon the credit of *Bain* and *Ames*. And I find in that Edition I have of *Bain* on *Ephes* 1. *Anno* 1618. *pag.* 134. *on vers.* 5. that he saith, *that Arminius was deceived in this among other things, that the objecters whose objection* Paul *preventeth vers.* 6. *do by the word of God conceive the word of the Covenant legall*, which he refutes 136 as one of those mistakes which did mislead *Arminius*: Nor doth Mr. *Blake* at all acquit *Arminius* from this mistake which Mr. *Bain* charged him with. For Mr. *Bain* did not charge him with that mistake in *the framing of the Apostles principal Syllogism for confutation of the Jewes arguing from the rejection of the Jewes Gods failing in his promise*, but in the framing the objection v. 6. as if the Jewes objection, *That if they were rejected who by the works of the Law sought righteousnes, then Gods word in the Legall Covenant to take them to be his people who kept the Law, did fail*: which Mr. *Bain* refutes, and shewes, *That the objection did arise concerning Gods word about their naturall descent, as being Israel and Abrahams seed*, which is the same which I alleged. And the same is the observation of *Ames* concerning the *cited Remonstrants*, *Animadv. in Remonstr. script Synod. de prædest. cb.* 8. *sect.* 4. where he hath these words, *Remonstr. autem pro confesso & concesso habent, agi hic de sermone legis, sicut apparet ex illis verbis: Si legem Moses non violarint; qui legem sequuntur. Sed in textu agitur de sermone promissionis, qui efficax est in populo præcognito, de quo præcipue gloriabantur Judæi, semetipsos Abrahæ filios, & hæredes promissionis ipsi falsæ jactitantes, sicut ex Pauli responso patet.* So that if

the

the Reader do conceive that *Arminius* in the words cited by Mr. *Blake*, meant by *the word of God the word of Promise not of the Law*, yet *Arminius* might conceive *the word of God* in the objection of the Jewes to be the legall Covenant or word of the Law, in which Mr. *Bain*, and I after him, took him to be deceived.

3. Whereas he saith, *That Arminius speaks in mine own Dialect, as though the ones Comment had been spit out of the mouth of the other, alleging Arminius his words*, and after his third *Quære* is, *when he affirms, that to be born after the flesh is all one with the Apostle with legal Justiciaries, Apolog. pag. 114. (which is Arminius his interpretation) how then can he by that distinction of children of the flesh, and children of the promise, shut out the naturall seed of Abraham? Are the naturall seed of Abraham and legall justiciaries one and the same?* He continues his spitefull language and calumniating course. For 1. though it is true that *Apol.* pag. 114. I say one born after the flesh is all one with the Apostle as legal justiciaries, yet I limit this speech to the Apostles speech, *Gal.* 4. 22, &c. And therefore it is a meer calumny that in the explication of *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8, I *spoke in Arminius his Dialect, as if my Comment had been spit out of his mouth.* Yea it might easily have been deprehended by Mr. *Blake*, that I rejected *Arminius* his explication of *children of the flesh*, and *children of the promise*, Rom. 9 8. in that I excepted *Exam. part* 3. *sect.* 2. against this very thing in *Arminius* his exposition, & did recite Mr. *Bains* words, who grants, that elsewhere *sons of the flesh are put for legal justiciaries, yet denies it of the phrase Rom.* 9. 8. *where he proves it notes barely natural descent from Abraham*, page 138, 139.

2. To this question I answer, 1. I shut not out the naturall seed of *Abraham* universally from the promise, but only do not include them universally & this I do from the Apostles distinction not understood in *Arminius* his sense. 2 To his second question, *Are the naturall seed of Abraham and legall justiciaries one and the same?* I answer, No. for saith Mr. *Blake*, *if the Apostle exclude all the naturall seed of Abram from this covenant of God with Abraham, (as Mr. T. from Stapleton argues) and take in onely his spiritual seed, how can he be reconciled to himself?*

Answ. There are divers untruths in this passage: First, It is untrue that *I do argue that the Apostle excludes all the natural seed of Abraham from this covenant of God with Abraham.* 2. *That I argue this from Stapleton*, which I am sure is most false, nor would have been said by Mr. *Blake* if he had any care to refrain from calumniating me. 3. Nor do I think by Mr. *Blakes* own allegation of *Stapletons* words in this chapter, from whence he imagines I borrowed my arguing that *Stapleton* himself did so argue, but Mr. *Blake* misreports him also. My assertion is, and if *Stapleton* do agree with me, I like it not the worse, that in the promise *Gen.* 17. 7. as it is Evangelical assuring regeneration, justification, and life eternall, all the naturall seed of *Abraham* are not included, but grant that many have been and shall be included, yet say, that as they are his natnrall seed so they are his spirituall seed by believing or election, and that to the elect onely that promise as Evangelicall is made by God, and that this the Apostle determines and proves, and no where gainsays.

But saith Mr. *Blake*, *In the words immediatly before this objection, he speaks of the Jewes (as his kinsmen according to the flesh, which were the naturall*

seed

seed of Abraham) *and saith, to them pertain the adoption, the glory, and the Covenants, &c. How then can his distinction be interpreted to throw them out of Covenant, when in expres's terms he had affirmed that they were in covenant? How can he deny that these are children, v. 7, when he had affirmed that to them pertaineth the adoption v. 4.*

Answer. If the Apostle had affirmed those Jewes his kinsmen after the flesh, that they were in covenant, *Gen.* 17. 7. and adopted, for whom he sorrowed so much, *v.* 2. he had plaid the hypocrite, expressing his sorrow for them as not include d in the covenant, who he knew were in it, he had trifled in raising an objection from thence and answering it, yea he had contradicted himself, who *v.* 6. saith, *All are not Israel that are of Israel*, and *v.* 7. that *because they were the seed of Abraham, they were not all children*, v. 8. that *the children of the flesh are not the children of God*, opposing *the children of the promise* to *the children of the flesh*. And it will concern Mr. *Blake* to reconcile the Apostle to himselfe, if he should mean as Mr *Blake* expounds him, Nor do I know how he could with any shew of truth affirm these men to be in covenant with God, to be his children who did obstinately oppose Christ, *being ignorant of the righteousnes of God, and seeking to establish their own righteousnes, were not subject to the righteousnes of God*, *Rom.* 10. 3. but *were broken off for unbelief*, *Rom.* 11. 20. It is true it is said, *Whose or of whom are the adoption and the covenants.* But doth he say this of the Israelites then living whose case he bewailed? I conceive not, but of their ancestors. For the speeches were not true of them, that of them was *Christ according to the flesh*,, or *theirs the giving of the Law*, yet I deny not it was their honour and privilege in some sort, that God vouchsafed these things to their ancestors and nation, and it did affect *Paul* much, that the people which were so much dignified by God, should now be rejected. But were it that of those persons it were said, that to them pertained the covenants, and the adoption, yet were it not true which Mr. *Bl* saith, that *Paul in expres's terms affirmed that they were in covenant*, or *were children of God.* For if it be true that by *the Covenants* were meant the Table s of the Covenant, as *Beza* conceives, or *the Covenants of Adoption*, in respect of outward legall privildges, which are onely there mentioned as proper to the Jewes, the adoption and covenants might be said to pertain to them, and they neither in covenant, nor children of God Evangelically. But of this Text I have before spoken, Sect. 27, *&c.* Mr *Bl* adds, *which may be confirmed by abundant other texts of Scripture; Ye are the children of the Lord your God, Deut.* 14. 1. *Out of Egypt have I called my Son, Hos.* 11. 1. *It is not meet to take the childrens bread and cast it unto Doggs, Mat.* 15. 26. *where all that were no Gentiles, all to whom Christ was sent are called Children: Ye are the children of the Prophets, and of the covenant which God made with your Fathers, Acts* 3. 20. *Doth the covenant appertain to them, and they stiled the children of the covenant, and yet are they out of covenant? Are they children to whom the adoption pertains, and yet no children? When Mr.* T. *hath given any fair answer to these Quære's, especially the two last, we shall conceive some probability of truth in his glose on the Apostles words; in the mean time we cannot but look upon it in full opposition and contradiction to that which the Apostle expressly delivers.*

Answ. 1. Now of all the passages call those brethren of *Paul* whose case

his

he bewaileth verse 3. *Children of God, his Son, Children, Children of the Prophets and of the Covenant.* 2. The speeches being of a people mixt of good and bad, and the speeches being indefinite, may be true if meant of some onely of those people: yea in the Apostles sense they cannot be true *of all that were not Gentiles, all to whom Christ was sent*, that they were the children of God. For many are termed by the Prophet *Isai.* 57 3. *the sons of the Sorceresse, the seed of the adulteresse and the whore*, by *John Baptist*, *Matth.* 3. 7. *Generation of vipers*, by our Lord Christ *Matth.* 23 15. *Children of hell.* 3. Sometimes the term of *Children* is meant as the term *righteous* is, *Luke* 15. 7. of one that is so in reputation though not in truth, as *the children of the Kingdom*, *Mat.* 8. 12. must be meant of them that were so in reputation, though not in truth: For had they been so in truth they should not be *cast out into utter darkness*. 4. By *the children of the covenant Acts* 3. 25. is not meant that they were then in the Evangelicall Covenant as made to them: For at that time they had not repented, but were exhorted thereto, v. 19 But they are called the children of the Covenant, because they were the posteriy of those Fathers with whom first the covenant was made, as they are called children of the Prophets, because they were the posterity of that people to whom the Prophets were first raised and sent, as is shewed before *Sect.* 27. out of which there is a fair answer to Mr. *Blakes* Riddles without an *Oedipus*, that first the *Covenants and Adoption*, *Rom.* 9. 4. are not said to pertain to those Israelites for whom *Paul* mourned. v. 3. but to their ancestors. 2. If they did, yet not in Mr. *Blakes* sense,, but in the sense fore-given. 3. That those Israelites for whom *Paul* mourned, *Rom.* 9. 3. are not stiled *children of the covenant. Acts* 3. 25. 4 Nor though it be true of those for whom *Paul* mourned, is it any thing to Mr. *Blakes* purpose, but hath another meaning foregiven. And thus there is a sweet harmony between my gloss and the Apostles expressions.

Mr. *Bl.* next gives his Analysis of the Apostles words, in which he grants v. 7. *a numerous company by Ishmael to be excluded (who were Abrahams seed after the flesh)* which evinceth what I contend for, that Gods promise *Gen.* 17, 7. was not made in any sort to *Ishmael* though he were the child of a believer and circumcised, therefore that covenant is not made to every believers naturall child, nor was the reason of circumcising this or that person, taken from the persons interest in the covenant, for *Ishmael* was circumcised though not in covenant. Then *Mr. Bl.* adds, " As then there was a " distinction of seed, so also now, one member he had laid down before, *viz.* " Israelites according to the flesh rested in all those privilledges there reckoned " up, v. 4, 5, these they pleaded, the Apostle yelds them: and *Mr. T*, (according " to the discovery of these times) denies them, The second member he " after falls upon; the eternally beloved and chosen of God, and largely am- " plifies. In these *Abrahams* seed may continue; though the other be cast " off,, to whom yet God hath continued (in successive generations) a God in " covenant, and continued to them the privilledges of being his people, though " now he was upon the rejection of them.

Answer. I should hardly have thought a sober minded man, much less a man reputed an ancient grave Divine, would so slightly have handled such a Scripture in which he saith is *my triumphing argument*, but that I meet with this passage defective in what was to be done, and made up of slirts, falshoods, impertl-

pertinencies, and assertions opposite to the Apostle. It is defective in two main things, first, in applying the distinction of the Apostle to the solution of the objection, by shewing how the word fails not, if the one sort of seed of *Abraham* be rejected. 2. In not shewing any invalidity in my deduction of my Conclusion thence, that the seed of *Abraham* to whom the promise *Gen.* 17. 7. as Evangelical is made, are only the elect. His flirts are at me, *as denying the Israelites according to the discovery of these times, what the Apostle yeelds.* Falshoods, that *the Israelites according to the flesh pleaded all those priviledges reckoned up*, v. 4, 5. For they were so far from pleading it as a privilege, that *Christ came of them according to the flesh*, that they abhorred and accursed him. 2. That I *deny the priviledges which the Apostle yeldeth them.* Which also are meer impertinencies to the solution of the objection, and to the distinction of the Apostle, who doth not at all in the expression of *Children of the flesh* mention those priviledges, nor mentions *Children of the flesh*, as importing an investiture into those priviledges, as Mr. *Bl.* seems to have conceived, but barely by that term notes their naturall descent from *Abraham*, insomuch that *Ishmael* is meant as a *Child of the flesh*, who was no way vested in those priviledges v. 4, 5. In stead of telling whether the *eternally chosen and beloved of God* were *the seed* meant *Gen.* 17. 7. and so *the word of God failed not*, he onely tels us, *In these the seed of Abraham may continue though the other be cast off*, which is impertinently and doubtfully expresst, as if there were not a certainty but onely a possibility of *the seed of Abraham continuing in the eternally beloved and chosen of God.* It is in like manner impertinent to the business, to tell what God hath done *in successive generations*, when the objection is of the inconsistency with his doings and his promises concerning the present generation. Lastly, it is directly against the Apostle, who opposeth the children of the promise to the cast off, to say, that he *hath continued a God in covenant to them whom he hath cast off*, and *continueth to them the priviledges of his people though he was upon the rejecting of them.* And it is a strange expression, when there is speech of rejection opposite to *eternall love and choice of God*, to say, *God is now upon the rejection of them*, which intimates a beginning of a rejection. But Mr. *Bl.* thinks to satisfie all by the words of *Gomarus*, which having set down at large, he then saith, *In which we have these three things, 1. Mr. T. his objection wholly solved. 2. The Apostle reconciled to himself. And 3. the doctrine of Covenant holinesse from the Apostle fully established, which when Mr. T. hath well considered with that which was spoke before (having the whole current of the Scripture against him) he will have little list to make this one Scripture his asylum.*

To which I answer, first there are many things in the words of *Gomarus* liable to exception, as 1. that he saith, *The Jewes great priviledges mentioned v. 4. 5. were objected.* But the thing that was objected was not those priviledges, but the word of God concerning Israel and *Abrahams* seed. 2. That he saith, *That those priviledges are attributed by the Apostle to the unbelieving Jewes.* Which is not true in the sense he means, that those present unbelieving Jewes for whom he mourned, v. 3. had the adoption, that is, were the people of God, or his children: but the Apostle saith onely *they were Israelites*, that is, of that Nation to which in the Ancestors those priviledges did belong, as I have shewed above, Sect. 27. 3. That he saith, *Those great priviledges*

are

are attributed by the Apostle to the unbelieving Jewes by vertue of their outward call, because salvation is revealed and offered to them under condition of obedience, and that offer sealed with circumcision. wherein 1. he saith, *the offer of salvation under condition of obedience, was sealed with circumcision* But I had thought the thing Pedobaptists would have sealed with circumcision; had not been the offer of salvation upon condition of obedience, but the covenant of God, *Gen.* 17. which is another thing than the offer of salvation which is by men indeed according to the covenant: but it is not the covenant, for that is Gods act, and is presupposed to the other. Besides, there are some promises at least in the covenant absolute, not upon condition, as the promise of regeneration, in respect of which the covenant cannot be conditional, and therefore the offer and the covenant are not to be confounded, nor do I think Pedobaptists will like this, that *that offer was sealed with circumcision.* Besides, there was no offer made to the Jewes of salvation under condition of obedience. An offer is made by preaching, circumcision was on the eighth day: was there any that preached at circumcision salvation under the condition of obedience to the circumcised, and then circumcised the child to seal that offer? Nor did the Jewes use circumcision to seal the offer of salvation under condition of obedience to Christ, but to bind them to keep the Law of *Moses* in expectation of righteousness, as appears from *Acts* 15.1.5.9,10. *Gal.* 5.3. *Rom.* 2, 25, *&c.* 2. Nor do I see any truth in that which he saith, *That those priviledges are attributed by the Apostle to the unbelieving Jewes by vertue of their outward call, because salvation is revealed and offered to them under condition of obedience, and that offer sealed with circumcision.* For neither do Church-priviledges belong to persons barely by reason of an outward call, which is but an offer of salvation, no man is accounted a Church-member, having right to the seal, as they term it, because salvation is offered without some consent, nor did those priviledges in any sort accrue to the Jewes *upon an outward call by which salvation was offered to them upon condition of obedience*, the proceeding of Christ from them, their having *Abraham, Isaac, Jacob*, for their fathers, their having the Law given them, &c. were not upon such an outward call, but Gods respect to them, *Deut* 7.6.4. It is not true that from *thence all Israelites are promiscuously called children of the Covenant, as Acts* 3. 25. For it is true onely of them that were after the Prophets as well as the covenant, sith they are called *children of the Prophets* as well as *of the covenant*, and neither Title is given to them because of the outward call alleaged, but because they were the posterity of those to whom the Prophets were sent, and the covenant exhibited. 5. It is not true *that the Apostle affirmes that the unbelieving Jewes are Abrahamites and Israelites; not onely by reason of their birth after the flesh, but also by reason of acceptance of the covenants and promises*: For neither is it true they did accept of the covenants and promises, sith they rejected Christ [to *whom the promises were made, Gal.* 3.16. Nor doth the Apostle say, *They accepted of them*, nor at all give that as *a reason of their being Abrahamites or Israelites.* Yea, they were Israelites or Adamites antecedentally to some of those recited priviledges. 6. Nor doth the Apostle say, *The Fathers and Adoption, and Covenants, and Promises, belong to all the Israelites*: yea he denies the promises to Israel and *Abrahams* seed to belong to every one that is of Israel and *Abrahams* seed, v. 6, 7, 8. 7. Nor doth he make any such distinction of

promiſe *in reſpect of the efficacie of it*, and *collation belonging to ſome*, and *tender or offering of the covenant of grace*: For neither doth the Apoſtle at all mention *the offer of the covenant of grace with condition of duty to be performed*, nor doth he make the promiſe to belong to any who have not the efficacie of it: yea, to ſay the promiſe belongs to any, and yet he not have the efficacie, is to make the word of God fall, which the Apoſtle diſclaims as a thing by no means to be imputed to God, for thereby he ſhould be charged of unfaithfulneſs in not keeping his promiſe. 8. Neither doth the Apoſtle make that anſwer which *Gomarus* ſets down, that *though the priviledges v. 4, 5, belong to all the Iſraelites, yet all are not therefore true children becauſe the priviledges are attributed to them by reaſon of their outward call, not by reaſon of their inward.* For the objection was not thus, To the Jewes belong thoſe priviledges, therefore they muſt be true children and heirs of ſalvation: But thus, Gods promiſe or covenant was with *Abraham* and his ſeed to be a God, therefore either God muſt be a God of the Jewes who are *Abrahams* ſeed, and they his people contrary to what your ſorrow intimates, v. 2 or elſe the word of God hath fallen, Now *Gomarus* ſets down another objection than that which the Apoſtle anſwers, and another than that which the Apoſtle makes, as may appear by what I have ſaid before. And for the three things Mr *Blake* gathers from *Gomarus*, the firſt is not true, that *my objection is wholy ſolved*: For there is not a word in *Gomarus* that anſwers this objection, Every child of *Abraham* was not a child of the promiſe *Gen* 17, 7, 8, as the Apoſtle determines, *Rom.* 9, 7, 8. None were his ſeed to whom the promiſe as Evangelical belongs, but the elect, therefore neither was the covenant *Gen.* 17, 7. as Evangelical, made to all the naturall children of *Abraham*, nor they circumciſed becauſe the covenant was made to them, nor is the covenant made with every beleiver by profeſſion, nor hath he right to Baptiſme by vertue of that title, nor is the covenant made to every true beleivers Infant or naturall child, there are none of them *Abrahams* ſeed but the elect, and therefore all the plea of the Pædobaptiſts from *Gen.* 17. 7. to prove the right of every beleivers naturall child to baptiſm, is manifeſtly falſe, going on that ſuppoſition which the Apoſtle plainly contradicts. The ſecond thing is frivolous: For there was no contradiction in appearance in the Apoſtles words, which need reconciliation, and therefore *Gomarus* and Mr *Blake* have taken upon them an unneceſſary task: But the ſeeming oppoſition to be reconciled, is between Gods performing his word to *Abrahams ſeed to be a God to them*, and his rejection of them from being his people, which the Apoſtle doth indeed reconcile rightly: but Mr *Blake* and *Gomarus* are both miſtaken in the thing as hath been demonſtrated. Yet this I find, that *Gomarus* with the other four Profeſſors of the united *Belgick* Provinces (of whom *Gomarus* is firſt) ſet down the ſame that I conclude in their *Judgement* at the *Synod of Dort about the ſecond Article* of the *Remonſtrants*, in which they ſay, *That to the elect onely the promiſes are made, is profeſſedly proved by Paul Rom.* 9, 7, 8. *For onely the ſons of promiſe are counted for the ſeed to whom that word of the everlaſting poſſeſſion of the inheritance appertains.* So that I have five more Suffrages together for me. And for the Doctrine of *Covenant Holineſs*, I confeſs the Apoſtle eſtabliſheth this Doctrine, That all the ſpirituall ſeed of *Abraham*, to wit, true beleivers, or elect perſons, are holy federally as being thoſe to whom God hath covenanted to be God: But Mr *Blakes* doctrine

ctrine of Covenant holineſs, that Gods covenant is to be a God to every beleiver and his ſeed, which is no other than his naturall ſeed (for infants are no otherwayes his ſeed) is ſo far from being eſtabliſhed by the Apoſtle, that he determines the contrary, denying that all *Abrahams* children were children of the promiſe, and proving the elect onely to be his ſeed to whom the promiſe *Gen.*17. 7, as it was Evangelicall was made by the ſtate of *Iſhmael* and *Iſaac*, *Eſau* and *Jacob*. And for this I am aſſured that I *have the whole currant of the Scripture for me*, and feare not to make this Text my *Aſylum*, ſtill having conſidered what Mr *Blake* produceth both here and before: the frivolouſneſs of which I hope by Divine aſſiſtance to ſhew in that which follows.

There is ſomewhat which Mr. *Blake* adds in that Chapter in anſwer to the Allegation of *Matth.* 3. 9. in which as I ſhewed before, *John Baptiſt* rejects their claim to baptiſm, though *Abrahams* naturall children without repentance and faith, and aſſerts the onely ſeed of *Abraham* in covenant to be his ſpirituall. Hereto ſaith Mr. *Blake*, I anſwer, Firſt, *When thoſe that were no better then theſe make the ſame plea*, John 8. 33. *We be Abrahams ſeed, and were never in bondage to any, Chriſt yeilds it*, v. 37. *I know that ye are Abrahams ſeed; he allowes all that upon this account they can claim. And for Phariſees he doth not barely yeld them to be Church members, but alſo Church teachers*, Matth. 23. 2.

I reply, Chriſts yeilds they were *Abrahams* narurall ſeed, but denies them to be *Abrahams Children*, verſe 39. that is, to whom the promiſe Evangelicall belongs. The Phariſees were not yeilded to be Church-members in the Chriſtian Church, nor were admitted by *Iohn Baptiſt* or Chriſts Diſciples to baptiſme without repentance and faith, nor were they teachers in the Chriſtian Church, though among the Jewes they are ſaid to *ſit in Moſes Chair*.

" 2. Saith Mr. *Blake*, *Iohn Baptiſt* doth not deny what Chriſt yeilds,
" but lets them know that this place wil not ſerve to avoyd wrath whilſt they
" live in impenitencie; notwithſtanding that this plea holds, they may pe-
" riſh, and yet Gods Covenant with *Abraham* hold; being able of ſtones
" to raiſe up children unto *Abraham*, to make good what in covenant he
" had ſaid. He no where ſayes that they are not intituled to priviledges of
" ordinances and thereby intereſſed in the prerogatives of Gods viſible peo-
" ple. What *Paul Rom.* 9. 4, 5. ſo largely yelds them, *Iohn Baptiſt* doth
" not deny them, which alſo now they had in viſible poſſeſſion.

Anſwer. Neither *Iohn Baptiſt*, nor *Chriſt*, nor *Paul*, yeilded them either to be in the covenant with *Abraham* (Mr. *Blake*'s own words: *notwithſtanding this plea holds &c.* do plainly imply, that *Gods covenant did not hold with them*, and that *by them God ſhould not make good what in covenant he had ſaid*) or to be Gods viſible people, or to have right to the priviledge of baptiſm: but the contrary is declared by them. What Mr. *Blake* concludes the Chapter with, is either but a dictate, that *priviledg of ordinance* (meaning of Baptiſm) *is a Birth-inheritance*, without either proof or ſhew of proof from *Prov.*19. 14. *Rom.* 3. 1. ſo that I ſhall trouble the reader with no more of the fopperies of this chapter: onely I deſire the reader to obſerve, that whereas uſually Pædobaptiſts grant that by birth a grown man is not intituled to the initial Seal without his own profeſſion, Mr. *Blake* denies that

Iohn saith, the viperous *Pharisees and Sadducees, and unbelieving Jewes are not intuled to priviledges of ordinances and thereby interessed in the prerogatives of Gods visible people.*

But Mr. *Sidenham* in his *Exercit. ch 6.* takes upon him to refell the plea from *Matth. 3. 8, 9. gathering that the pretence of being Abrahams children, could not give them a right to baptisme; and if John denied Abrahams naturall seed on that account, much more would he the adopted children.* But herein I conceive he doth not rightly set down his adversaries collection: For the adopted children of *Abraham* I conceive are no other than beleivers, and surely Mr *Sidenhams* adversaries do not imagine that *John* denied them baptism. I for my part remember not my allegation of this Text afore the writing of this Book. But I find Mr. *William Kay* in his *Baptism without Bason* thus averring, 1. That *Matth. 3. 8, 9. is directly against Infant-baptism, in that none but such as have faith and repentance, must think to be baptized.* 2. That *the pretence or consequence from circumcision, and being Abrahams naturall children, to prove their title to Baptism.* I add to the Covenant Evangelicall *Gen. 17. 7. is also condemned, in that he allows them not to think within themselves, We have Abraham to our Father,* which is not meant simply as if they might not in any sort think *Abraham* to be their Father; for Christ acknowledgeth it, *John 8 37.* and they might lawfully think that to be so which was so but in some respect, and the respects are intimated in the Text, 1, In respect of baptism to which they come, but as *Paraus Comment. in Matth. 3. 7. John did not admit them as being unworthy.* 2. In reference to the covenant, *Gen. 17 7.* which appears in that he adds, *For I say unto you that God is able even of these stones to raise up children to Abraham,* which can be understood no otherwise than of spirituall children, who are *children of the promise, Rom. 9. 8.* which the Pharisees are not, 3. In respect of that which they imagined, that they should be secured from wrath to come, *v 7,* in that they had *Abraham* to their father. Now what saith Mr. *Sidenham* to this?

1. *That they were of age, and men degenerated from Abrahams faith, that he did not refuse them because Abraham was their father, or upon that account that Abrahams seed had not right to the promise, but as onely pretending Abraham to be their father, when they walkt contrary to the principles of Abrahams faith.*

Answer. 'Tis true, he did not refuse them *because Abraham was their Father,* nor *as onely pretending Abraham to be their Father:* Nor doth he deny that it was true that they had *Abraham* to their father in respect of naturall generation, but because though they had *Abraham* to their father in respect of naturall generation, yet they did not believe as *Abraham,* nor had right to the promise, which is enough to shew that the children of beievers are to be refused and not admitted to Baptism till they become beievers themselves.

2. Saith Mr. *Sidenham, This is the same as to grown men professing faith, baptized, and then not admitted to the Lords Supper because carnall and Apostate, it be said, You have cut off your own right by your contrary actings, which impeach not the truth of this position, That believers and their infants are in covenant, and ought to be judged so untill they manifest the contrary; or that if they belieued themselves afterwards the promise should not be to them and their children: And*

that

that the Text holds out no more than this, that when persons are grown up to years, and come to understanding, they must then stand on their right, and looke to make out personall qualifications for new ordinances.

Answer 1, It is not the same: For such a speech should imply a former right now cut off, but *John Baptists* speech disclaims any right they ever had to baptism. 2. *John Baptists* speech proves, believers children as such are not in the covenant, for *Abrahams* children were not, and that they ought not to be judged so until they manifest faith and repentance, for *Iohn Baptist* denied them to be *Abrahams* children in covenant without them, and that the promise is not to their children because they believe; for the promise was not to *Abrahams* children by naturall generation though he were father of believers, and it proves that none of *Abrahams* children have right to baptisme without faith and repentance, and consequently infants no more than grown men. But Mr. *Sidenham* yet thinkes to avoid the inference from this text, thus.

" 3. This was at the first institution of the ordinance, when baptism was " was newly administred: now new institutions require grown persons, and " actuall visible bilievers to be the first subjects of them: they could not bap- " tize their children first, for then the parents would be neglected: And the " bringing in of a new ordinance requires renewing of speciall acts in those " which partake of it. Now in the new Testament God renewes the cove- " nant of *Abraham*, adds a new initiating seal to it: It was before entail'd " in such a line which is cut off, it's now of the same nature, one'ly every " one must come in his own person first, as *Abraham*, and enter his own " name, and then the promise to him and his seed. Thus it was in the former " place, where when the Jewes came to be baptized, they were exhorted first " to repent and be baptized themselves, then the promise is to you and your " children.

Answer. All this scribling is at random, and without any proof, or answer to the objection: It is quite beside the objection, which was not barely from *John Baptists* not baptizing their children, but from the reason of *Iohn Baptists* refusing to admit themselves to baptism. So that Mr. *Sidenhams* answer is onely to the Consectary, infer'd from the Conclusion deduced, not to the premises, no nor the first conclusion it self. For the argument *is* this, If *Abrahams* natural children had not right to baptism without their own faith and repentance. But the Antecedent is true, *Ergo* the Consequent, and consequently not infants to be baptized. Again, if *Abrahams* children were not in the covenant without faith and repentance, neither are ours, for we have no more priviledge for our children then *Abrahams* had: But the Antecedent is true, *Ergo* the Consequent, and consequently a believers child is not in covenant because a believers child. Yet once more, If persons circumcised and descendended from *Abraham*, were not therefore admitted to baptism, then the same thing doth not intitle to baptism which did intitle to circumcision, nor the command of circumcision a command concerning baptism. But the Antecedent is true, *Ergo* the Consequent, and consequently infants are not to be baptized because they were to be circumcised. Now Mr *Sidenhams* answer is to the allegation of *John Baptists* not baptizing infants, not at all to any of these arguments drawn from his refusing the Pharisees, though coming to his

baptism

baptism, and conceiving they might, having *Abraham* to their Father. Yet what Mr. *Sidenham* saith takes away the force of the argument if it had been thus made: Those we are not to baptize whom *John* did not baptize: but *John* did not baptize infants, *Ergo*. Yea his answer strengthens the argument: For if *Johns* baptism were at the first Institution of baptism, and infants were not baptized, then neither are they to be now. For the first institution is the rule of observing it, as the Lord Christ himself urgeth concerning marriage, *Matth.* 19. 4. and *Paul* concerning the Lords Supper, 1 *Cor.* 11, 23. If baptism were a *new institution*, and did *require actuall visible believers as the first subject of it*, then it is not all one with circumcision, which admitted infants at the first institution, then such onely are to be baptized except some further Institution can be shewed, the institution for infant-circumcision is not sufficient for infant-baptism, for that was in force as much at the first institution of baptism as after. It is false that *they could not baptize their children first*, that is, at the first institution, *John Baptist* and the Disciples of Christ might have baptized infants at first as well as *Abraham* circumcised them, yea ought to have done it, If Pædobaptists say true, that the command of circumcision was the Rule in force concerning baptism: nor need *the parents be neglected*, no not though they had baptized the children first in order of time; yea the right of the child being contemporary with the parents faith, if they say true, they should have been baptized as soon as ever the parent was a believer, or the child in covenant. Gods Covenant with *Abraham* was *to him and his seed*; but his covenant was never made to every believer and his seed. In the new Testament God renews the Covenant with *Abraham* in respect of spirituall blessings, but for the promises domestick or civill, he doth not renew it. He adds to the new Covenant the seal of Christs death, whose blood confirmed it, and the initiating seal of his Spirit, I know no other initiating seal added to it. It is not true that the new covenant, or covenent of grace was entail'd before to a certain line, though the covenant with *Abraham* in respect of the civill domistick promises were entail'd to *Abrahams* naturall posterity, and is now cut off: Nor is the covenant every way of the same nature with *Abrahams* covenant, nor upon a believers entering his name is the promise to him and his seed, nor is it *Acts* 2. 38, 39. said, that upon their repenting and being baptized themselves, that the promise is to them and their children, but the being of the promise to them and their children, is urged as a consideration fit to move them to repent and be baptized.

He next sets down 4 affirmations, 2. *That no man must be baptized, or receive an ordinance by any fleshly prerogative. Answer.* Then no infant is to be baptized by vertue of birth from a believer, for that is a fleshly prerogative, as the birth of Christ was but a fleshly prerogative to *David*, the virgin *Mary*, though there were *an entail of a promise* to them of this thing, so is the imagined birth-privilledge of believers infants, and yet there is no promise to retain it to a believers child.

2. *That no person grown up to years of understanding, hath right to a sealing ordinance, but upon his own personall qualification.*

Answer. Then Mr. *Blake* did erre in intituling unbelieving Jewes *to privileges of ordinances, and thereby interessing them in the prerogatives of Gods*

visible

visible people. 2. There is no other right to an Infant to baptism, than what a grown person hath.

The third affirmation I grant, and the fourth too, if there were any *such old priviledges of the promise to be conveyed to those which do really embrace the Gospel and their seed.* And this grant that those Pharisees and Sadduces had *demonstrated themselves to be onely the children of the flesh, and not of the promise,* and that they were excluded, shews the covenant as Evangelical not to be made to a believers naturall seed, nor they thereby have right to baptism.

SECT. XXX.

Of the meaning of Mr. M. his second Conclusion, the ambiguitie of which is shewed.

I now return to Mr. *M.* whose second Conclusion was thus expressed, *Ever since God gathered a distinct select number out of the world to be his Kingdome, Citie, household in opposition to the rest of the world, which is the kingdome, citie, household of Satan he would have the infants of all who are taken into covenant with him, to be accounted his, to belong to him, to his Church and Family, and not to the Devils.* This conclusion being the main pillar upon which he settles Infant-baptism, the Antecedent of his *Enthymem* I examined with great diligence after the exact manner of Scholastick Writers in their Disputes. Which dealing of mine being indeed the onely way to clear truth, and approved by a learned member of the Assembly [Mr *R.C. of P.C.O.*] and known to be one of the most accurate disputants in his time in *Oxford*, yet Mr *M.* pag. 105. of his *Defence*, in a most injurious though frivolous way, traduceth as an indirect Artifice. To which some answer is given in my *Apologie sect.* 5. *pag.* 23 I shall now view the reply he makes: First, *he compares my dealing with an unnam'd person in Cambridge, whose faculty was to make a clear text dark by his Interpretation*: whereas my way was the true and onely way to clear his meanin by distinction, which is by Logicians called *the light of speech*, and *in all consideration of things to be first*, as Keckerm *Log Syst. part.* 2. *lib.* 1 *c.* 1 speaks: Nor hath Mr *M.* shewed in his *Defence*, that any of those senses of his words which I set down, might not be conceived to be his meaning; and therefore his complaint of me is ridiculous, and I shall have cause to censure him as a confused Dictator rather than an accurate Disputer, who doth so indistinctly set down his main conclusion, That an adversary cannot determinely resolve what is the meaning, and so neither easily examine his proofs, nor know what to oppose.

But he tells me *he meant it of a visible priviledge, in facie Ecclesiæ visibilis*, yet he doth not tell what that visible priviledge is. He tells me, *That they have their share in Fœdus externum*; but sets not down what share they have, nor what he means by *Fœdus externum*, in which they have share. And after he saith, *God would have the children of them who by externall vocation and profession joyn to the Church of God even while they are children, to enjoy the same priviledge with them*, which hath also ambiguity in it. For whereas there are many priviledges which the parents enjoy, as *R. G.* to be baptized, to be admitted

to

to the Lords Supper, perhaps the Father to be an Elder, teaching or ruling, or a Deacon in the Church, and by (*Children*) may be meant persons of ten or twenty years old, and while they are children may be understood either during their infancy, or during their relation as children to their parents (which is as long as they are men) the words may be understood either that they have the same priviledge of admission to the Lords Supper or Church-government, while they are infants, or that they have even in infancy the same priviledge to be baptized that the parent had upon his profession. Which last if it were his meanng (as most likely it was) then his second conclusion being the same with his Antecedent in his *Euthymem*, his argument is an inapt tautology, Infants of professors have the same priviledge with the parents to be baptized: *Ergo* they are to be baptized, which is to prove the same by the same: yet this I must needs take to be his meaning, till he shew what other priviledge with their parents children of visible professors have in infancy.

Then he distinguisheth of the *Covenant of grace taken largely and strictly*, which distinction is shewed before *Sect.* 25, to have no footing in Scripture, and to be inaptly used by Mr *M.* He distinguisheth of *Jewes some Abrahams seed according to the promise, some onely in the face of the visible Church, and of being in Christ by the mysticall union, and by visible and externall profession* Which distinction I misslike not though they be not of use here, sith they were not the terms used in his Conclusion. He distinguisheth of *Seals belonging to the Covenant, the Seal of the Spirit, and externall Seals* But he neither shews where the externall seals (as he calls them) are tearmed Seals of the Covenant: nor was the term (*Seal of the Covenant*) at all used in his conclusion. Yea to shew how unskilfully he handles the matter in all these distinctions, he doth not distinguish any of those terms that were in question, and were the predicate in his proposition, to wit, *to be accounted Gods, to belong to him, to his Church and family, and not to the Devils.* And this piece of unskilfulness is in that which followeth.

When therefore I say they are visibly to be reckoned to belong to the Covenant with their parents, I mean, look what right a visible professor hath to be received and reputed to belong to the visible Church, quà visible professor, that right hath his child so to be esteemed.

But first, this speech here explained was not in his Conclusion in his *Sermon*, these words were not there, *They are visibly to be reckoned to belong to the Covenant with their parents*, but this, *They are to be accounted Gods, to belong to him, to his Church and Family, and not to the Devils.* 2. Were the sense here given the meaning of his *Conclusion*, it would not be true. For if the right belong to the visible professors, *quà* visible professors, the same right cannot belong to the child except he be a visible professor. For what agrees to any *quà talis, as such*, agrees *universaliter & reciproce*, and therefore by this expression, every visible professor is to be received and esteemed, and every one to be so received and esteemed, is a visible professor, which cannot be said with any truth or shew of truth of the infant child of a believer. Besides, if this Conclusion were good, an infant should have right to be admitted to the Lords Supper sith the parent hath right thereto as a visible professor.

But Mr. *M.* makes a large discourse to prove, *That to those to whom the spiritual part of the Covenant belongs not, yet there are outward Church-privileges*

which

which belong to them as they are visible professors. And to prove this he cites, *Gen.* 6.1. *Deut.* 14.1. *Gal.* 3.26. *Matth.* 8,12. *Acts* 3.25. *Rom.* 9.4. *Rom.* 9.3.1. *Iohn* 8 17. *Psal.* 147.19,20. *Deut* 33.4. *Iohn* 4 22.

In answer to which I say, 1, That I grant this speech to be true. 2. I deny that the Texts are pertinent to the purpose of Mr. *M.* who intends this speech of Gentile visible professors, whereas the texts are most of them of the priviledges peculiar to the Jewish people, namely, *Deut.* 14. 1. *Matth.* 8. 12. *Acts* 3.25. *Rom.* 9. 4. *Rom.* 3. 1. *Iohn* 8. 17. *Psal.* 147 19, 20. *Deut.* 33. 4. *Iohn* 4. 22. Of the other two the former is of those before the Flood, who whether they were called *Sons of God* by descent, or profession, or some other way, it is uncertain. The other *Gal.* 3. 26. is to be understood of being *the Sons of God* really, and the term [*All*] is to be limited, as v. 27. by [*ye that are believers*] as he very words shew. For when he saith *Ye are all the sons of God by faith in Christ Iesus*, it is plain this is meant onely of those who had faith in *Christ Iesus* 3. In all this discourse he doth not shew a Text proving the privileges he mentions to belong to the infants of Gentile visible professors. Certainly some of them cannot be appleid; no, not to the Infants of the Jewish nation, as v. 9. that to them were committed the Oracles of God, that to them God shewed his word, &c. 4 Nor doth Mr *M.* distinctly tell us, which of these, or what other outward priviledge it is that belongs to the Infants of visible professors, which is the onely thing pertinent to the present business.

After this he asserts, *That there are some rightly admitted by the Church to visible Membership who onely partake of the visible priviledges, and undertakes to prove it from Rom.* 11. But I have in the first p rt of this *Review* shewed Mr *Ms*, and others mistakes about the ingrafting, *Rom.* 11.17. and proved that it is meant of giving faith according to election. Yet I grant it true which Mr *M.* asserts in those word, and do take notice that pag. 110. he acknowledgeth that I grant in my *Examen* pag. 149. a lawfulness of admitting men into a visible communion upon a visible profession, and that rightly even by a judgement of faith, though their inward holiness be unknown to us. And yet in the next pag. 111. he tells me, *This mistake runs through your whole Book, that none are to be reputed to have a visible right to the Covenant of Grace, but only such as partake of the saving graces of it.* But of this calumny more may be seen in my *Apologie*, Sect. 10. pag. 47.

After all these expressions of his meaning in his *Conclusion* he adds, pag. 111. *This then was and is my meaning when I say, that infants of Believers are confederates with their parents, that they have the same visible right to be reputed Church-members, as their parents have by being visible professors, and are therefore to be admitted to all such externall priviledges as their infant-age is capable of; and that the visible Church is made up of such visible professors and their children; that the invisible takes in neither all of the one, nor the other, but some of both.*

In answer whereto I say, 1. Neither Mr *M.* in his pretended explication keeps the terms of his second *Conclusion* in which the words were not as Mr. *M.* sets them down, *That infants of believers are confederates with their parents.* Nor (2) do any of the words explain that proposition. For would any that knowes the meaning of words, take this for a right paraphrase? *Infants of believers are confederate with their parents, that is, they have the same visible right,*

ere. Is [*confederate*] all one with [*to have visible right, to be reputed Church-members, to be admitted to externall Church-priviledges, to be of the visible Church?*] Yea would not a Grammarian count such a paraphrase to be quite besides the words paraphrased, and the words paraphrased plainer than the paraphrase it self? Sure [*Confederate*] is [*being in Covenant together*] And yet in all this Paraphrase there is not so much as the term *Covenant* mentioned, much lesse any explication in what covenant, and in what manner, by what act believing parents are in covenant together with their infants. 3. By this Paraphrase we have 4 propositions of one, like so many *Hydra's* heads rising up in the place of one. The first is, *That Infants of believers have the same visible right to be reputed Church-members as their parents have by being visible professors.* But this is manifestly false: For if the visible right be by being visible professors, infants cannot have the same visible right but by being visible professors, which to assert of them is all one as to say, the snow is black. The second, [*And are therefore to be admitted to all such externall Church-priviledges as their infant age is capable of*] is ambiguous: for the capacity of their infant-age may be understood of Capacity from the institution of God; and so infants of Gentile-believers are to be admitted to no externall priviledges Sacramentall, for none are appointed for them: or naturall capacity in respect of receiving the Sacrament, and then if by the Sacrament be meant not onely the outward element, but also the use or signification by it, they have not a naturall capacity of receiving the Sacrament of Baptism: If onely of the elements they are capable also of the Lords Supper, as well as baptism. For they may eat and drink bread and wine as well as be washed by baptism. The third proposition is, *That the visible Church is made up of such visible professers and their children.* This is indeed the conclusion of the *Assembly* in their *Confession of Faith, ch. 25. art. 2.* and they cite to prove it, *1 Cor. 7. 14. Acts 2. 39. Ezek. 16. 20, 21. Rom. 11. 16.* The impertinency of which is shewed before in the first part of this *Review*, and in that which goes before in this part of this *Review*: Of the impertinency of two other texts, to wit, *Gen. 3. 15. Gen. 17. 7.* Somewhat is said also before, and more is intended to be declared in the remainder of this *Review*. The fourth proposition, *That the invisible neither takes in all of the one nor the other, but some of both*, I grant to be true.

" After all these Mr *M* adds, I beseech you stand no longer doubtfull of " my meaning: I mean of them as I mean of other visible professors, they are " taken into covenant both wayes respectively, according as they are elect or " not elect; all of them are in covenant in respect of out-ward priviledges, " the elect over & above the outward priviledges, are in covenant with respect " to saving graces; and the same is to be said of visible members both parents " and infants under the N. T. In this point of being in covenant as was " to be said of visible members in the former administration, whether Jewes " and their children, or Proselytes and their children.

Answer. Here again Mr *M.* explains the term *Of Infants being taken into Covenant*, which was not in his second conclusion: However I note first, That *in respect of saving grace, all the infants of believers are not taken into covenant, but onely the elect.* 2. That when he asserts, That *all the infants of visible professors are taken into covenant in respect of outward priviledges:* 1, He never

shewes

shewes what those outward privileges are. 2. Nor any where else that I know, instanceth in any but the initiall seal, which is now no other than baptism, and this then being the antecedent in his *Enthymeme*, his argument is this, All infants of believers are taken into Covenant in respect of the outward priviledge of Baptism, *Ergo*, they are to be baptized; which is all one as to say, They are to be baptized, *Ergo* they are to be baptized, unlesse he mean they are taken into covenant *de facto*, and so his assertion should be, They are already baptized (wich is false) and if his inference be, *Ergo* they are to be baptized, his argument is, They are already baptized, *Ergo* they are to be baptised, which were to assert *Anabaptism*. 3. Nor doth Mr. *M.* tell where that covenant is that promiseth the outward Church-priviledge of an initiaall seal, nor by whose act they are taken into covenant, or who takes them into covenant. 4. If he understand it of the outward covenant, meaning thereby the outward administration, he useth, the word improperly by a Trope, and so speaks obscurely in his main conclusion on which his whole dispute rests, which is contrary to Logick Rules, and all right Disputation. Besides, he doth but trifle thus in his arguings, Infants of believers are taken into covenant, that is the outward covenant, that is the outward administration, that is (now) Baptism, *Ergo* they are to be baptized, which is to prove the same by the same. Lastly, if that speech of his be true, That *in respect of outward priviledges the same is to be said of visible members both parents and infants under the New Testament, in this point of being in covenant, as was to be said of visible members in the former administration, whether Jewes and their children, or Proselytes and their children*, it is apparent to me that he makes the covenant now and then not onely the same for substance, but also in respect of administrations contrary to his first conclusion. For what are those outward priviledges in respect of which they are the same but outward administrations? And if so, his speech is in my apprehension professed Judaism opposite to the Apostles determination in the Synod *Acts* 15. And yet Mr. *M.* tells me *he endevours in all this to speak as clearly as he can possibly*, which makes me hopeless of any thing but confusedness in his writing, when after I had distinctly opened the various senses of his terms, yet he wilfully declines making answer in which of those senses I should take his words, and when he takes on him to explain his meaning, he takes on him to explain other terms then were in his conclusion, and yet his explications are as dark as his terms which he would explain, and in the upshot his second conclusion can have no other sense consistent with his own *Hypothesis* but such as asserts Judaism, or being cõceived to be the antecedent of his *Enthymeme*, is the same with the conclusion of it, which is meerly to trifle, proving the same by the same: which course how unfit it is for him who is to dispute, I leave it to them to judge who know what belongs to Scolastick exercise.

Mr. *M.* next chargeth me with holding *no more promises for believers children in reference to the covenant, then to the children of Turks.* And yet page 119. he doth in these words maintain the same which I do. *I joyn with you that it is an error to say, that all Infants of believers indefinitely are under the saving graces of the covenant, for although I find abundance of promises in the Scripture of Gods giving saving graces unto the posterity of his people, and that experience teacheth us, that God uses to continue the Church in their posterity, and that Gods*

election lies more among their seed then others, yet neither to Iew nor Gentile was the covenant so made at any time, that the spirituall part and grace of the covenant should be conferred upon them all, which is directly to contradict the usuall plea of Pedobaptists, that *the covenant of grace is made to every believer and his seed,* and particularly the words of the *Directory*, *The promise is made to believers and their seed.* seeing the covenant of grace is made to none but those on whom the spirituall part is conferred, nor can (without wresting the words from the plain meaning according to the Grammar sense) the speech of the *Directory* be understood of any other promise than saving grace.

Mr. *M.* and with him Mr. *G. Vindic. Pædob, pag.* 12. charge me, that *in my judgement believers children are not actually belonging to the Covenant or Kingdom of God, but onely in possibility; that they belong to the Kingdome of the Devil actually,* which calumnies are refuted in my *Apologie, Sect.* 14.

Next, he speaks thus to me: *But say you, to make them actually members of the visible Church, is to overthrow the definitions of the visible Church, which Protestant Writers use to give, because they must be all Christians by profession. I reply, It overthrowes it not at all, for they all include the infants of such professors, as the visible Church among the Iewes did include their infants male (and female too, lest you say that circumcision made them members.)*

Answer. Though Protestant Divines do hold many of them, that infants belong to the visile Church, yet they put them not in their definitions. There are many definitions cited by me in the first part of this *Review Sect.* 14. in which infants are not included, not in that definition of the Church (visible) which *Baxter plain Scripture proofe, page* 82. saith, "Certainly all Divines "are agreed, That it is a Society of persons separated from the world "to God, or called out of the world, &c, Not in that of Dr. *Featly Dipper* "*dipped, pag.* 4. A true particular visible Church is a particular Congrega- "tion of men professing the true faith, known by the two markes above men- "tioned, the sincere preaching of the Word, and the due administration of "the Sacraments. Norton Resp. ad Appollon. pag. 10. *Immota Thesis. I- "dem illud in professione constituit Eccl. siam visibilem, quod interna sua natura "constituit Ecclesiam mysticam*: i. e. *Fides usq; adeo luculenta est hæc veritas ut "vel invito Bellarmino lib. de Eccles. milit. etiam à præcipuorum inter Pon- "tificos calamis excidisse videatur. The Assembly Answer to the reasons of the "seven dissenting brethren, pag.* 48. *Precog* 1. The whole Church of Christ "is but one made up of the collection and aggregation of all who are called "by the preaching of the word to professe the faith of Christ. Mr. *M.* him- "self in his Sermon at the Spittle April 1652. pag. 15. Secondly, that part "of the Church which is upon earth in regard that the very life and being of "it, and of all the members of it, lye in internall graces, which cannot "be seen, in that respect the Church of Christ is called an invisible Church: "But now as the said Church and members doe make a profession of their "faith and obedience sensibly to the eyes and ears of others, in that respect it "is called a visible Church: But the visible is not one Church and the invi- "sible another, but meerly the same Church under severall denominations, "the one from their constituting graces, the other from the external profession "of them. The Church visible of the Jewes consisted of the whole nation, and was visible otherwise than the Christian, and therefore the definition of

the

the Christian Church visible is different from that of the Jewish Church visible, and infants included in the definition of the one are not included in the definition of the other.

Mr. *M.* saith, *I add also Baptisme now (as well as circumcision of old) is a reall though implicite profession of the Christian faith.*

Answer. Baptisme of it self (I mean dipping in water) is no reall explicite or implicite profession of faith, but onely when it is done with consent of the baptized to that end: Otherwise the Indians driven into the water by the Spaniards against their wills, should be professors of the Christian faith. The like may be said of circumcision.

Mr *M* omitting my next reason, [That to make infants [visible Church-members, is to make a member of the visible Church, to whom the note of a member of the visible Church doth not agree] saith thus to me: *But say you, Infants are onely passive, and do nothing whereby they may be denominated visible Christians. I answer, Even as much as the infants of the Iewes could do of old, who yet in their dayes were visible members.*

I reply, It is so; yet that which made a visible Church member in the Jewish Church, is not enough to make a visible Church member in the Christian Church, which consists not of a whole nation known by circumcision, genealogies, outward policy, national meetings, family dwelling, &c. But of so many persons as are called out of the world by the preaching of the word to professe the faith of Christ. Mr. *M.* adds, *Yea (say you) further it will follow, that there may be a visible Church which consists onely of infants of believers. I answer, no more now than in the time of the Iewish Church; it's possible, but very improble, that all the men and women should die and leave onely infants behind them, and it's far more probable that a Church in the Anabaptists way may consist onely of hypocrites.*

Answer. It is somewhat more possible, or more probable, there should be onely infants left in a Church of a house, town, or village, than in the Church which consists of a numerous nation, as the Iewish Church did: nor is it unlikely; such things have happened in sweeping plagues. And if *it be farre more probable that a Church in the Anabaptists way may consist onely of hypocrites,* the same with more probability may be said of a Church gathered in the Pedobaptists way, in which there is of necessity so much ignorance in matters of Religion, all being admitted Church-members before they know or can know any thing of Christ. *Fam sumus ergo pares.* But if it be possible, as it is granted, that a Church visible of Christians may consist only of infants, it will follow that there may be a visible Church of Christians in which there is no one professor of the faith, contrary to the definition of a visible Church, That it is a company of professors of faith, and they shal be visible Church-members, who neither by themselves or any for them, do any thing which is apparent to the understanding by the meditation of sense, whereby Christianity is expressed. The case is not the same of the Iewish Church and the Christian; for the Christian Church is any company though but of two or three gathered together in Christs name, *Matth.* 18. 20. But the Iewish Church was the whole Congregation of Israel known otherwise, as hath been said, than the Christian.

Next, Mr *M.* against these words of mine [It is also true that we are not to account infants [of believers] (which he omits in repetition) to be-

long

long to God [before God] (which he likewise omits in repetition) in respect of election [from eternity] (omitted by him) or promise of grace [in Christ] (omitted also) of present estate of in-being in Christ, or future estate by any act of Science, or faith without a particular relation: for there is no generall declaration of God, that the infants of present believers indefinitely all or some either are elected to life, or are in the covenant of grace in Christ, either in respect of present in-being or future estate', excepts two things- 1. *This makes nothing against that visible Church-membership he pleads for.*

Answer. If that visible Church-membership he pleads for, arise from the covenant of grace in Christ (as hitherto hath been the plea) nor can they shew any other) then they are not visible Church-members who have not an estate in that covenant which is the cause of it: For take away the cause and the effect ceaseth, and then the visible Church-membership of existing infants of present believers is overthrown, sith the cause of it appears not. And if they are not to be accounted by act of faith to belong to God in respect of promise of grace in Christ, and the Minister is to dispense the seals by a judgment of faith, as Mr *M.* holds in his *Sermon*, pag. 47, in his *Defence*, pag. 111. then there being no act of faith concerning existing infants of present believers, they are not to be baptized.

" 2. Saith Mr. *M.* I retort the Argument upon your self, and dare boldly " affirm, that by this argument no visible Church, or all the visible profes- " sors of any Church, are to be accounted to belong to God either in respect " of election from eternity, or promise of grace, or present state of in-being " in Christ, &c. without a particular revelation, because there is no decla- " ration of God, that present visible professors are indefinitely all or some " either elected to life, or are in the covenant of grace in Christ either in re- " spect of present in-being or future estate: look by what distinction you will " answer this: For visible professors who are grown men, the same will serve " for infants of believers.

Answ. If Mr. *M.* had put in these words of mine, *By any act or science of faith,* I should have granted the same might be said of visible professors grown men, which I had said of infants. But this no whit hurts our Tenent or practice who do not baptize grown persons because by no act of faith, or science we know them to be in the covenant of grace in Christ, but because by an act of faith we know Christ hath appointed Disciples appearing such by their profession of faith, to be baptized by us, and by an act of science or experience by sense, we know them to be such whom we baptize. Concerning whom though we cannot account them elect and in the covenant by an act of science, or faith without a particular revelation, yet we may by an act of certain knowledge mixt of science and prudence from sense of their visible profession know them to be serious, sober, understanding and free professors of Christianity, and by an act of faith from Christs institution of baptizing professing disciples, know we ought to baptize them, and upon their profession out of charity, which *believeth all things, hopeth all things,* 1 *Cor.* 13. 7. judge them by an act of opinion elect, and in the covenant of grace in Christ. None of all which can be said of existing infants of present believrs, and therfore we ought to pass no judgement on them in this thing, but suspend our judgmenut, and act of baptizing concerning our selves with that comfortable hope which we have from indefinite promises.

Next

Next Mr *M.* takes upon him to excuse some speeches of Mr. *Cottons*, against which I excepted in my *Examen*, *pag.* 42. 43. one was, *That the covenant of grace is given to every godly man in his seed.* Concerning which Mr *M.* tels me, *That he takes M. Cottons meaning to be, that look as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the other godly Jewes were to their seed in respect of the covenant, that is every godly man to his seed now, except onely in such things wherein these Patriarks were of Christ, in all other things wherein God promised to be the God of them and types their seed, godly parents may plead it as much for their seed now as, they could then, and what ever inconveniences or absurdity you can seem to fasten upon Mr. Cotton, will equally reach to them also. As for example, suppose an Israelite should plead this promise for his seed, you'l demand if he plead it to his seed universally, that's false, add so of the rest of your inferences, look what satisfying answer an Israelite would give you, the same would Mr.* Cotton *give, and as satisfyingly.*

Answ. Mr *Ms* paraphrase of Mr. *Cottons* words, is such as no Rule of Grammar will warrant, the words being so expresse, *It* (the covenant of grace) *was given to Christ, and in Christ to every godly man*, Gen. 17. 7. *And in every godly man to his seed*: where the same *covenant of grace*, not an uncertain promise of any thing whatsoever, is said *to be given to every godly mans seed*, which is said *to be given to Christ, and to every godly man*, and *in every godly man*, using the same pronoune which was used concerning Christ: nor is it said, that *it might be pleaded by every godly man*, but *it was given*, which in plain construction is meant of the same grant which was made to Christ, and to a godly man. 2. Nor perhaps would Mr *Cotton* have owned this explication of his words. 3. If he had, they had not been true, for every godly Gentile now cannot plead the same for his seed now, which *Abraham, Isaac* and *Jacob*, and some other Israelites could then, (because God made such peculiar promises to them, particularly to *Abraham*, Gen 17. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. in respect of their seed) as he hath made to any believing Gentile now. For much of that he promised then was out of respect to the future comming of Christ from them, which being accomplished, the reason of those promises, and of circumcision and other rites ceaseth. And yet the promises were not then so universally to them and their seed, but that God took himself not ingaged to be the God of many of them, nor are Gentile-believers seed now *Abrahams* seed till they believe as he did, and therfore in explication of Mr. *M.* there can be no good satisfaction so as to verifie *Mr Cottons* words.

" The other speech of Mr *Cotton*, that " God will have some of every " godly mans seed stand before him for ever, *he confesseth is* not to be justi- " fied, if it be meant in reference to election and everlasting life, that every " godly man shall have some of his seed infallibly saved, nor doth he think " Mr *Cotton* meant so: but for his part he thinks he only added to that pro- " mise made to *Jonadabs* children, *Jerem.* 35. that God would alwsys beare " a mercifull respect unto the posterity of his servants, according to that pro- " mise, *Exo.* 20. 5. I wil shew mercy to thousands of them that loveme and keep " my commandements. And that being his scope (as he thinks it was) I need " not to have kept such a stir about it.

Anf. The words in the plainest sense they bare, had that sense which Mr. *M.* counts *unjustifiable*, nor can they be construed in such an indefinite manner as Mr. *M.* conceives, the good promised being no lesse than *standing before God for*

ever

ever: which how ever it allude to *Ionadabs* promise, yet is not to be understood in the sense made to him, nor in any other sense now than that of eternall salvation, that I know, and by his declaration should belong to some of every godly mans seed determinately. So that what ever his scope were, his words were likely to be a stumbling-block to many who are too much taken with his dictates, and the place in which I examined them leading me to it, and both Mr. *Cottons* letter to me, acquainting me with his *Dialogue* of *the grounds of Infant-baptism*, of which the supposed Interest in the covenant is the chief, and the desire I have to make learned men more cautelous in venting such passages as may occasion error, knowing how *Luthers* unwary speeches were the seed of Antinomianism, and other learned mens writings have misled, most Divines adhering pertinaciously to leading men, provoking me thereto, I did and still do think it was necessary I should say what I said about those speeches.

Mr. M. tells me, pag. 116, *You doe but lose time and waste paper in endeavouring to confute what was never asserted by me*, viz. *That the covenant of saving grace is made to believers and their naturall seede that the infants of believers are so within the covenant of grace as to be elected, and to have all the spirituall priviledges of the covenant belong to them. But this he suspects to fasten on him against my own light*: from which I cleared my self, *Apolog Sect.* 9. He then interprets his own words *of infants being within the covenant of grace as visible professors are quâ visible* (which speech is shewed false before) *they are to be accounted to belong to God as well as their parents*, viz. *by a visible profession they are made free according to Abrahams Copy*, viz. *in a visible priviledge for their posterity* But he leaves out those passages which I alledged, saying, *The covenant of Salvation is come to his house*, that in the first cõclusion it's said, *The covenant is the same*, which he means of saving graces, and then saith, *and children belong to IT*, which can demonstrate no other than the same covenant, that is made *a part of the Gospel preached to Abraham.* To which I might add, that in his *Sermon*, page 40. he saith *The text not onely shewing that they are within the covenant, but also that a right to baptism is the consequence of being within the covenant*, which covenant is made by him the covenant of salvation, pag. 16 and in his *Defence* pag. 88. *We are enquiring after the salvation of them to whom a promise of salvation is made, and hence infers the salvation of infants of believers dying in infancy*, which were frivolous if he did not conceive, *Gen.* 17. 7. to promise salvation to believers infants: and page 98. counts it absurd that *in a covenant of grace temporall blessings should be ratified by the seal of it.* So that either M. M. heeded not his own speeches, or confounded things much different, or said and unsaid the same thing, if that were not his meaning which I conceived. And I must still professe that his setting down first distinctly the identity of the covenant consisting in saving graces, and then affirming Infants of believers to belong to it, and not understanding it of the same Covenant, hath the shew of juggling tending to deceive not to instruct the Reader. There are more speeches produced by me to shew, that if he did speak consonantly to other Writers and sayings, he meant as I interpreted his words, two of which he chuseth to vindicate, one the proposition of the Directory, (*The promise is made to believers and their seed,*) which how frivolously it is interpreted by Mr. *G.* and Mr. *M.* is shewd in my *Apol. Sect.* 9. in my *Addition*

to my *Apol.* to Mr. *Bailee*, *Sect.* 3. To which I add, that in the *Assembles Confession of Faith* it is said, *ch.* 7. *art* 3 that *in the covenant of grace God promiseth to give unto all those that are ordained unto life, his holy Spirit*, *ch.* 14. *art.* 2. *The principall acts of saving faith are, accepting, receiving, and resting upon Christ alone for justification; sanctification, and eternall life, by vertue of the covenant of Grace*, ch. 17. art. 2. *The perseverance of the Saints depends upon the nature of the covenant of grace.* The other speech he would clear, is thus by me expressed, *Baptism seals onely the promise of saving grace, remission of sins, &c.* So in the *Directory of Baptism*, *That it is the seal of the covenant of grace, of our ingrafting into Christ, and of our union with him, of remission of sins, regeneration, adoption, and life eternall: and after, And that the seed and posterity of the faithfull born within the Church have by their birth interest in the covenant, and right to the seal of it* In the *Rules of direction in the Ordinance Octob.* 20. 1645. *That the Sacraments are seals of the covenant of grace in the blood of Christ.* And therefore if there be not a promise of saving grace to Infants, in vain are they baptized, the seal is put to a blank, as some use to speak. To this saith Mr. *M.* "I utterly deny your consequence, that unlesse there be absolute promises of saving grace to infants, the seal is set to a blank: For give me leave but to put the same case; First for the Infants of the Jewes, was the seal put to a blank with them, or had they all promises of saving graces? Secondly, let me put the same case in grown men, who make an external visible profession, and thereupon are admitted to baptism, can any man say, that all the saving graces of the covenant, or the spirituall part of it is promised to all visible professors? Is it not abundantly known, that in all ages even in the best times, even in the Apostles times multitudes were baptized, to whom God yet never gave saving graces, and therefore never promised them? for had he made a promise, he would have performed it.

Answer. To the words in my *Examen* (*the seal is put to a blank*) was added, as some speak, which I did to intimate that it was Pædobaptists phraseology, not mine, and that they counted this an absurdity, not that I did so. So that my consequence was, it being counted frequently in their writings an absurdity that the seal should be put to a blank, that is, that baptism should be administred to them that had not the promise, and it seals onely the promise of saving grace, if the promise of saving grace belong not to the infants baptized, then in vain are they baptized according to Pædobaptists *Hypothesis*, for the seal of the promise is put to them to whom it is confessed the promise is not made. Mr. *M.* himselfe in his *Sermon*, pag. 43. *Infants are capable of receiving the holy Ghost, of union with Christ, of adoption, of forgivenesse of sins, of regeneration, of everlasting life, all which things are signified and sealed in the Sacrament of Baptisme.* The covenant then sealed is the covenant of these saving graces, which if it belong not to infants baptized, but another outward covenant, in vain are they baptized, for they have not the covenant which baptisme seals. And that this is the sense of other Writers, appeares by the words of *Aurifaber. Dialog. contra Anabapt.* p. 195. *Dico ergo: Omnibus fidelibus baptismum competere cum ipsorum semine tam mulieribus quam viris tam infantibus quam adultis: horum omnium enim se Deum fore declarat Deus, his remissionem peccatorum in Christi sanguine; his mentis renovationem per spiritum sanctum; his vitam aeternam promittit ac regnum coelorum: quare quod ipse obsignabitur hac Dei gratia.*

Amef. Bellarm. enervat. tom. 3. l. 1. c. 4. ch. 9. Proteſt. Circumciſio à primâ ſuâ inſtitutione habuit promiſſionem illam annexam quâ nulla eſt major: Ero Deus tuus & ſemini tui poſt te. Gen. 17. quam Chriſtus ita interpretatur, Matth. 22. ut vitam æternam illa doceat contineri, & Paulus Epheſ. 2. 12. Oſtendit ſpem vitæ ex illâ pendere. I wil add the words of *Calvin, Epiſt. 229.* which are in ſtead of many others, both becauſe of the great eminency of the man, being accounted almoſt an Oracle by many of my Antagoniſts, and becauſe they are full to the preſent purpoſe: they are thus in Engliſh. " This principle is " ſtill to be held, That baptiſm is not conferred on infants that they may be " made ſons and heirs of God: but becauſe they are already with God reckoned in that place and degree; he grace of adoption is ſealed in their fleſh Otherwiſe the *Anabaptiſts* ſhould rightly keep them from baptiſm: For unleſſe " there ſhould agree to them the truth of the outward ſign, it would be a meer " profanation to call them to the participation of the ſign it ſelfe. Moreover, " if any deny baptiſm to them, our anſwer is ready, that they are already of " the flock of Chriſt, and of the family of God, becauſe the covenant of " ſalvation which God maketh with believers, is common alſo to the ſons, as " alſo the words ſound, I will be thy God and of thy ſeed after thee, *Gen.* 17. " 7. unleſſe this promſe went before, by which God adopteth the children of " believers not yet born, it is certain baptiſm is ill beſtowed on them.

Which words do plainly expreſs the covenant of ſalvation which is made by God with believers, is common to the ſons, that (ſo it is meant, *Gen.* 17. 7.) that with God they are afore baptiſm reckoned in the place and degree of ſons and heirs of God, who adopteth them not yet born, that unleſſe the truth of the outward ſign (that is according to Mr. *M.* adoption, regeneration, remiſſion of ſins, &c.) did agree to them, it were profanation to call infants of believers to the participation of the ſign, and Anabaptiſts ſhould rightly keep them from Baptiſm. Therefore *Calvin* thought the covenant of ſaving grace *Gen.* 17. 7. made by God to believers infants (which Mr. *M.* diſclaims) and otherwiſe infant-baptiſm is profanation, and it is rightly oppoſed. Yea, the ſhifts that are uſed to free their doctrine of infants intereſt in the covenant, and the ſealing of it from the difficulty of verifying it againſt the exceptions before alledged, do all ſeem to ſuppoſe the covenant in which infants have intereſt, is the covenant of ſaving grace. As when Mr. *Baxters plain Scripture, &c.* pag. 223. will have *Baptiſme ſeal onely the conditionall promiſe* Mr. *Philips vind.* pag. 37. expreſſeth *the ſealing by offering.* Mr. *Davenport's Confeſſ. of Faith* p. 39. maketh *the benefits of the covenant not to be offered in the Sacraments, but to be exhibited onely to true believers.* Mr. *Cotton's grounds of Bapt.* pag. 70, *The covenant of grace doth not give them ſaving grace at all, but onely offereth it, and ſeals what it offereth.* Dr. *Homes*, that *the adminiſtration of the covenant of grace, belongs to believers children though not the efficacie.* Dr. *Twiſſe*, that *Infants are in the covenant of grace in the judgement of charity*, and that baptiſm *ſeals regeneration, &c. not conferred, but to be conferred.* Dr. *Th. Goodwin*, that *they are to be judged in the covenant of grace by parcels though not all in the lump*, yet all make the promiſe, *I will be the God of thy ſeed*, applied to infants of believers' contain the promiſe of ſaving grace, and therefore I had great reaſon to conceive Mr. *M.* ſo meant his ſecond concluſion. As for the two caſes he puts, I neither grant all the Infants of the Jewes, nor viſible Chriſtian profeſſors

professors adult had all saving graces who were circumcised or rightly baptized by the Apostles, nor do I say they were sealed with the seal of the covenant, it's the Pedobaptists expression not mine, except where I use the term to express their mind; nor do I count it an absurdity to say the seal was and is to be put to a blank, that is, that those should be baptized to whom the promise of saving grace is not made, when I speak after mine own mind. But in the place of my *Examen* pag. 46. in which I alleged that as an absurdity, that the seal should be put to a blank, it was not because I took it so to be, but because the Pædobaptists so count it, as Mr. *Calvins* words before recited shew.

SECT. XXXI.

Of the novelty and vanity of Mr. Marshals *and others doctrine about Sacraments, being seals of the covenant, and the severall sealings of them.*

BUt Mr. *M. desires me a little to consider the nature of a Sacrament in what sense it is a seal*, and he tells me, *that in every Sacrament the truth of the Covenant in it self, and all the promises of it are sealed to be Yea and Amen: Jesus Christ became a Minister of the Circumcision to confirm the promises made unto the Fathers, and so to every one who is admitted to partake of baptism according to the rule which God hath given to his Church to administer the Sacrament, there is sealed the truth of all the promises of the Gospel, that they are all true in Christ, and that whoever partakes of Christ, shall partake of all these saving promises, this is sealed absolutely in Baptism.*

Answer. Mr *M.* would have me to *consider the nature of a Sacrament, in what sense it is a seal*, and I am very willing so to do, as knowing that as Mr. *M.* imagines that I am mislead for want of considering thereof, so I am sure Mr. *M.* and other Pædobaptists are both mistaken, and do abuse others in this point, by reason of their inconsideratenes, or superficial consideration of this thing. The word *Sacrament* is a Latin word in prophane Authors signifying an oath made by a Souldier to his Generall; in Ecclesiastick Writers it is applied to all the mysteries of religion, and it is used most by the African Writers, *Tertullian*, *Augustine &c.* as the word *Mystery* is by the *Greeks*, *Chrysostome Cyril, &c. Chamier Paustrat. Cath tom. 4. l. 4. c. 4. Sect. 14. Sæpe jam dictum latissimam fuisse olim Sacramenti significationem: serò tandem contractam in angustos istos terminos quos hodie vix migrat: quod diligenter animadvertendum. Certè Sacramenti definitionem nullam est invenire ante Augustinum, qui suo exemplo posteris præiit, deinde Augustini definitione, &c.* Whence I inferre, that as the term *Sacrament*, so the definition of a Sacrament is but a novelty, and possibly the great contentions about the number of the Sacraments, some making seven, some three, most Protestants two onely, would be lessened, if moderate learned men had the handling of it. I confesse that sundry Texts of Scripture do plainly shew the two rites of Baptism and the Lords Supper to be the chief rites of the Church, as 1 *Cor.* 10, 1, 2, 3, 4. & 12, 13. *Eph.* 4, 5. *Mark* 16. 16. 1 *Cor.* 10. 16, 17. & 11. 23, *&c.* Yet that the Scripture either calls these Sacraments, or sets down one generall nature of them to a certain definition of them, cannot be demonstrated. They are certain rites appointed for certain

uſes according to certain rules, but ſuch a nature or eſſence genericall as diſtinguiſheth them from all other rites, as laying on of hands, &c. denied to be Sacraments I find not in Scripture. Divines elder and later, have framed their definitions according to their own conceits. After *Auguſtines* time that definition was commonly received in Schools, *That a Sacrament is a viſible ſign of an inviſible grace*: yet the Ancients did rent ſuch ſpeeches as occaſioned the opinion commonly received in Schools afore the reformation by *Luther* and *Zuinglius*, that they did *conferre gratiam ex opere operato*, *give grace by the bare outward uſe of them*. *Zuinglius* denying them to be any more than ſigns, the *Lutherans* denying that they give grace by the bare uſe of them without the concurrence of faith, to which the *Lutherans* aſcribe all the efficacie; the Papiſts object the baptizing of infants who did not believe, uſed by them all: whereupon the oppoſers of infant-baptiſme, falſly termed Anabaptiſts, proved infant-baptiſm inconſiſtent with their own doctrine. I will ſet down Mr. *Bedfords* words in his Epiſtle to Mr. *Baxter*, printed in the *Friendly Accommodation* between them, pag. 352. *The Anabaptiſts took occaſion from that poſition of Luther, No Faith no Baptiſm. Contemeous with him was Zuinglius and others, who to over-throw the reall preſence, inſiſted upon it that Sacraments were but ſigns for repreſentation; and when that doctrin was once broached, the Anabaptiſts could eaſily make their advantage of it.* To anſwer whom the *Lutherans* maintain, that by baptiſm, or before they are made believers, as the words of the *Lutherans* in the *Conference at Montbelgard*, cited by me in my *Examen part* 3. *ſect.* 15. *p.* 143. ſhew, *Oſiander epiſt. Hiſtor. Eccl. Cent.* 16. *l.* 2. *c.* 68. *pag.* 449. *Cum autem baptiſmus ſit lavacrum regenerationis* (teſte Paulo) *ſentimus nos Deum dare fidem infantibus vel ante baptiſmum ad preces parentum & Eccleſiæ, vel in ipſo actu baptiſmi & regenerationis, quæ ſine fide eſſe non poteſt.* And to this opinion did many in *England* warp, when the face of the Church of *England* became ceremonious, and tended to ſymbolizing with the *Lutheran* Proteſtants, or with the more moderate not Jeſuited Papiſts in the time of the late Prelates potency, as may be ſeen by the paſſages cited by me in *Examen part.* 3. *Sect.* 15. *pag.* 143. and by the printed writings of Dr. *Davenant*, Dr. *Ward*, Mr. *Thomas Bedford*, which have been refuted by Mr. *Gataker* and *Mr. Baxter*, nor is it likely but ſtill the ſame mind is in *Mr. Bedford*, notwithſtanding the late Syneciſm, or rather clawing of one another which hath been between him and Mr. *Baxter* in their printed *Friendly Accommodation*. In which Mr. *Cranfords* Epiſtle hath theſe words to Mr. *Bedford*, *Brother you know my mind, that I conceive the ground of Anabaptiſme to have been the erroneus Doctrine, de nudis ſignis, as is cleare in the Eccleſiaſticall Stories of old, and moſt arguings of Anabaptiſts.* Which ſhewes they fear Infants Baptiſm will not be maintained without this doctrine of giving by Baptiſm to the elect at leaſt initiall ſeminall regenerating grace reall or relative. But Mr. *Baxter* thinks otherwiſe, that that doctrine will increaſe *Anabaptiſm*. Leaving them to their ſeverall fancies, I proceed.

Mr. *Calvin*, and with him many others, take another courſe to avoyd extreams, neither making Baptiſm a naked ſign, which is imputed to *Zuinglius*, nor aſcribing to it the giving of grace by the work wrought, with the Papiſts, nor holding ſuch initiall ſeminall regeneration or ſeed of Faith at Baptiſm, given at leaſt to the elect, as *Lutherans* and others (which perhaps will be found

found as much as the Papists ascribe to it) but ascribing to Baptism and the Lords Supper, not onely signification, but also obsignation, and so making this the generall nature of Sacraments to be seals of the Covenant of grace, which they say is made to infants of believers, though they want not faith at or before Baptism; and from this promise they desire a title to the baptism of Infants of believers, as is shewed out of *Calvin* above. But 1. there is much ambiguity in their determinations about the covenant of grace what it is, and what it contains, and in what sense it belongs to infants of believers as such, and what believers infants it belongs to, and how baptism seals it. So that in their speeches there is much equivocation, and frequent saying and unsaying, as chiefly about the promise, *Gen.* 17. 7. *I will be thy God and the God of thy seed after thee*: which is one way expounded in their Commentaries on *Rom.* 9. 7, 8, and elsewhere, as meant of saving graces, and applied onely to the elect and true believers in their disputes against *Arminius*: But elsewhere expounded of every Gentile visible professor of faith in Christ, and his naturall seed, as if thereby the outward privileges of visible Church membership, and initiall seal were promised and applied to all infants of believers, whether elect or not in their disputes against Anabaptists, as may be perceived by this and other writings published by me. 2. The objection still holds, How can baptism seal to an infant? Every seal is a sign, though every sign be not a seal; but baptism is no sign to an infant, sith it signifies nothing to it at the time of baptism, because the infant hath not understanding to perceive the use of it; and when the infant comes to understanding there's no print of baptism to represent any thing to the person baptized some years before. If the person know any thing of it, it is by report, which is no visible sign, but audible to the baptized. 3. A seal is an assuring sign to the eye of what is promised to the eare: but baptism assures nothing to an infant without faith, therefore it seals nothing without faith. And thus in Mr *Perkins* his *Exposition of the fifth principle of his Catechism*. Heretofore we were taught, *A Sacrament is a sign to represent, a seal to confirm, an instrument to convey Christ and all his benefits to them that do believe in him*. Faith therefore was a necessary prerequisite in the person to whom the Sacrament was a seal of the Covenant of grace, which infants wanting it is no seal to them, and consequently no Sacrament, as Mr. *Gataker* argues in another case, *Discep. de bapt. inf. vi & effic. pag.* 192. if it be a seal of the essence of a Sacrament.

The main if not the onely Texts whence they fetch this Doctrine of making the nature of Sacraments to be Seals of the covenant of grace, are *Rom.* 4. 11. *Gen.* 17. 7, 10, 11. In the former it is said, *Abraham received the sign of Circumcision a Seal of the righteousness of faith which he had yet being uncircumcised*; and in the other Circumcision is termed the *Covenant*, and *token of the Covenant*. Whence [the seal of the Covenant of grace] is either made the definition of a Sacrament in generall, or at least the *genus* of it, and in the writings of Pædobaptists seals of the Covenant and Sacraments are used as terms of the same signification. *In the Confession of faith of the Assembly, chap.* 27. *art.* 1. *Sacraments are holy signs and seals of the Covenant of grace*, and they cite but two texts for it, *Rom.* 4. 11. *Gen.* 17. 7. 10. Vide *Gataker. Discept. de vi & effic. inf. baptism. pag.* 243. And in the *Ordinance of Parliament Octob.* 20. 1645. about Rules concerning [illegible]

ning persons to be admited to the Lords Supper, this is one principle which every one who is admitted to the Lords Supper, is required to give account of, that *Sacraments are seals of the covenant of grace in the blood of Christ*: so that in effect it is made as one of the first *Credenda*, or articles of faith necessary for all to know. On the contrary, I have seen a little book in English of one Mr. *Jackson*, in which are nineteen arguments to prove circumcision no seal of the covenant of grace. For my part, as I expres my self in my *Examen*, pag. 117. I should not stick to yeild that the rites of the New Testament called Sacraments, may be called seals of the covenant of grace, being rightly expounded in this sense, that they shew forth Christs death, and thereby to the true believer, the benefits of the covenant of grace are assured: yet considering how Writers make this the very *Genus* in the definition of them, and of their nature and essence, and thence inferre duties and draw arguments to determine cases of conscience about the use of Sacraments as they are called, and make it a necessary point to be acknowledged by all, I reject it, and except against this use of that term for these reasons.

First, Because this use of that term is not in or from the holy Scripture, That term *Seal of the covenant of grace*, is not expresly in the holy Scripture, I suppose will not be denied: if it be, let it be shewed where. Though the term *Seal*, and the true *Token of the Covenant*, be ascribed to circumcision, *Rom.* 4. 11 *Gen.* 17. 11. yet is not the term *Seal of the Covenant of grace*, applied to any Sacrament, no not to circumcision. Nor is the term *Seal of the righteousness of Faith*, *Rom.* 4. 11. of the same sense with the term *Seal of the covenant of grace*. For *the Seale of the covenant of grace* in the ordinary acception, is as much as an assuring sign or mean of the grace of the covenant to be bestowed, *Rom.* 4. 11. it is said, that *Abraham received the sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the righteousness of Faith, which he had being yet uncircumcised*; and therefore it was rather a seal of certification of what he had, than a prediction or promise what he should have. Mr. *Baxter* against *Mr. Blake*, pag. 104. saith truly, *That circumcision was the Seal of the righteousness of Faith, even a justifying faith already in being*, *Rom.* 4. 11, 12. *The New England Elders* in their *Answer to the third and fourth of the nine positions*, pag. 65. say truly thus, *The scope of the Apostle in that place, Rom.* 4 11, *is not to define a Sacrament, nor to shew what is the adequate subject of the Sacrament, but to prove by the example of Abraham that a sinner is justified before God, not by works but by faith* (thus) *As Abraham the Father of the faithfull was justified before God, so must his seed be, that in all believers whether Iewes or Gentiles, circumcised or uncircumcised, for therefore Abraham received circumcision which belonged to the Iewes, to confirm the righteousness which he had before, even whilst he was uncircumcised, that he might be the Father of both.* And to speak truth; to conceive that circumcision there is made the seal of the covenant of grace, that is, that *God would be the God of Abraham and his seed* for the future, sanctifying, justifying, saving him and them, is indeed to evacuate the force of the Apostles argument, which is, that righteousness is not appropriated to the Lawes by the Law, but common to the Gentiles with them by faith, because *Abrahams* circumcision sealed to him the righteousness of faith, which he had before he was circumcised. Nor do I see that which *Genier. Paust. Cath. tom.* 4 *c.* 2. *c.* 10. *qu.* 47. saith, doth prove that circumcision *Rom.* 4. 11, *is meant of a Seal of a*

promise,

promiſe, becauſe Gen. 17. in the inſtitution it was termed a token of the covenant, for the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 4 11. mentions not what God appointed circumciſion to be to every circumciſed perſon, but what peculiar uſe *Abrahams* circumciſion had to him and all believers though uncircumciſed. And though it is true, *that righteouſneſs of faith ſuppoſeth a word of God, or a promiſe or covenant of grace, yet Ro.* 4. 11. the circumciſion there mentioned is ſaid to ſeal not a promiſe of ſomething future, but ſomething paſt and already had many years before, *Gen.* 15. 6.

But were it granted, that circumciſion there ſealed the promiſe to come, to wit, that part of the covenant, *Gen.* 17. 4. *Thou ſhalt be a father of many Nations*, and that v. 7. *And I will eſtabliſh my covenant between me and thee, and thy ſeed after thee in their generations for an everlaſting covenant to bee a God unto thee and thy ſeed after thee*, or that *Gen.* 15. 5. *So ſhall thy ſeed be*, mentioned *Rom.* 4. 17, 18. and ſo did aſſure a future eſtate to others as well as an eſtate already obtained to *Abraham*, yet this is aſcribed in that place to no ones circumciſion but *Abrahams*. For 1. The occaſion and ſcope of the paſſage ſhew it is meant of *Abrahams* circumciſion, it being alleged to prove, that Gentiles were to be juſtified by faith though uncircumciſed, becauſe *Abraham* was juſtified by faith afore circumciſion, and his circumciſion after did but ſeal (not convey) the righteouſneſs of faith we had before. 2. The expreſſion [*He received*] ſtanding in oppoſition to [*yet being uncircumciſed*] ſhewes that the receiving of the ſeal of circumciſion was in his own perſon. 3. The end of receiving it ſhewes it more plainly: for it was, *That he might be the father of them that believe.* But this was the end onely of *Abrahams* perſonall circumciſion: Neither *Iſhmaels*, nor *Iſaacks*, nor any others perſonall circumciſion were, that *Abraham* might be *the father of them that believe*, but onely *Abrahams*. 4. The time exactly noted of his believing, and imputation of righteouſneſs to him, diſtinguiſhed from the time of his receiving circumciſion ſhew plainly that it was the ſame perſon who had the one and the other, and the receiving it not as a command to execute it upon others, but as a ſign and ſeal to himſelf, and all believers whether circumciſed or uncircumciſed, evidently ſhew it is ſpoken *Rom.* 4. 11. of *Abrahams* perſonall circumciſion and of no others.

As for *Gen.* 17. 10, 11. it is true Circumciſion is termed *the Covenant*, and *a token of the Covenant*: But it is not ſaid of that promiſe onely, v. 7. nor of that promiſe in the Goſpel ſenſe, and therefore it cannot there be proved to be a token or ſeal of the Covenant of grace; but it followeth that *Rom.* 4. 11. *Gen.* 17, 7. 10. are impertinently alledged by the *Aſſembly* to prove this propoſition, *Sacraments are holy ſigns and ſeals of the Covenant of grace.* Yea the end of circumciſion was conceived generally by the Jewes, and ſo uſed to bind men to obſerve the Law of *Moſes* for righteouſneſs. And thus they taught who are mentioned *Acts* 15. 1. "Except ye be circumciſed after the manner of "*Moſes* yee cannot be ſaved. And v. 5. That it was needfull to circumciſe "them, and to command them to keep the Law of *Moſes*, *Acts* 21. 20, 21. "Thou ſeeſt brother how many thouſands of Jewes there are which believe, "and they are all zealous of the Law, and they are informed of thee, that "thou teacheſt all the Jewes which are among the Gentiles, to forſake *Mo*-"*ſes*, ſaying, That they ought not to circumciſe their children, neither

walk after the customes, and the Apostle *Gal.* 5. 2, 3, saith, *Behold I Paul say to you, That if any of you be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testifie again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to keep the whole Law.* So that circumcision in the ordinary use may seem to have been a seal of the Law rather than of the Gospel or covenant of grace; and if your baptism be of the same nature with circumcision, it is so far from being a rite of the Gospel, that it rather binds us to observe the Law. But fourthly, were it granted that it was in the use of it according to the institution a seal of the covenant of grace, how doth it follow from thence, that this is the nature of every Sacrament? Whence will it be evinced that that is the *Genus* of every Sacrament which is not so much as once attributed to them. The Passover is counted a Sacrament, and we find that it signified the Passover over the Israelites houses, and sparing their first born, and that it typified *Christ*, 1 *Cor* 5. 7. But this doth not prove that it was a seal of the covenant of grace any more than *Jonahs* being in the Whales belly, which was a type of Christs buriall, was a seal of the covenant of grace. I grant we are said *to be baptized into Christs death, to be buried by baptism into death*, Rom 6 3, 4. *to be buried with him in Baptism, and therein to be raised up through the faith of the operation of God who raised him from the dead*, Col. 2. 12, *and that they who are baptized into Christ, have put on Christ*, Gal. 3. 27. And *the Cup is called the new Testament in his blood*, 1 *Cor.* 12. 25. And therefore I should yeild to call both these ordinances signes memorative of Christs death in the first place, and by consequence seals of the New Testament and its benefits, specially the Cup in the Lords Supper. But this doth not prove this is the *Genus* of Sacraments, much less of all Sacraments. Nor doth it any whit justifie the determining of doubts of conscience, and so binding duties on mens consciences concerning meer positive rites without any institution of Christ, or Apostolicall example, meerly from this devised term, *The Seal of the Covenant*, and making it so necessary to be acknowledged, that it is pressed on persons to be admitted to the Lords Supper, as it were a necessary Article of Faith.

2. This term *Seal of the Covenant*, applied to these Sacraments, as being of their nature is, so farre as my reading and memory reach, but a novell term, not used till the 16. Century, & in that not used among the learned *Romanists and Lutherans*, at least not frequently. I grant the Ancients say, *Men are sealed by baptism*, and sometimes by laying on of hands or anointing after baptism. And this sealing is attributed to infant baptism by *Nazianzen* in his fortieth *Oration*. But this sealing was not a confirmation of the covenant of grace, but a confirmation of their faith received in Baptism. The ancient *Greeks* call it *the seal of Faith*, as the *Latins* call it *the seal of Repentance*, and *the Sacrament of Faith*, in respect of the profession of Faith, as *Grotius Annot. on Mat.* 28. 19. observes when he saith, *And such were the Interrogations of faith either in the first times, or those next the first in respect of which by Basil and others, it is called the seal of faith, sealing of faith, or repentance, by* Tertul. *in his book of* Repentance, and this sealing was not to assure a promise, but to strengthen and keep their faith or vertues. Whence as Mr. *Gataker* observes in his *Strictures on Dr. Downams Epistle*, pag. 44, 45. they accounted Baptism to some not as ἀφεσεως, a pardoning of sins, but a seal of vertues; and where *Nazianzen* calls it σφραγίδα, he expresseth it thus, σφραγὶς ἀνθ' ὑποσχέσεως καὶ τῆς προθυμίας

συμβολον

σφραγὶς, *a seal as keeping and noting dominion.* No where do I find any of them use the term *Seal of the covenant of grace*, applied either to Sacraments in generall, or to baptism in special.

3. But were the use of the term *Seal of the covenant of grace* in the Scripture, or the writings of the Ancients, yet it is against Logick to define a Sacrament by a *Seal of the covenant* as the *genus*, and so to make it of its essence. For it is a rule in Logick, *Definitio non fit ex verbis metaphoricis*, *Scheibler Top. cap. 3. num. 126. Ita Aristot. Topic. lib. 2. c. 2. sect. 4. Keckerm. Syst. Logic. lib. 1. sect. cap. 8. Aristotle* saith, πᾶν καὶ ἀμεταφορὰν λεγόμενον ἄδηλον, *Every translated speech is doubtfull* till reduced to proper, for it may have divers senses. Besides, metaphors, or borrowed speeches, may be many, as in this point we may call a Sacrament a Pledge, as in the *Common Prayer Book Catechism*, or a pawn, earnest, as well as a seal *Chamier. Panst. Cath. tom. 4. l. 2. c. 9. sect. 10. You have also the similitude of a pledge somewhat divers from Seals, but nevertheless tending to the same, which we also doe most willingly use.* And if we should define a Sacrament by a pledge, and from that metaphor infer, that an infant must contract afore it receive the Sacrament as a pledge, we might do it with as good reason as they who infer they are to be sealed because the seal followes the covenant. Well doth *Chamier* call a *Seal* a *Similitude*, which cannot shew what a Sacrament is, but what it is like; and therefore all metaphors are unfit to shew the quidditative conceit of a thing, nor are to be used in definitions except there be want of proper terms, of which there is not in this case. Now to define a Sacrament by a *Seale of the covenant*, is to define it by a metaphor, neither Baptism nor the Lords Supper are Seals in proper acceptation, they make no visible figure or impression on the body, therefore to use the term thus is an abuse, much more when positions and duties are urged on mens consciences from it. I will subjoyn Mr. *Baxters* words in his *Apologie* against Mr *Blake*, *Sect.* 64. *pag.* 11. *Some sober men no way inclined to Anabaptism, do think that we ought not to call the Sacraments Seals; as being a thing not to be proved from the word; (for all Rom. 4.) But I am not of their mind; yet I think it is a Metaphor, and to make it the subject of tedious disputations, and to lay too great a stress upon a metaphoricall notion, is the way not to edifie, but to lose our selves.*

Lastly, were all this yielded to Mr *M.* that the term *Seal of the covenant* were the language of the Scripture and Ancients, and fit enough to express the generall nature of Sacraments, yet I conceive it of little moment to the ends to which it is applied. For what is it to seal and not to confer grace, but onely to assure? And so the use of it is to represent to the mind as a morall instrument. But that is not done to infants, who are not naturally capable to understand the meaning, therefore this term [*Seal of the covenant*] beyond [*sign of grace*] doth not take away the objection of Papists, Lutherans, or Antipædobaptists *That without giving grace or faith by baptism, it is in vain or without effect to baptize infants.* And in like manner the deriving from it Pædobaptism is very frivolous. These things will appear by considering what Mr *M.* and others say of the covenant which they say is sealed, and of the sealing, there being little agreement among Pædobaptists, whether the inward or outward covenant, the absolute or conditionall be sealed, whether the sealing be absolute or conditionall, to the Major, Minor, or Conclusion. I will examine

what I find said by Mr *M.* First, whose words are commended by Mr. *Prynne* in his *Suspension suspended, pag.* 19, [illegible] he saith, *In every Sacrament the truth of the covenant it self, and all the promises of it are sealed to be Yea and Amen, and that is sealed absolutely in baptism to all that partake of it.*

But 1. there's no Scripture that saith so: That *Rom.* 5 8. is impertinent: For Christ is not called the *Minister of Circumcision* because he did administer circumcision to others, that were not true, he circumcised none, but he was a circumcised Minister *for the truth*, he was of the circumcision, that is, a Jew not a Gentile. Nor is it said his circumcision was to confirm the promises of the Fathers that they were true; but that therefore he was a circumcised *Minister for the truth of God*, that *the promises of the Fathers might be confirmed* by his ministring the truth of God in his preaching, or in his accomplishment of what the promises foretold. 2. Nor do I know any act in baptism that hath any aptnesse of it self, or by institution to seal this position, that the covenant of grace and all the promises of it are Yea and Amen. 3. Yet were it so, this sealing is not to Infants, who have no intelligence thereof, and so no confirmation thereof by baptism. 4. Nor doth this sealing any more pertain to the children of believers, than unbelievers, it is but of the truth of the covenant in it self, not of any persons interest in it. 5. This is as well sealed by the baptism of others, yea by the baptism of any one deceased, most of all by Christs baptism, as by each persons own baptism. 6. This sealing may be not onely to them that are baptized, but to them that deny baptism, yea to Infidels, yea to Devils, who may and do believe the truth of the covenant it self, and all the promises of it to be Yea and Amen, and have it sealed as well to them by the baptism of a person as to the baptized, and better than to an infant. But perhaps Mr *M.* helps the matter in the second or third.

"But as to the second (saith he) which is *interesse meum*, or the receivers "interest in that spirituall part of the covenant, that is sealed to no receiver "absolutely, but conditionally; in this particular all Sacraments are but "*Signa conditionalia*, conditionall seals sealing the spirituall part of the co"venant to the receivers upon condition that they perform the spirituall part "of the covenant. Thus our Divines use to answer the Papists, thus Dr. *A*"*mes* answers to *Bellarmine*, when *Bellarmine* disputing against our do"ctrines, that Sacraments are Seals, alledges then they are falsly applied of"tentimes; he answers to *Bellarmin*, Sacraments are conditionall Seals, and "therefore not Seals to us but upon condition.

Answer. The spirituall condition is faith, so *Ames Bell. enerv. tom.* 3. *l.* 1. *c.* 1. *q.* 4. *th.* 11. *Sacramenta non sunt testimonia completa & absoluta, nisi credentibus. Sacraments are not compleat and absolute testimonies but to the believing.* Now if the Sacraments seal onely condi ionally, they seal onely this proposition, that he that believeth shall be justified, saved, &c. But this is all one with sealing the truth of the covenant in it self: nor doth this seal the baptized persons interest in the covenant any more than the unbaptized; no more to the infants of believers than of unbelievers, not at all to any till they believe, and so to no infants ordinarily, and if then the baptizing of them must be derived from this interest and sealing of the covenant, either none are to be baptized till they do believe, or all alike are to be baptized. Besides, if Sacraments be but conditionall signes, or testimonies incompleat, and condi-

tionall,

tionall till persons believe, then they are but conditionall incompleat Sacraments till a person believes, fith to be a sign & seal is of the nature of a Sacrament; and if so, then infants have not a compleat Sacrament or absolute, but an incompleat and conditionall baptism, and consequently though the baptizer begin to baptize the infants, yet he cannot say he doth baptize them, but must wait till they be believers, and then he may say he baptizeth them, and gives them a compleat Sacrament, and is bound to baptize them when they come to years whom he did wash in infancy, or else he mocks them, which is the mind of Christ indeed, that he that believeth should be baptized, and no other, *Mark* 16.16. Besides, whether there be any conditionall sealing may be a question. Mr. *Baxter Apologie against Mr Blake, Sect.* 77. *pag.* 140. speaks of it as a strange thing useless and vain. But this I shall leave till I examine Mr. *Baxters* exceptions against me about the conditional covenant and sealing, onely I take notice of his words *Sect.* 79. *pag.* 141, *A conditional seal is not a seal till the condition be performed*, and infers, that if baptism be a conditionall seal, it is no seal, and consequently no sacrament to an infant untill he doth perform the condition.

" Mr *M.* adds, Now for the third thing the obligation which is put upon " the receiver, a bond or tie for him to perform, who is admitted to receive " the Sacrament, this third I say is also absolute, All circumcised and baptized persons did or do stand absolutely ingaged to perform the conditions " required on their part, and therefore all circumcised persons were by the " circumcision obliged to keep the Law, that is, the legall and typicall administration of the covenant which was then in force, and infants among the " rest, are bound to this though they had no understanding of the covenant, " or that administration of the Covenant when this seal was administred to " them.

Answer. It is true, God required that his covenant should be kept, which is expressed to be, *That every man child among the Hebrewes should be circumcised, Gen*, 17.9, 10. but this was the duty of the parents, not of the infants, who were to be circumcised not to circumcise. And it is true, *That all circumcised persons were by the circumcision obliged to keep the Law.* And if circumcision sealed this, its sealing of this was the sealing of a command not a promise of God, for they are not obliged to keep Gods promise (that is the work of God alone) but his precept, so that this sealing is not of the covenant of grace at all: yea by this sealing obliging to keep the whole Law, the covenant of works is sealed rather than the covenant of grace, as the Apostles speech shews, *Gal.* 5.2,3,4. And this sealing belongs to all infants and elder persons, for all are tied to perform the condition of the covenant, that is to repent and believe. And if hence be derived a title to baptism, either all are to be baptized because all are obliged to the condition of repentance and faith, or none are to be baptized but penitent & believing persons. To speak the plain truth, the right use of baptism is first to seal to God, testifying our repentance and faith by it, afore God seals to us by it any benefit of the covenant of grace. To conclude, Mr. *M.* hath not yet acquitted himself from putting a seal to a blank, which Mr *Calvin* counts a profanation of the Sacrament when he baptizeth an infant, who hath neither a promise of spiritual grace from God, nor doth perform the condition of the covenant, nor understand by baptism any thing of the covenant,

nor professe any accptance of the covenent, nor is or can be known to have any part in the covenant of grace, nor is there indeed any thing but vanity in this discourse of Mr. *M.* or the Pædobaptists doctrine about Sacraments being seals of the covenant of grace, and the interest of believers infants therein.

SECT. XXXII.

The exceptions in my Examen, part 4. Sect. 5. *against Mr* Ms *speeches about the covenant and conditionall sealing, are made good against Mr.* M. *and Mr.* Blake.

But that we may the better discern the vanity of Pædobaptists conceits about the seal and covenant, I shall enquire a little more into this point, in which I find much jangling and uncertainty among them. To which I conceive my self the more ingaged, because some words of mine in my *Examen, part 4. Sect.* 5. gave some overture to Mr *M.* and after to Mr *Bl.* and Mr *B.* to except much against me about this point. Two things which I said in that passage, it seems, are not relished; one, that I said that God seals not to every one that is baptized, but onely to true believers; the other, that making Gods promise in the covenant of grace conditional in this sense, that persons after agnize the covenant, and that to speak of it so as if it were common to the elect and reprobates, and conditionall in this sense, as if God left it to mens liberty to whom he had sealed, to agnize or recognize that sealing, or to free themselves if they please, and so nullifie all; yet so, as to afford them a while the favour and priviledge of being in covenant with him, is symbolizing with *Arminians*. To this Mr *M.* replied but little, yet what he saith in his *Defence*, pag. 236, I shall briefly answer. First, saith he, *Was not Circumcision Gods sign and seal, which by his own appointment was applied to all the Jewes and proselytes, and their children?*

Ans. Circumcision was appointed by God to be applied to all the Jews, & proselytes and their children being males of eight dayes old, and was by his institution a sign of the covenant made with *Abraham, Gen.* 17. *Abrahams* own circumcision in his own person, was, *a seal of the righteousnes of faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised*, but that God did by Circumcision seal to every one the righteousnes of faith who was rightly circumcised, I find not, nor if I did, should I think it were any thing to prove that God seals the righteousnes of faith to every one that is baptized rightly, sith I doe not take circumcision and baptism to be all one, or to have the same use, or that baptism seals in the same manner as circumcision. Mr. *M.* adds, *Did it ingage God absolutely to every one of them to write his law in their hearts, &c. Answer.* No. *And are not the Sacraments Signa conditionalia, conditionall signes and Seals?*

Answer. I conceive baptism, according to Christs institution, to be a sign of the faith of the baptized, and so it is a sign absolute, and not conditionall, and because the object of that faith is Christ dead and risen again, whereby we are justified, and baptisme as fitted to mind the baptized of Christs death, burriall and resurrection, *Rom.* 6. 2, 3, 4. *Col.* 2. 12. it is in its nature, that is in its right use, apt to seal, that is to assure justification and salvation,

vation, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. and so may be termed in its nature a seal aptitudinall; but yet it seals actually to none but those who truly believe, which it doth absolutely in respect of justification, and coditionally in respect of glorification, which is not yet attained, nor to be attained but upon condition of perseverance: yet it doth not seal that as an uncertain thing because conditionall, for even the condition also is assured by vertue of the death of Christ confirming the covenant of grace, or the New Testament in his blood. But when I say these things are actually assured by baptism, I do not conceive they are actually sealed by God, not to the true believer without the inward testimony or seal of the spirit, without which God never sealed actually by his word or Sacraments these promises of the covenant of grace or the persons interest in them, although both the word of God, the oath of God, the death of Christ, the ordinances of Baptism and the Lords Supper, are in themselves, or in their nature aptitudinall seals, that is, apt signs to assure them. The like I say of the Lords Supper, both which are alike signes and seals, neither to an infant without extraordinary operation. Mr *M.* adds,

And did any orthodox Divines before your self, charge this to be Arminianism, to say, that the Gospel runs upon conditions? I confesse it is Arminianism to say any thing is conditionall to God, this I never asserted, but that the Gospel is both preached, and by the Sacraments sealed to us upon condition of faith, will passe for orthodox doctrine when you and I are dead and gone.

Answer. I never charged this to be Arminianism, That *the Gospel runs upon conditions, that it is both preached and by the Sacraments sealed to us upon condition of faith*, according to the explication given. What I count symbolizing with the Arminians, I have before declared, to wit, Gods conditionall sealing and covenant common to elect and reprobates, as Mr *M.* in his *Sermon* seemed to conceive. To what I said that I did not well understand that God required of the Jewes infants to seal in their infancy, *I reply* saith Mr *M. But I hope you understand, that the infants were sealed in their infancy, and by this they received not only a priviledge to be accounted as belonging to Gods family, but it also obliged them to the severall duties of the covenant, as they grew up to be capable of performing them.*

Answer. I understand the Iewes were circumcised in their infancy, but that God did seal to every circumcised infant, either the truth of the promises, or his interest in them, or that they did in infancy seal to God, I do not yet understand. For though they had the priviledge mentioned, yet not by vertue of Gods sealing to them, and though they were obliged to the duties mentioned, yet not by vertue of their sealing to God.

But Mr. *Bl.* and Mr, *B.* are more earnest in this point, and in opposition to what I said in my *Examen, part* 4. *Sect.* 5. in his *Answer to my Letter* Mr *Bl. ch.* 15. asserts, *Sect.* 1. "The seals of the Sacrament are conditionall, not "absolute, Sect. 2. The entrance into covenant and acceptation of the terms "of it, is common to the elect and reprobate, a heart stedfast in the cove"nant, and the mercies of the conenant, are proper onely to the elect and "regenerate, *Sect.* 3. To say that the seals of the Sacraments are conditionall, "and that the reprobate are within the verge of the covenant, as tendered in "the Gospel, and accepted, is not to symbolize with Arminians. To "which I replied in my Postscript, *Sect.* 21. concerning which Mr. Bl. in his plain

" plain Scripture proof, &c. pag. 224. of the first Edition, saith, But to these " Mr. Bl hath fully answered Mr. T. though in his Apology he passeth over " much, and is not able to discern his meaning. For my part I speak impartially according to my judgement, I think there is more true worth in those " two or three leaves of Mr. *Blakes* book, in opening the nature of the co " venant, than in all Mr *Ts* book that ever he wrote about baptism.

And pag. 222. he chargeth me with two errors in *Apologie*, and saith of them, *I conceive these dangerous errors of Mr T. about the nature of the Covenant and Seals in generall, are the root of his error about baptism, or at least much strengthen it*, and there he takes upon him to refute them. Since that time Mr. *Bl* hath renewed his exceptions, *Vindic grat. ch.* 7. to which as touching upon Mr *B.* about the thing sealed, and manner of sealing, Mr *B.* hath replied in his *Apologie against Mr. Blakes Exceptions, Sect.* 60 *&c. pag* 115. Because of Mr *Bs* censure I have received the passages in Mr *Blakes answer to my Letter, ch.* 15. & in my *Postscript Sect.* 21. and leaving Mr. *B.* (who is no competent judge of my Writings, by reason of his prejudice against me and the cause I maintain) and others to conceive of my books as they please, I am not ashamed to profess, 1. That I discern no such true worth in Mr *Blakes* mentioned passages which open the nature of the covenant, but rather sundry that darken it, the shewing of which now would be but a digression. 2. That there is not one of the three positions set down by Mr *Blake*, which doth contradict any thing I said in my *Examen, part* 4. *Sect* 5. For I said not the Sacraments are Seals absolute, not conditionall; but that God seals not upon condition persons agnize the covenant, as Mr *M.* said in his *Sermon*, pag. 49, nor did I deny, that the entrance into covenant and acceptation of it, is common to elect and reprobate, but that Gods covenant of grace, or as I said before, his promise in the covenant of grace, is common to the elect and reprobates, and this was it which I termed symbolizing with Arminians, not that which Mr. *Blake* sets down. 3. That I do not find that I have need to make any further reply to Mr. *Blake* therein, nor to the six arguments he brings, *Vindic. Fœd. ch.* 7. to prove Sacraments sealing conditionally. And for the flings Mr *Blake* hath at some speeches of mine, I shall briefly return answer. Those words of mine, I like not to call the Sacrament a conditionall Seal, for that which seals doth assure, and supposeth the condition. In my apprehension, that which is called conditionall sealing, is not sealing, but offering or propounding, or representing: but about this I will not contend, Mr. *Bl.* leaving out the later words, thus opposeth, *Then our Lawyers have a long time deceived us, who have given us presidents (as they call them) for obligations under seal, so run in these words; The condition of this obligation is such, and after an indication of the condition, to conclude and close up all: then this present obligation to be void and of none effect, or else to stand in full force and vertue: Seals we see leave the condition to me doubtfull.* Whereto I reply.

Neither I nor the Lawyers do deceive Mr *Blake*, but he deceives himself, the words of the president do intimate that the validity of the obligation is conditionall, and is left doubtfull, not that the seal is conditionall, which doth absolutely assure or testifie the obligation: or, as the Lawyers speak, the act and deed of him that seals, which is not future, but present, and so not conditionall. Mr Bauer *apol. against* Mr Blake *Sect.* 77. I never heard of nor knew

knew a conditionall sealing in the world, though I have oft heard of the effects of obligation and collation of right to be conditionall, which are not onely separate from the terminus proximus *of sealing, but also are directly the effects of the covenant, promise, testament, &c. onely, and but remotely of the seals, inasmuch as that seal is a full owning of the testament of conveyance: yet such a thing as a conditionall sealing may be imagined.* In a word, a conditionall engagement, or obligation, is one thing, and frequent; a conditionall seal, or sealing, is another thing but unknown. There are other things at me as calumniating Mr. *M.* concerning his words, as symbolizing with the Arminians, which I shall acquit my self from in answering Mr *B.* and that *Mr Bs questionist and my self are both of one pitch both for knowledge and ignorance, and stand equally affected to Mr. Bl. both in respect of his person and opinions*; which intimate as if he were perswaded I were that questionist, whom I profess to be unknown to me, and were disaffected to Mr. *Blakes* person, though I knew not wherein I have shewed any disaffection to him, and for my knowledge or ignorance be it more or lesse, I hope it will appear in the conclusion, that God hath given me so much knowledge as to shew the vanity of *Mr Blakes* and *Mr Bs* pleas for Infant-baptism. And for his flirt or scoff at *the wide standing open of the door in my night Sacraments*, I think my actions justifiable in celebrating the Lords Supper at night as Christ did, with such notes as the Apostle made thereon in calling it the *Lords Supper*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 20. and relating it so distinctly, v. 23, 25. My admitting none but baptized persons after profession of faith, is justified by *Mr Blakes* own words, though somewhat misrepresenting my tenent, *Vindic. Fœd. ch.* 23. nor do I admit any one other profession to baptism than was done in the first times by men who had the Spirit of God to guide them; and if any be baptized in the night, it's justifiable by *Pauls* action, *Acts* 16. 33. His flings also which he hath, *Vindic. Fœd. ch.* 17. *p.* 126. shew the same Satyricall vein, when he saith, *I establish a new conditionall covenant against the New Testament light*, which I shall shew I establish in that sense, I do it according to plain New Testament light, and censures these words, the not teaching one another spoken of, *Heb.* 8. 11. is meant of that obscure teaching which was under the Law, *Apol. pag.* 154. *said somewhat Magisterially after my manner*, whereas neither could I well dilate then being straitned in time, and the exposition of that place there was but on the by, and enough was said by me in those words answerably to the occasion, and I conceived understanding men would gather the reason of my interpretation from those few words, which is, that the new covenant being there declared cõtradistinct to that in *Horeb*, as *the writing the laws in the heart* is mentioned to distinguish it from the writing in stone, so *the teaching* is mentioned to distinguish it from that obscure teaching which was under the Law, which I said not magisterially, nor any thing else, as *Mr. Bl.* miscensures me. This is enough, if not too much to answer these flirts of *Mr. Bl.*

Fourthly, I add, That I find sundry passages in *Mr. Bl.* which seem to me to speak to the same purpose with my words, as *Answer to my Letter, pag.* 99. that *Baptism assures actually when men doe believe*, pag. 102. out of *Mr. Ball*, *They that be truly in covenant obtained the highest blessings*, *p.* 106. *The covenant of Jeremies is no more than that promise*, Deut. 30. 6. *The Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed, that thou mayst love the Lord, &c.* And his words *Vindic. Fœd. ch.* 7. *pag.* 46. That *the Sacraments* [illegible] *seal*

seal to believers and penitent ones, are answered by Mr B: Apol. against Mr Bl. sect. 10, thus, I perceive Mr. T. and you are more of a mind than I was aware off.

SECT. XXXIII.

That it is no error as Mr Baxter calls it, but a Truth, That the Covenant of grace is made onely to the elect.

BUt that I may acquit my self of Mr. *Bs* charge of errors in these points, I shall answer first what he saith about my fifth imagined error, because as *Mr. B.* saith, *Appendix to his Aphorisms, pag. 66. It is in vain to enquire whether the Sacraments do seal absolutely or conditionally, till you first know well what it is that they seal.* And here I think it needfull to set down *Mr Bs* words against *Mr, Bl. in his Apol. p. 103. Sect. 52. Arg. 17.* "That doctrine which signifieth an unsealed covenant for giving right to the covenant of grace, is unsound. But such is Mr. *Blakes*, therefore no Scripture can be brought to prove such an outward covenant of Gods: And it is against the common reason and custome of men, that a second covenant should not be drawn to convey right to the seal of the first covenant, seeing right to covenants seals go together, and if there must be another covenant to give right to that, then by the same reason there must be another to give right to that, and another to that, and so *in infinitum*. To the Antecedent it is apparent that Mr. *Bl.* distinguisheth *ex parte Dei* between the outward and inward covenant. It is probable that he thus distributes them from the blessings promised, whereof some are inward, and some outward: for though he explain not himself fully, yet I know no other sense that it will bear. It is evident that his outward covenant hath no seal. For it is a covenant *de conferendis sigillis*. If therefore it have a seal, it is either the same which is promised, or some other: other I never heard of. They no where tell us what is the seal of their outward covenant: The same it cannot be, for the same thing cannot be the *materia fœderis*, or the legacie it self, or the benefit given, and the seal too of that covenant whereby it is given. And pag. 65. *Mr Bls* common phrase is, that they are [in the outward covenant] and what that is, I cannot tell, and *then proves*, that God makes no such outward covenant. From whence I inferr, 1, That *Mr. B.* had not cause to blame me for not disdaining *Mr Blakes* meaning when he understands him no better, 2, Nor to magnifie his writing so much, in which he finds so many flawes. 3. Nor to rest so much upon an imagined *ground of mens right to baptism by Gods promise or covenant grant* which the chiefest assertors of Pædobaptism cannot well tell what it is. 4. That by *Mr Bs* judgment there is no such outward covenant of God, as *Mr Bl.* and other Pædobaptists infer infant-baptism from, and for the inward covenant, or covenant of saving grace, *Mr M. Mr G.* and others, disclaim it as made to all the infants of believers. Let us view what *Mr B.* saith about the covenant sealed by baptism and its sealing. In his *Confut.* of my six imagined errors plain *Scripture proof, &c.* pag. 223, he thus speaks, *Error 5. Mr T. holdeth that the Covenant whereof Baptism is the seal, is the absolute covenant of grace made onely to the elect, Confutation. Many more mistakes he*

utters

utters in the way to this about the Covenant. This he publickly pleaded for in his Dispute, and alledged Dr. Twisse as affirming the covenant of grace to be absolute. To which I then answered, 1. That to thrust in mens names and words, when in disputation we are enquiring what the Scripture saith, was unseasonable and diverting. 2. That Dr. Twisse doth constantly in all his writings affirm, That the promises of remission of sin and salvation are conditionall, though the promise of the grace [I will take the hard heart out of their bodies &c] is absolute. This I dare affirm as having read six of Dr Twisse his books again and again. And then he adds somewhat of Dr. *Twisse*, which I leave to others to answer as they shall see cause.

Answer. That Baptism is the seal of the covenant is not my expression, except when I speak in answer to Pædobaptists according to their mind, and in what seal and manner I allow it, I have said before. What I said of Dr *Twisse* in the disputation, was neither unseasonable nor diverting, nor untrue. The dispute was (so far as I can gather from my memory and the notes I have of the dispute) whether the words *Deut.* 29. 13. did prove that God did make the covenant there with all that are said to enter into covenant, which I denied, and Mr. *B.* endeavoured to prove from the words [*and that he may be to thee a God*] and from *Deut.* 30. 6. where he promiseth to *circumcise the heart of them and of their seed*; which I proved could not be, sith the covenant of grace is made only to the elect, and it is absolute in that promise, *I will write my lawes in their hearts*, which is the same with circumcising the heart, and so could not be meant of all that entred into covenant, *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12 (which Mr *B.* since acknowledgeth in his letter to Mr. *Bedford* when he saith thus, *The Text seemes plainly to speak of their seed not in their infant estate but in their adult, Deut.* 30.) but of the elect onely, and in respect of that promise the covenant of grace is absolute, which I thought seasonable, no way diverting from the business to confirm by Dr. *Twisse* his authority, whose tenent Mr *B.* confesseth was, *That the promise of the first grace* [*I will take the hard heart out of their bodies, &c.*] *is absolute.* And to shew that I did Dr. *Twisse* no wrong, I shall alledge some words of his which I find in his *Animadversions on Corvinus his Defence of Arminius against Tilenus*, p. 235 *Negamus Deum pasisci fœdus gratiæ cum omnibus & singulis: dicimus hoc fieri solum cum electis*: that is, *We deny that God makes the covenant of peace with all and each, we say it to be made onely with the elect.* pag. 346. *At fœdus gratiæ absolutum est; quod & nube testimoniorum divinorum comprobatum damus*: that is, *But the covenant of grace is absolute, which also we prove by a cloud of testimonies.* But Mr. *B.* having given Dr *Twisse* a lash, on the by falls thus on me.

But Mr. T. his answer to me was, That the promise of saving grace is not conditional, and that though some parts of the covenant be conditionall, yet it is all together that is called the covenant, the leading promise being not conditionall, therefore the covenant is not conditionall, and that it was a grosse palpable error of me to say, That the promise of saving benefits was made to infants that were not elect.

Answer. My answer is the same now that it was then, and having upon occasion of this charge, reviewed the notes of the dispute, which though very imperfect, I have yet by me, I find not but that in the greatest part of the dispute, I answered Mr. *B.* rightly, though he prave most shamefully and unbrotherlike

misrepresented me to the world, and made a noyse in the world as if he had driven me to gross absurdities, which having acquitted my self from in my *Praecursor*, *Sect.* 17. he replies nothing to that Section, which I take to be a tacite confession of his unworthy abusing of me, And I do think it necessary to tell the world, that I find so little of brotherly love to me, or common ingenuity in his insolent carriages towards me at the Dispute, and his relations of me and of the Dispute in print, that I think I should have found better dealing from a Jesuite than from him. And though I take him to be a godly man, and an excellent Preacher and Writer in practicall points, yet I find him to be but a superficiall Disputer, and a slight interpreter of Scripture. But to the point.

Four things Mr. *B.* it seems mislikes in my answer, 1. That I said, *That the promise of saving grace is not conditionall.* To declare my self more fully, it is requisite I should shew what promise of saving grace I make not conditionall. There is the saving grace of redemption, regeneration, justification, remission of sins, adoption, glorification. The condition imagined as presupposed to the promise of saving grace, that is, to the fulfilling of it, is either the well using naturall abilities, as foregoing the promise of conversion and regeneration; or faith and repentance as foregoing justification, remission of sins, adoption, glorification. The promise of saving grace may be said to be conditionall in respect of these later saving graces, and the conditions mentioned, yet in respect of the promisers intention and act in the event, certain, necessary, and infallibly to be performed by the person to whom the promise is made, and in this sense I grant the promise of saving graces conditionall, that is, that God hath promised to none the saving graces of justification, remission of sins, adoption, but on condition of true repentance and faith; nor glorification but on condition of perseverance therein: yet that these conditions are not uncertain in the event, or left to the persons to whom the promise is made, to do by themselves, but by Gods intention and actings certainly to be accomplished; or it may be said to be conditionall, that is, so as that the condition of any of these graces is made the well using naturall abilities, or that the conditions of these later saving graces are uncertain in the event notwithstanding the promisers intention and acting, and thus I deny the promise of saving grace to be conditionall. More briefly, I deny the promise of regeneration and conversion, to presuppose some well using our naturall abilities, or that justification, remission of sins, adoption, glorification, are promised upon condition of our repentance, faith, obedience, perseverance, left by God to be performed by us, and not promised as certain in the event, which is the *Arminian* sense, yet deny that the promise of justification, remission of sins, is absolute, so as that God promiseth that an elect person shall be justified, or have remission of sins without a fore faith, which is charged on the *Antinomians*.

The second thing which Mr. *B.* mislikes in my Answer is, *That though some parts of the Covenant be conditional, yet it is all together that is called the Covenant.* But this speech if it be liable to exception, Mr. *B.* must except against the holy Ghost, who doth expresly call all together the covenant, *Heb.* 8. 10. saying, *This is the Covenant which I will make*, and having recited all together, he adds, v. 13. *in that he saith a new covenant.* And the like is *Heb.* 10. 16.

The third thing misliked in my answer is, *And the leading promise being not conditionall, therefore the covenant is not conditional.* But there is no just cause of excepting against this, sith it is usuall, and that according to a Logick Rule to determinate from the more famous part, or chief part, as a visible Church is called Holy, or of Saints, even in Scripture, 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. from the better part, a field of corn where is much tare. Do not Pædobaptists usually call the covenant *Gen.* 17. the covenant of grace, though there be other promises than of saving grace, and what promise is made of saving grace there, is made under the covert of words expressing other things. And to shew that there is reason for what I said, I urge, 1. That the promise of *writing the Lawes of God in the heart, Heb.* 8. 10. is not onely the leading promise, but also it is the comprehensive promise, including or inferring all the rest, for therefore God will be a God to them, be mercifull to their unrighteousnes, because he will write his Lawes in their heart; to those and those onely he promiseth the later to whom he promised the former. Yea, it seemeth to be the principall thing God aimed at in the new Covenant, to assure that he would not write his lawes in stone as he did before, but write them in their heart. 2. That where *Zacharias mentions Gods holy Covenant, and the oath he sware unto Abraham, Luke* 1. 72, 73. he puts it to be in this (which I take to be absolute) *that he would give to us, that being delivered from the hand of our enemies, without fear we should serve him in holiness and righteousnes before him all the dayes of our life, v.* 73, 74, 75.

The fourth thing misliked in my answer is, that I said, *That it was a gross palpable error of Mr. B. to say that the promise of saving benefits was made to Infants that were not elect.* If I understand Mr. *M.* he counted it a gross error, when he disclaimed this assertion, That *the covenant of saving grace is made to believers and their naturall seed. Defence of his Sermon, pag.* 116. and Mr. *G.* when in his *Vindic. Pædob* p. 12. he said of this conclusion, that infants are taken into covenant with their parents in respect of saving graces, *You know the conclusion in that sense is so manifestly against Protestants principles and experience, that no Protestant can hold it.* But Mr. *B.* it's like will not be convinced by mens sayings, let us try what we can do by Arguments

1. The promise of saving benefits is made onely to those to whom saving benefits are bestowed: But to elect infants onely they are bestowed. *Ergo.* The Major is manifest to them that acknowledge God to be true and faithfull, it being manifest falshood and unfaithfulnes to promise and not to perform. But it is certain by experience and Scripture that God saves none but the Elect. Therefore it is a gross and palpable error as charging God with lying to say, that his promise of saving benefits is made to infants not elect.

2. This is proved directly from the Apostles words, *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. which also strengthens the former argument, where he concludes that the promises of God must be understood as made to them only to whom they were performed, otherwise *the word of God should fall*, which he abhorres as blasphemy. But I argue further thus.

To them onely is the promise of saving benefits made, who are children of that promise, that God would be a God to them in respect of saving benefits, for to be the children of the promise there is manifestly meant of those to whom the promise of being God is meant, *Gen.* 17. 7: as is proved before,

fore, *Sect.* 28, 29. which the Apostle in that chapter understands of saving benefits, which I think will not be denied; if it were, it might be proved from *v.* 8 *&c.* But the elect onely are children of the promise, this is proved before, *Sect.* 28, 29, and might be proved from *v.* 11. *Ergo.*

3. *I* further argue from the same place; If any other than the elect Infants had the promise of saving benefits made to them; then all the naturall seed of *Abraham*, for no infants besides the elect, had more promises of saving benefits than they: But they all had not the promise of saving benefits made to them, the Apostle determines, that the promise was to *Ishmael* not *Esau*, but onely to *Isaac* and *Jacob*, *That the purpose of God according to election might stand, or be of him that calleth*, whom he will for the seed, *v.* 11. Therefore the promise of saving benefits is made onely to elect infants.

To the Allegation of this text, *I* find something said by *Mr. B. in his plain Scripture proof, &c. Part.* 2. *chap.* 1. 1. *There is no strong appearance of contradiction in this to what we have taught. For I willingly acknowledge, that they are not therefore the children of God, because they are the seed of Abraham, or others that were godly, but because they are the children of the promise.*

But *Mr.* B. clean mistakes the Apostles speech, for he conceives that all the naturall seed of *Abraham* were yeelded to be the children of God, but not because children of the flesh, but because children of the promise, as if he granted the thing, but denied the reason, whereas the Apostle denies the thing it self, affirming, that all the seed of *Abraham*, were not the children of God, *Rom.* 9 7, 8, and contradisting *the children of the promise to the children of the flesh*, which were non-sense if they were the same, and no distinction or opposition between them. As if a man say, not all natives but free-men are Citizens, he supposeth all natives are not freemen, and denies all natives who are not free-men, to be Citizens

Mr B. adds, I pray you observe, 1. *That which the Apostle here pleadeth, is, That salvation was not by the Covenant tied to all Abrahams seed.* To which I reply, This grants what I would evince, that the promise of saving benefites was not to all *Abrahams* seed, but only to the elect of them. But yet saith *Mr. B. he denieth not but Church-membership did for the time past belong to the generality of them. Now it is not the certain salvation, but the Church-membership of Infants that we are disputing for (in regard of the individuals*

Answer. Though it be the Church-membership of infants which Pædobaptists dispute for, and not the certain salvation, yet they would inferre their Church-membership from that Covenant which was a Covenant of salvation as it was Evangelicall. And this *Mr.* B. must yeild, who in the words forecited against *Mr. Bl.* denies an outward covenant giving right to the Seals, and asserts, *A right to Baptism as it is a benefit given directly by God from his promise, or covenant Apol. against Mr Bl p.* 80. which is no other than of saving grace, by which if salvation be not tied to all *Abrahams* seed, then that covenant is not the ground of their Church-membership, and right to the initiall seal, and consequently not to our Infants, for take away the Cause, the effect is removed, & so this text is directly against infant-baptism *and Church-membership.* Mr. B. adds,

2. *The Apostle disputeth not against the salvation or Church-membership of every one of Abrahams seed, (for many of his seed were after this saved) but a-*

gainst

gainst the salvation of the whole seed or posterity conjunctim. *But now Anabaptists dispute against the Church-membership visible of any infants.*

Answer. If the Church-membership visible of the whole seed or posterity *conjunctim* of *Abraham* be asserted (as it is by Mr. *B.*) from that covenant which the Apostle denies to belong to the whole seed or posterity *conjunctim* (which Mr. *B.* grants) he disputeth for the Anabaptists against the imagined visible Church-membership of all infants of true believers.

"3. Saith Mr. *B.* That which the Apostle mainly drives at, is, that men "are not therefore saved because they are *Abrahams* carnall seed (and conse- "quently not because they are the carnall seed of any other. And I say so too "with all my heart. But the Apostle doth not say, or mean, that *Abrahams* "seed should not be saved: for they shall again be called, and so all Israel "shall be saved, *Rom.* 11.) But onely that they are saved, not because they are "his seed, but because they are children of the promise: And so say we, That "the seed of the faithfull are Church-members, and Disciples and subjects of "Christ, not properly or directly because they are their seed (for so they are "no better than others: but because they are children of the promise; God "having been pleased to make the promise to the faithfull and their seed; and "having promised that the seed of the righteous shall be blessed; and that he "will be mercifull to them, and will take thm to be a people to him, and "he will be to them a God, and he hath pronounced them holy. *Isaac* was "*Abrahams* seed, and *Jacob* his, and yet not saved because his seed directly "and properly (yet remotely they were:) but because children of the pro- "mise.

Answer. Mr. *B.* in his passage shewes, he neither understood the Apostles scope nor answer, but according to his overly manner of handling Texts, perverts both. I grant that from the Apostles words it followeth, *That men are not therefore saved because they are Abrahams seed, and consequently not because they are the carnall seed of any other.* But it is manifest, and acknowledged by all Interpreters almost I meet with, that the Apostles scope is to answer an objection as the words v. 6. shew, That if the Jewes were rejected the word of God to Israel and *Abrahams* seed falls; which shews, that the objectors did not conceive God by covenant tied to save all *Abrahams* seed, and *Israel*, because he had by covenant tied himself to be a God to *Abraham* and his seed, *Gen.* 17.7. and therefore *Paul* did not rightly suggest, *Rom.* 9 1, 2, 3. as if they should be rejected. The clearing of the consistency of these two things, the truth of Gods promise, *Gen.* 17.7., and the Apostles intimation that the Jewes should be cast away, was his scope, not that which Mr. *B.* imagines the Apostle mainly drives at, to shew why the Jewes are saved, for the Apostle supposeth that they should not be saved, and to maintain it, answers the objection. Whence also it may be perceived, that Mr. *B.* quite perverts the Apostles answer: For he makes it to be this, 1. *That the Apostle doth not say, or mean, Abrahams seed should not be saved*, whereas it's the very occasion of the objection, that he determined that a great part, or the body or people of the Jewes, who were *Abrahams* seed, were then rejected, as his words shew, *Rom.* 9. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 31. & 10, 1, 2, 3, 21. & 11.7. 15. 17. 20, &c. and the Gentiles taken for Gods people in their stead: the searching of which was the great quarrell the Jewes had against *Paul* so that Mr *B.* makes *Paul* not to say that

which

which he did teach, and plainly intimated in that very place. 2. That *he onely sayes, that Abrahams carnall seed were saved, not because they are his seed, but because they are children of the promise*, which is both contrary to the Apostles supposition, which is, that they are not saved, and that because they are not children of God, nor children of the promise, though children of the flesh, and impertinent to the removing of the objection concerning the rejection of the Jewes, how it could stand with Gods promise. For the answer as Mr. *B.* makes it, had no way justified Gods truth, but strengthened the objection, if it were supposed they were children of the promise, whom yet *Paul* counted for castawayes. Nor do the Apostles words say the children of the flesh are saved though not because they are *Abrahams* seed, but that they are not the children of God, who were onely children of the flesh, not children of the promise, nor counted for the seed to whom the promise *Gen.* 17. 7. was made at all, as it was Evangelicall. As for what Mr. *B.* alledgeth, *That the Jewes shall be again called, and so all Israel be saved, Rom.* 11. *and therefore the Apostle doth not say, or mean, that Abrahams seed should not be saved*, it is inconsequent, for the Apostle might and did suppose the present should not be saved though hereafter the Jewes shall; it followes on the contrary, he supposed the present Jewes should be rejected, because he speaks of the calling and salvation of the Jewes, was a thing future, yet not *till the fulness of the Gentiles be come in*, in the mean time he saith, *blindness happened to them in part*. And for what he saith, that *God hath been pleased to make the promise to the faithfull and their seed*, he neither sheweth where that promise is, nor do I know where to find it, nor where *he promiseth to take them to be a people to him, and that he will be to them a God*, and for what he alledgeth, that the *seed of the righteous shall be blessed, and that God will be mercifull to them*, how little they make for the visible Church-membership of Gentile believers infants, will be shewed in answering *Chap.* 21, 22,, of the first part of his Book. And for Gods *pronouncing them holy*, he is fully answered, *Antipædob. part* 1. *Sect.* 235 &c. It followes in Mr. *B.*

"4 And observe further, That *Paul* here speaks not a word against the "priviledge of the infants whose parents deny not God, nor violate his Co- "venant, and fall not away. If any man should affirm, that all the infants of "the faithfull so dying, are certainly saved, there is not a syllable in this text "against him. For *Paul* onely pleads, that if men fall away and prove un- "believers, God will not save them beause *Abraham* (or any other remote "progenitor) was faithful. The covenant never intended this: But yet children "of those that fall not away, or be not broken off for unbelief, do lose none "of their privilledges, but may belong to the visible or invisible Church If a- "ny man should deny Christ, and yet think to be saved because they are En- "glishmen, or because their progenitors long since were faithfull; I should "use to them *Pauls* words here. But what is this to those who do not de- "ny Christ, and therefore are both Children of the flesh, and of the- "promise? Besides, those the Apostle here excludeth, were aged unbelievers, "so that this text hath not any colour either against baptism, or their Church "membership.

Answer. There is little truth in this passage, *Paul* speaks, *Rom.* 9, 6. 7, 8, &c. against the being in the Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 7. of *Abrahams* and *Isaacs* naturall seed, and therefore by consequence *against the Church membership and*

Baptism

Baptiſm of believers children by vertue of that covenant being made to them; and he excludes *Eſau* before he was born, and therefore other than *aged believers*, and if *Eſau* the ſon of *Iſaac*, no Apoſtate, were out of the covenant, and declared ſo afore he was born, then had he died in infancy, he had not bin ſaved, and ſo there is more than *a Syllable* in this Text againſt him, who ſhould affirm, *That all the infants of the faithfull ſo dying, are certainly ſaved*; for this Text affirms ſome infants of the moſt holy believers, are not in covenant, and if not in covenant, not certainly ſaved, but certainly reprobate. The children of thoſe who fall not away, have no ſuch *priviledge, that they do certainly belong either to the inviſible or viſible Church*. If there may be infant-children of believers who may be children of the fleſh and not children of the promiſe, then the promiſe of ſaving benefits is not made to any other than the elect, for ſure it is made to none other of other believers, if it be made onely to the elect ones of *Abraham* and *Iſaac*. I go on.

4. The promiſe which is *in Chriſt Yea and Amen*, Is made onely to the Elect, for it is not *Yea and Amen* to any other, ſith it is not ratified & accompliſhed to any other. But the promiſe of ſaving benefits is *in Chriſt Yea and Amen*, for ſo are as many promiſes as are in Chriſt, 2 *Cor.* 1. 20. and ſuch is the promiſe of ſaving benefits. *Ergo.*

5. Thoſe promiſes which were made *to Chriſt*, were made onely to the Elect, for whether Chriſt perſonall be meant the promiſes were made to him onely for thoſe whom he repreſents, and they are onely the elect, or Chriſts myſticall body that is his Church, they are the elect onely: But the promiſe of ſaving benefits *made to Chriſt*, *Gal.* 3. 16. *Ergo.*

6. The promiſe which is of the Covenant *confirmed unto Chriſt*, is onely to the elect: But ſuch is the promiſe of ſaving benefits, *Gal* 3. 17. *Ergo.*

7. The *promiſe which is of eternall life*, is made onely to the elect: But ſuch is the promiſe of ſaving benefits, *Tit.* 1. 2. *Ergo.*

8. To whom the promiſe of ſaving benefits is made, are *Heirs of the Promiſe*: But they are only to the elect, for to *the Heirs of promiſe Gods counſell is ſhewed to be immutable for their ſalvation*, *Heb.* 6. 17. But ſo it is onely to the elect. *Ergo.*

9. Thoſe promiſes *by which we are made partakers of the Divine Nature*, are made onely to the elect: But ſuch are the promiſes of ſaving benefits, 2 *Pet.* 1. 4. *Ergo.*

10. The promiſe of that *Covenant* is made onely to the elect, *of which Chriſt is ſurety*, for Chriſts ſuretiſhip engageth him to perform it, and he performs it onely to the elect, therefore he is ſurety of the covenant onely for the elect: But the promiſe of ſaving benefits is *of that covenant of which Chriſt is ſurety*, *Heb.* 7. 22. *Ergo.*

11. That covenant which is confirmed by Chriſts blood, is made onely with the elect, for it was ſhed for them onely. But ſuch is the new covenant, or covenant of grace, *Matth* 26 28. *Ergo.*

12. That covenant which is different from the firſt covenant in that *it is not an occaſion of complaint in that it was broken, and they continued not in it*, is made onely to the elect: But ſuch is the new covenant, or covenant of grace, *Heb.* 8. 7, 8, 9. *Ergo.*

13. The covenant which ingageth God *to write his lawes in the hearts of*

those to whom it is made, is made onely to the elect, for God doth this onely to them: But such is the new covenant, or covenant of grace, *Heb.* 8. 10. & 10. 16. *Ergo.*

14. The covenant of which *Christ is Mediator*, is made onely to the elect, for he is mediator for them onely, sith he prayes for them onely, *John* 17. 9, *And he is Mediator of the new covenant, that by means of death they which are called might receive the promise of eternall inheritance*, *Heb* 9. 15. But such is the new covenant or covenant of grace, *Heb.* 12. 24 *Ergo.*

15. That covenant which is an *everlasting Covenant*, is made onely to the elect, for the covenant with reprobates is not everlasting. But such is the new covenant, or covenant of grace, *Heb* 13. 20. *Ergo*

16 That in which are *given the sure mercies of David*, is made onely to the elect, for no other have them given to them: But such is the new covenant, or covenant of grace, *Isa.* 55. 3. *Ergo.*

17. That covenant which engageth God *to give to them to whom it is made, deliverance from all enemies, and to serve God in holiness and righteousness before him all the dayes of their life without fear*, is made onely to the elect, for to them onely God performs it: But such is the covenant of grace, *Luke* 1. 73, 74, 75. *Ergo*

That covenant which assures perseverance to them to whom it was made, is made onely to the elect, for they onely persevere: But such is the new covenant of grace, *Isa.* 54 9, 10. *Jer.* 32. 40. *Ergo.*

19. If the covenant of grace be made with other than the elect, then it is the absolute or conditionall covenant, as Mr *B*, distinguisheth; but neither: Not the first, as Mr *B.* confesseth; nor the conditionall, for it is made onely with believers, and they are onely the elect. I grant it is *propounded*, as Dr *Twisse* speaks, *Animad. in Corinth. Defens. pag.* 235. or as others say, offered or tendered to others, but made with the elect. *Ergo.*

If the covenant of grace be made to any other than to the elect, then with all, which seeme to be Mr. *B*s opinion, when he saith, *Plain Scripture Proof, &c. pag:* 316, *The new Covenant is conditionall and universall.* But it is not made withall. That covenant which was made with all, had *Adam* for the common head, but the new covenant was not made with *Adam* as the common head, but with Christ who is *given for a covenant of the people*, *Isai.* 49. 8. and therefore the promise was, that *the seed of the woman should break the Serpents head*, *Gen.* 3. 15. which Mr *B* most corruptly interprets, *Of the whole seed of the woman, infants as well as others. Plain Scripture proof, &c. part.* 1. *Chap.* 24. *pag.* 69, but it is true primarily or onely of Christ, *Heb.* 2. 14. But Christ is not a common head to all, but onely to the elect, who *are chosen in him*, *Eph.* 1. 3, 4. *Ergo*

I omit the Arguments which Doctor *Twisse* urgeth in his *Animadversions on Corinus*, *pag.* 346. *Answer to M. Hoard*, *pag.* 283. 286. *Doctor Kendall*, *Vindic. part* 3. *ch.* 18. *pag.* 14, 15, and hasten to consider what Mr *B.* saith further against me.

And he saith in his *Examen* and *Apology*, that Mr *M.* speakes like *Corinus* and the Arminians, in his asserting the conditional sealing, and when he talks of the Covenant, Christs suretiship, &c. To which I answer, A [illegible] many hotspurs of this age do make any thing Arminianism, which is but

" but contradictory to Antinomianiſm. I will not ſay Mr *T.* is an Anti-
" nomian, for I think he is not; but this opinion, that the covenant of grace,
" which baptiſm ſealeth, is onely to the elect, and is not conditionall, is one
" of the two Maſter-pillars in the Antinomian Fabrick.

Anſwer. 1. If any Antinomian or Antipædobaptiſt hath been in this age a verier hot-ſpur than Mr *B.* let him be diſciplin'd at *Bedlem*: For my part I know none that hath in his Writings ſhewed ſo much heat (call it fury or zeal as you pleaſe) with ſo much confidence and peremptorineſs, and ſo many miſtakes againſt Antinomians, Antipædobaptiſts, and others, as he hath don. And ſurely they want not conſiderate men that fear leſt the eſteem he hath gotten by his practical Writings, and for infant-baptiſm, and the Miniſtery, may occaſion the ſwallowing down of ſome things he vents about univerſall redemption, univerſall covenant of grace, uncertainty of perſeverance, and ſalvation, the condition of juſtification, which without more than a grain of ſalt will turn to Arminianiſm and Popery, if received by ſuch underſtandings as are not of good concoction. Nor do I know any man who under ſo great a ſhew of ſeeking truth and peace in the Church, hath more hindred both. For that which he ſaith, That *this opinion that the covenant of grace is onely to elect, and is not conditionall, is one of the pillars of Antinomianiſm.* I have made ſome ſearch into my books, and made uſe of my memory, and though I find that in the Synod at *New Town* in *New England*, *Auguſt* 30, 1637, this is made the 81 *Error* of the Antinomians, That *where faith is held forth by the Miniſtery as the condition of the covenant of grace on mans part, as alſo evidencing juſtification by ſanctification and the activity of faith, in that Church there is not ſufficien. bread.* And in other books they are charged with error in holding the covenant of grace abſolute, ſo as if by it men were exempted from duty, they were juſtified without faith, &c. Yet I never to my remembrance heard this charged with Antinomianiſm, that the covenant of grace is made onely to the elect, but find it avouched by many of their beſt Antagoniſts; and the covenant of grace is held by able Anti-Arminians unconditionall in theſe two ſenſes, 1. That God requires no condition from us to be performed by our power, but what he requires of us to do, he promiſeth to works in thoſe to whom he makes promiſe in that covenant. 2 That in the covenant of grace God requires no condition which is of an uncertain event, but to thoſe to whom he makes his promiſes of righteouſneſs, forgiveneſs, eternall life, he alſo by covenant aſſures repentance, faith, and perſeverance: and therefore though ſome propoſals of the covenant of grace be conditionall, yet no promiſe as it ſtands in the entire covenant, is conditionall: and therefore the covenant and all the promiſes to be termed abſolute and conditionall.

" Mr. *B.* adds, 2. But to theſe Mr *B.* hath fully anſwered Mr. *T.* and fully
" cleared Mr *M.* and himſelf from the charge of ſymbolizing with the Ar-
" minians, and hath fully proved, that the entrance into covenant, and ac-
" ceptation of the term of it (though not ſincerely and unreſervedly) is com-
" mon to the elect and reprobate; and that the reprobate are within the verge
" of the covenant, as tendered in the Goſpel, and accepted (as beforeſaid
" with a half heart.) And if any that are run into the other extream, ſhall
" think that this affirming that [Chriſt hath brought the reprobate alſo into
" the covenant of grace conditionall] be any part of the Arminian errors,

"as the whole Scripture is against them, so Mr. *Blake* hath said enough to "satisfie.

Answer. What Mr *Blake* asserted and took upon him to prove, did neither contradict what I said, nor vindicate Mr *M.* who said in his *Sermon pag.* 49. 1. *That God did seal to Infants presently, and put their name into the Deed.* 2. *That in the mean time untill they come to years of discretion, Jesus Christ who is the surety of the covenant, Heb.*7.22. *and the surety of all the covenanters, is pleased to be their surety.* 3. *That God accepts of such a seal on their parts as they are able to give in their infant age, expecting a future ratification on their part, when they are come to riper years.* 4. *That in the mean time he affords them the favour and priviledge of being in covenant with him.* 5. *When they are grown men, they may refuse to stand to this covenant, and nullifie all.*

These things I count symbolizing with Arminians, to say that infants who may and do when they come to age, refuse to stand to this covenant, are for a while afforded by God the favour and priviledge of being in covenant with him, even in that covenant of which Jesus Christ is their surety, and that for a while Jesus Christ is their surety which contains three points of Arminianism, 1. That God affords them the favour of being in covenant with him in that covenant of which Christ is surety, who are reprobates. 2. That Christ is their surety. 3. That they may be thus in covenant for a time onely. To say that any is afforded the favour of being in covenant with God who may be so for a time, and that Christ is surety for such covenanters, is to hold that God makes this new covenant with other than the elect, and that Christ is surety for them, is to hold that the new covenant is made with all, and that it doth not assure effectuall calling and perseverance, but is upon an uncertain condition left to mans will, which are condemned as the Arminians errors on the second and fifth Articles, by the *Deputies of Gelderland Act Synod. Dordr. Judic. Theol. Prov. pag.* 131. *Of South-Holland pag.* 141, 142. *Of North-Holland, pag* 154. *Of Zealand, pag.* 259. *Of Utrecht, pag.* 162, 163, 171. *Of Friesland, pag.* 181, *&c. Profess. Delg pag.* 309. *Disput. Geld. pag.* 324. *Transisul. pag.* 371, and others.

And whereas Mr. *Bl. Vindic. Fœd. pag.* 39. chargeth me with misciting *Corvinus*, I confesse I have not now his book by me, having lost it, yet such remaining notes as I have by me, do give me cause to think there is somewhat to that purpose in or neer the place, and however it is carried on, *Corvinus* by the Deputies at the Synod of *Dort*, in his *Defence of Arminius against Tilenus*, and by Dr. *Twisse* in his *Animad.* pag. 346. and generally charged on the Arminians by other Authors forecited: And though I count Mr *M.* far from Arminianism, yet I again say, the speeches he used do symbolize with their language. Mr. *B.* adds,

He that will deny Reprobates to be so far within the covenant of grace, must not onely deny Infant-baptism, but all Sacraments, till he be able infallibly to discern a man to be elect. And doubtless this interest in the covenant is a fruit of Christs death.

Answer. I deny not but Reprobates may be in the covenant of grace in this sense, they may have it tendred to them by the preachers of the Gospel, they may accept of that tender with half an heart, they may think themselves to be in it, they may by baptism engage themselves to believe unto the death, they

may

may be received into the Church, deemed to be really in the covenant of grace? But it is not true that God ever made the new covenant to or with them, or that Christ as a mediator brought them into the covenant of grace, or was surety of them, or that God afforded them for a time the favour of being in covenant with him. And though I deny not that it is a fruit of Christs death, that whosoever believeth on him should live, yet that this is not obtained for the reprobate, but the elect; nor a part by it self, but together with this, that *he should gather into one the Children of God that were scattered abroad*, John 11, 52. And *that they which are called might receive the promise of eternall inheritance*, Heb. 9.15. Nor need I by these assertions of mine deny Baptism or the Lords Supper to any man till I be able to discern him infallibly to be a man elect. For I have warrant to baptize him if he shew by his profession that he is a Disciple of Christ, and though I knew infallibly he were one of those whom God would save, and had promised saving grace to him, and in that sense were in the covenant of grace, yet for the present not a Disciple, I shou'd justifiably refuse to baptize him. And this is a sufficient plea why we baptize not infants of believers, because they are not then Disciples, no not though it could be proved God had promised to be their God.

Mr. B. adds, Mr T. *one day in the pulpit in pleading that the covenant belonged onely to the elect, was pleased to bring me in as witnessing thereto, in the Append. of my Aphor. pag. 43. because I there say, that the absolute promise, or prophesie there mentioned is made onely to the elect; when yet onely the very scope of the place is to prove that it is not the absolute promise that is most fitly called the Covenant of grace.*

Answer. My alledging Mr *Bs* words was right and pertinent: For they acknowledged the promise *Heb.* 8. 10, to be absolute, and to the elect onely, which was enough for my purpose, and this the Author of that Epistle calls *the new Covenant* or *Testament*, and however, Mr *Bs* conceit is I have proved before the holy Ghost doth make it to be the Covenant of God, and therefore I deem it fitly be called the covenant of grace, chusing to speak as the Scripture speaks, rather than as Mr *B.* conceives fittest.

SECT. XXXIX.

Mr *Baxter hath not proved that the absolute promise or covenant is not it that is sealed in Baptism and the Lords Supper.*

HE adds, *But that this absolute Promise, or Covenant (if you will call it so) is not it that is sealed in Baptism and the Lords Supper, I prove against Mr T. thus, clearly.*

Answer. He should prove nothing against me though he should prove neither the absolute nor conditional promise to be sealed in baptism and the Lords Supper. For though it be true, that in some sense I grant Baptism and the Lords Supper to seal the covenant of grace, yet in the sense and to the purposes Pædobaptists use to say the covenant is sealed by them, I reject it, and can freely yeild that the use of Baptism and the Lords Supper is not to seal Gods Covenant either absolute or conditionall to us, except by remote consequence,

quence, but to signifie our duty of engaging our selves to be Christs Disciples in Baptism, and to remember his death in the Lords Supper. But Mr *B.* disputes in this is against himself, in that his arguments will overthrow his own assertion of infant-baptism, and against his fellow Pædobaptists, who make baptisme to seal the promise of Regeneration from *Titus* 3. 5, and the promise of being a God to *Abraham* and his seed from *Gen.* 17. 7. which the Apostle *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. makes absolute, and appropriates to the elect. I need not cite again Pædobaptists speeches, making baptism the seal of Regeneration, and of the Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 7. having cited before, *Sect.* 30, sundry, to wit, the *Assembly* in the *Directory*, *Mr M. &c.* *In the Assembly at Wistminster their confession of faith, chap.* 28. *Baptism is ordained by Jesus Christ to be to the baptized a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of Regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ to walk in newness of life.* *Artic.* 27 *of the Church of England.* *Baptism is a sign of Regeneration or Newness, whereby as by an instrument they that receive baptism rightly are graffed into the Church, the promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God, by the holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed.* In the *French Confess. Artic.* 35. *By Baptism, as by a certain and stable seal, this promise is sealed, that Christ will be to us sanctification and justification.* In Mr *Gataker's* two books against Dr *Davenant*, there are so many passages out of the chiefest Protestant Writers which do make baptism the sign and seal of Regeneration, and of the promise of it, that it would be tedious to transcribe them, I shall poynt at some pages wherein they may be found. *Discept. de vi bapt. infant.* pag. 23, 52, 110, 117, 118. *Strict.* in *Daven. Ep.* pag. 76, 77, 78. There is one passage which he cites often out of *Vorstius*. *That the Gospel Preachers are wont to acknowledge one onely generall effect of Baptism, to wit, the sealing of a double saving grace promised in the Gospel concerning the remission together and the purging out of sins by the Blood and Spirit of Christ, which is by inward renovation, which is absolutely promised.* Yea Mr *Gataker*, a man deservedly much valued by Mr *B.* *Discept. de bapt. infant.* saith, *That Baptism doth equally if not primarily design internall renewing, regeneration, mortification, quickning, which in that sign are not onely most clearly shadowed, but also painted, both the thing it self doth lowdly speak, and the holy Scripture doth most expressly, Rom.* 6. 3, 6. *Col.* 2. 11, 12. *Tit* 3. 5. *Eph.* 5. 25. And though all express not the sealing of regeneration alike by baptism, some placing it in the assuring to the conscience, some in the giving of title, some of regeneration already given, some of regeneration to be attained in time, yet all make it the seal of that covenant wherein God promiseth it, and do commonly distinguish it from the Lords Supper, which they make the seal of growth as they do baptism, of new-birth and entrance into the Church. So Mr *M.* in his Sermon, p. 43, 51. But let us hear what Mr *B.* opposeth,

" 1, That which is sealed to by the Sacrament, is a proper covenant, ha-
" ving a restipulation on our parts as well as a promise on Gods part. But
" an absolute promise is not a proper covenant with such a mutuall engage-
" ment, but properly a meer promise or prophesie, therefore it is not this ab-
" solute promise which is sealed by the Sacraments. The Major M. T. can-
" not deny; for he pleaded it himself in the pulpit as a reason to prove that
" Infants might not be baptized, because they could not engage themselves.

And

" And he brought that passage in my foresaid Appendix, pag. 68. as attesting it, where I say it is a mutuall engaging sign or seal: As it is given it is " Gods seal, as it is accepted it is ours. And indeed the very definition of a " proper Covenant (of which *Grotius de jure belli*, and other Lawyers, will " inform you) sheweth as much that it must be a mutuall engage- " ment. Now in that absolute promise [*I will take the hard heart out of their* " *bodies &c.*] There is no such matter, but onely God telleth what he " will do.

Answer. According to my own judgement I use not to term Sacraments Seals of the Covenant, nor did I urge Mr *Bs* words otherwise than as an Argument *ad hominem*, to prove from his own words, that infants have not baptism rightly according to his own grants. 1. because there is no restipulation on infants part, therefore there is no covenant properly so called between God and them, and so baptism of Infants is not a seal of a covenant, and consequently according to the supposition of Pædobaptists, no Sacrament. 2. *Baptism is* saith Mr *B. a mutuall engaging sign or seal, as it is given it is Gods seal, as it is accepted it is our*: But in infant-baptism there is no mutuall engagement or signing. Infants promise nothing, nor sign or accept of any thing, *Ergo* infant-baptism is not, according to Mr *Bs* own grants, right; nor are these objections avoided by saying the parents covenant for them: for neither is there any the least ground or hint in Scripture that for baptismall covenanting the parents covenant should go for the childs covenant, nor do in the practice of baptizing the parents restipulate though they declare their faith, and if they should promise or engage for the child, they should sin, and so should and have those that have promised as sureties the infant should believe and obey Christ, which they have not been able to perform, but have taken on them Christs prerogative, *Heb.* 7. 22. Nor is the baptism of the infant his sign or seal, he being meerly passive, as they say, and so doing no act, nor engaging thereby, and if the parent do engage for the child, the parent should be baptized for the child, if baptism be the baptized party his seal. But as I said, I do not call baptism a seal of the covenant, and therefore am not tied at all to answer this Argument, except to shew the fucility of it. For which end, 1. the mann r of speech is liable to exception in the use of the term *Proper Covenant*] which I imagine Mr. *B.* useth unskilfully for *Properly so called*. 2. There is no proof of the *Major*, from this, that *Baptism* or *the Sacrament is a mutuall engaging sign or seal*. For that proves rather that baptism or the Sacrament it self is a proper covenant, than that that which is sealed by the Sacraments is a proper Covenant. 3. Nor doth it follow, That *if the very definition of a proper Covenant be, that it must be a mutuall engagement*, that which is sealed by the Sacraments must be a proper covenant, but onely proves that upon supposition, that the covenant sealed to by the Sacraments, must be a proper covenant, that then it must be with restipulation or mutuall engaging. 4. though Lawyers do determine that a covenant properly so called, is a mutuall engagement, yet this proves not that which in Scripture is termed the covenant which they say baptism seals, is such. Yea, in all the places (that I know) where the covenant of grace is mentioned, there is no restipulation at all mentioned, neither *Gen.* 17. nor *Jer.* 31. nor *Luke* 1. nor *Heb.* 8 & 10. But where there is a restipulation, it is rather the covenant of the Law than of the Gospel. 5. That which

which is a meer propheſie or promiſe, is as properly בריח & διαθήκη, which we tranſlate *Covenant*, as a mutuall engagement, as I ſhall ſhew hereafter againſt Mr. *Bl.* 6. Nor do I know why that may not be a mutuall engagement if the abſolute promiſe were ſealed to by the Sacrament as well as if the conditionall. For if the engagement in the conditionall covenant on Gods part is, that if he believe he ſhall be juſtified; and on mans part, that he will believe: or rather in baptiſm he teſtifies, he doth believe. The abſolute promiſe is to give faith: Is not God and Man in like manner engaged by baptiſm in ſealing this as well as the other? 7. I know not how it can be truly ſaid, That *Baptiſm as given is Gods ſeal, and as accepted Mans ſeal.* For neither doth God give baptiſm to be accepted but his promiſe, nor is the baptized ſaid to accept baptiſm, but the promiſe. Nor is there any act of God which may be called his Seal, but he covenants, and I preſume they will not confound Covenant and Seal. 8. Nor doth the infant accept, or ſeal, or engage, and therefore in infant-baptiſm there is no covenant or ſeal. 9 By this deſcription of Mr. *B.* there ſhould be a mutuall ſeal, and ſo a ſeverall ſeal, and not baptiſm Gods and Mans ſeal too. For according to the manner of ſealing Covenants which are mutuall as the one party ſeals with his own ſeal, ſo the other party ſeals with his own diſtinct ſeal; and ſo if baptiſm be Gods ſeal, the party baptized ſhould have another ſeal to ſignifie his engagement.. 10. Mr. *B.* tells me, that *Grotius de jure belli, and other Lawyers will inform me, that the very definition of a proper Covenant is, that it muſt be a mutuall engagement.* But he doth not tell me where it is in *Grotius*, nor in what other Lawyer. I have lightly looked over the 11. Chapter of the ſecond book of *Grot. de jure belli ac pacis*, which is, *de promiſſis*, and ſome other following, and find not that which Mr. *B.* ſaith, but find ch. 11. ſect. 5. that he determines that *of an infant is no promiſe, becauſe the uſe of reaſon is required to a promiſe*, and therefore in infant-baptiſm there is no reſtipulation or mutuall engagement, and ſo no proper covenant by Mr *B.* his doctrine. But what ever other Lawyers ſay, I am miſtaken if it be not uſuall with the Lawyers in conveyances to uſe this expreſſion, That the ſeller is ſaid to covenant to and with ſuch a perſon, who makes no reſtipulation or reciprocall engagement. And both in the Scottiſh covenant, and in our ſolemn League and Covenant, I find covenanters engaged to do many things without any reſtipulatiun or reciprocall engagement, and therefore do not conceive it neceſſary to a covenant that it be a mutual engagement, or with reſtipulation. Mr. *B.* adds,

2. *If it were the abſolute promiſe of the firſt grace that is ſealed by the Sacraments, then the Sacraments muſt be given to no man, or to all men: but that is abſurd, therefore ſo is the former. The conſequent is manifeſt, becauſe that abſolute promiſe or propheſie is onely of the elect, and that before regeneration. Now no man hath any ſign given him, ſo much as probable by which to judge of the unregenerate elect, ſo that it muſt either be given to all or none.*

Anſwer. The whole frame of this Argument depends on theſe miſtakes, 1. That a perſon hath title to baptiſm by vertue of its intereſt in Gods covenant of grace, and that accordingly a Miniſter is to baptize. 2. That a probable ſign of ſuch intereſt warrants the baptiſm of the party ſo intereſſed, which I have often proved to be falſe, and that nothing but manifeſt diſciplelhip certainly known to the baptizer, warrants him to do it. And indeed if we muſt

baptize

baptize according to that rule of persons interest in the covenant, probably signified. Salvages in *New England* are to be baptized upon the probable signes they give of being wrought upon by a Sermon afore they know and profess the faith of Christ, and few or no infants are baptized, there being either no sign given to any man of their being in covenant, or at most but of very few of the baptized.

Mr. B. *Ap. to his Aphor. p. 70. If a Minister adventure to administer it upon probability, then should he be guilty of prophaning the ordinance.*

3. Saith *Mr B. Or we may argue thus: It may be known to whom that covenant belongs which is sealed by the Sacraments. But it cannot be known (before the fulfilling, no not at all) to whom (particularly) that absolute promise doth belong; therefore that absolut promise is not it which is sealed by the Sacraments.*

Answer. 1. By denying the *Major.* 2. By retorting the argument thus, It may be known to whom that covenant belongs which is sealed by the Sacraments: But it cannot be known ordinarily in this to whom (particularly) the conditionall promise of the covenant of grace belongs, for to none (particularly) besides the elect belongs the promise of justification, adoption and glorification. Therefore the conditionall promise is not it which is sealed by the Sacraments.

"4. Saith Mr. *B.* If (according to Mr *T.* his judgement) that absolute "promise must be fulfilled to a man before he be capable of receiving the Sa- "craments which are seals of the covenant of grace, then is it not that abso- "lute promise which is the covenant of grace sealed to by the Sacraments: "But according to Mr. *T.* his judgment) that absolute promise must be fulfil- "led to a man before he be capable of (a right) receiving the Sacraments, "which are seals of the covenant of grace: Therefore it is not that abso- "lute promise which is the covenant so sealed to. The Antecedent is evident, "if you consider, 1. That it is the promise of the first renewing grace which "we speak of (for all after grace is promised conditionally.) 2. That Mr. "*T.* pleadeth that believers onely are disciples, and such disciples onely must "be baptized. 3. That faith is a part of this first grace absolutely promised "(as is commonly judged) The giving of a new soft heart, is the giving the "seed of all graces, and so of faith. The consequence is evident, be- "cause the mercy promised in the covenant which is sealed, is not given be- "fore the first sealing: But the mercy promised in that absolute promise is "(according to Mr. *T.* and in part the truth) given before the first sealing "of the Covenant of grace; therefore, &c. God doth not promise a Seal "to a man that hath a new heart to give him a new heart, or to a man "that is a believer, that he will give him to be a believer; except we speak of "the continuance or increase of faith and newnesse which is not the thing "in question.

Answer. The consequence of this argument may be denied, and the reason of it also: For according to the Apostle, *Abraham received the sign of Circumcision, a seal of the righteousnesse of faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised,* Rom. 4. 11. If then the sealing of the covenant of grace by baptisme be the same with the sealing of the righteousnesse of faith by circumcision, Rom. 4. 11 (which is the common regent of many Pædobaptists, who from this Text draw a definition

definition of Sacraments, though falsly, as is shewed before) then the mercy promised in the covenant which is sealed, is given before the first sealing. Yea, if the conditionall covenant be sealed to believers now, justification which is the mercy promised in the covenant which is sealed, is given before the first sealing. For a man is justified actually as soon as ever he believes, as I am confident *Mr. B* wil grant: But he is not regularly baptized till after his believing, therefore a believer is justified, and consequently the mercy promised in the first covenant which is sealed, is given before the first sealing, That *all after grace is promised conditionally*, is said by *Mr. B.* without proof, and how inconsistent it is with the promises of perseverance, how much it undermines the doctrine of the Saints perseverance, how it disables the godly to plead the promises, and takes away their comforts when they are sensible of their failings, if the after graces of recovery after falls, and perseverance to the end, be promised conditionally, I need not shew it here, sith Dr. *Owen* hath done it amply in his Treatise of *Perseverace, ch.* 4, 5, *&c.* Dr. *Kendall* in his *sancti sanciti, ch.* 3, and wou'd be here a digression.

5. Saith *Mr. B. The benefits of the Covenant of grace which are sealed by the Sacraments, are (by those of age) to be received by faith. But the benefits of the absolute promise of the first grace are not to be received by faith: Therefore this is not the covenant of grace so sealed. The Major is evident: Mr. T. saith, one-ly believers must be baptized as disciples: The Minor is proved before. Faith is part of the thing promised, and we do not by faith receive our first faith, or our power to believe.*

Answer. It is not I onely, but *Mr. B.* himself, who speaks in effect what I say, *Plain Script. proof, &c. pag.* 299, 300. of the first edition when he saith, "That in the institution, and every example of baptism through all the "Bible, the first grace is prerequisite as a condition, is undeniable, as might "be manifest by a recitall of the particular Texts could we stay so long upon "it. *John* required a profession of repentance in those he baptized. Jesus "first made them Disciples, and then by his Apostles baptized them, *John* 4. "1. The solemn institution of it as a standing ordinance to the Church, "which tells us fully the end is in *Matth* 21. 19, 20. Go and disciple me all "Nations, baptizing them; &c. Now for the aged, a disciple and a belie-"ver are all one, *Mark* 16 16. He that believeth and is baptized shall be sa-"ved, *Acts* 2. 38. Repent and be bap ized every one, &c. 41 They that "gladly received his word were baptized, *Acts* 8. 12, 13. The Samaritans "believed and were baptized both men and women. *Simon* himself believed "and was baptized, *Acts* 8. 36, 37. If thou believest with all thy heart thou "maist (be baptized) and he answered, I believe, &c. *Paul* believed upon "*Ananias* instruction, and then was baptized, *Acts* 10. 47, 48. & 16. 15, 33. "& 18. 8. & 19. 4, 5, &c. You see it is still required, that at all age do first "believe and then be baptized.

I acknowledge he puts in these words [*for the aged at all age*] by which he would prevent the inference from his own words against infants baptism, intimating that there are an institution and examples of infant baptism elsewhere: But this is but a vain caution, when his own proposition is, That *in the institution & every example of baptism through all the Bible, the first grace (to wit Faith) is prerequisite as a condition, is undeniable.* So that which he intimates

in

In his caution, is contradictory to himself, and a palpable falshood, there being no other institution or example of baptism to any but disciples or believers In all the Bible; and therefore baptism of Infants who are not believers or disciples, is a manifest abuse, deviation from Christ and his Apostles appointment and practice, by Mr. *B.* his own words, and consequently will-worship and profanation of that ordinance. As for the present objection, *I* deny the *Major* if it be universall, though Mr. *B.* saith, it is evident, but proves it not, nor doth any concession prove it. For though I grant persons are to be believers afore baptism, yet it doth not follow that the benefits of the covenant of grace, which is sealed by the Sacraments, are to be receiv d by faith, and not before. It is Mr. *B.* his mistake, that the promise to which there is sealing, must be fulfilled af er and not before. The contrary is manifest in *Abrahams* circumcision, in baptism as I shewed before, and in the Lords Supper. For even in that very instant of Mr. *B. Plain Script proof, &c. pag.* 296. to prove *the Sacrament to be a mutuall engaging sign*, when he saith, *Receiving the Elements is our engaging sign, that we receive Jesus Christ to be our onely Saviour and Lord; as giving is Gods sign that he giveth us Christ*: the sealing on the part of the receiver is to a thing fulfilled, that he receives Christ, and of the giver that he gives him.

" 6. Saith Mr. *T.* The covenant sealed by the Sacrament, is a plainly " propounded unquestionable Covenant: But this absolute promise of the " first grace is not such, but very dark and doubtfull (and the most learned " cannot agree whether there be any such thing:) Therefore, &c.

" I have spoken my judgment of this in the Appendix of my Aphorisms. " The places alledged to prove an absolute promise of the first grace, some " learned divines I say do nor prove it; because the new and soft heart there " mentioned, may be a further degree of newness and softness, or though " there be no condition there expressed, yet it is in other places, and therefore " to be so understood there: To which end they cite *Deut.* 30. where God " promiseth the very same blessing (to circumcise their hearts that they may " love the Lord, &c.) on a condition which is here thought to be promised " absolutely. Mr. *T.* could not understand Mr. *Blake* about this.

Answer. If Mr. *B.* mean by *unquestionable Covenant*, that which no learned man hath questioned, the *Major* is false, and must be revoked by Mr. *B.* if he will maintain the conditionall covenant to be sealed to by the Sacrament, for that hath been questioned by learned men; who have denied the covenant of grace to be conditionall, and they think this to be a very good proof, that the holy Scripture where it speakes of the new Covenant, mentions the promises without condition. If he mean *unquestionable de jure*, which ought not to have been questioned, and which though it seem dark and doubtfull to some, yet is plainly propounded by God, and is in it self perspicuous; the *Minor* is false. As for what Divines say, it little moves, when the Scripture opposeth the new spirit and soft heart to a strong heart, as being in them before, and to which the new spirit, new heart of flesh, succeed. *Ezek.* 11. 19. & 36. 26. not to a lesse new or fleshly heart. And if elsewhere conditions be put and not there, the promises in those places are not proved conditionall, though to me the conditions *Deut.* 30. 1, 2, seem not to be of the promise, *v.* 6. but of the promise *v.* 3. I do not value Mr. *B.* his judgement so much as to be drawn by it any farther

than his reasons carry me, which, I take it, are the same in his *Appendix*, with these in his mock-titled book which I have answered. I give Mr *Baxter* our new Doctor *Subtilis*, leave to quip me with my dulness in being grown such an old superannuated dotard, as that I could not understand Mr *Blake*, time was when I thought I could have understood as profound a Doctor, but now *I* am content not to understand such deep notions, I should say non-sense as these, *Disciple all, covenant all, &c*: I hope I shall have by Divine assistance, so much understanding as to demonstrate the frivolousness of those dictates in *Mr Blakes* and *Mr Baxters* writings, whereby they have befooled the men of this age, and my *Strange and wild doctrine*, as *Mr B.* calls it, will supplant *Mr B.* his familiar and tame doctrine, without speaking like *Mr Saltmarsh and the Antinomians*, and my speech about *Mr M*, will be justified after the clearing my self from the fourth imagined error, to which I now hast.

SECT. XXXV.

My speech about Gods sealing to none but believers, is cleared from Mr Baxters *Objections.*

Mr *B. Plain Scripture, &c.* pag 222. calls it my *fourth error that I affirm in my Apolog.* pag. 152, 153. *That every right administration of Baptism is not Gods sealing. Actually it sealeth not but when it is administred to a believer. It may be called a right act of the Administrator according to Gods appointment, but not Gods sealing, &c.* And for *confutation* saith thus: *It must be understood that our question is not about the internall seal of the spirit, but onely the externall seal of the Sacrament, which are two distinct things. The nature of this seal, and whether it seal conditionally or absolutely, I have fully opened in the Appendix of my Aphorisms of Justification, whither I must desire the Reader to turn and read it, to save me the labor of doing it here.*

Answer. That these imagined errors of mine about the nature of the Coyenant and seals are not the root of my pretended error about baptism, is abundantly shewed before; and it hath been often affirmed by me, that the reason of my opposing infant-baptism is, because it agrees not with the institution and examples of baptism (which *Mr B:* his words cited in the next Section before verse) in the holy Scripture, and the arguments from the Covenant and seal, and the pretended law of visible Church-membership, no way extant unrepealed, of which the Apostles practice shewes they were ignorant, though many godly and learned men have embraced them, are meerly an humane invention. That there is no error of mine in what I hold about the covenant, much lesse dangerous error, is already shew; I shall now shew the subtilty of Mr *B:* his arguings against my speech about Gods sealing.

According to his direction I have read over his sayings in his Appendix in answer to the ninth Question, and what *Mr Blake* excepted against him, and his reply to *Mr Blake* in his *Apologie, Sect* 60, *&c.* And the issue of my thoughts in this, 1. That there is nothing but jangling and uncertainty in their debates about the imaginary sealing by the Sacrament, it being not agreed what is sealed, the outward or inward covenant; what is the Syllogism, whose

whose parts are to be sealed, or what part thereof is to be sealed, the Major, Minor, or Conclusion, nor how it is sealed conditionally or absolutely, actually or aptitudinally, nor to whom the sealing is, whether to every communicant or onely to penitent believers. And in my reading of other Authors I find much uncertainty in their determinations about this pretended sealing, and the thing sealed, which I have briefly touched before. *Mr. Humphrey* in his *Rejoynder* to *Dr. Drake*, *part. 1. Sect. 4, 6. part. 2. Sect. 4, 5.* tells us, That *in the nature of it the Sacrament is Gods seal onely, not metaphorically or tropically, but formally, not a seal of our faith but of Gods assuring the tenor of it, not onely mans particular interest absolutly, but conditionally to all, and that as well the threatning of condemnation in case of unbelief, as the promise of righteousness in ease of Faith, the receiver of the Sacrament seals not by way of assuring, or conveying, but engagement to the condition on his part yet not in esse, but in fieri agreeing to the terms of Christ proposed, expecting salvation if ever he have grace to perform his engagements, and yeildeth to be damned if not.* 2. That the digladiations of Pædobaptists one against another, are by Gods just judgement usefull to shew their iniquity in pressing others to subscribe to their Dictates, which they oppose one another in. 3. That they do evidently prove that the argument is not good which they bring for infant-baptism to prove their infant-right to the seal. For if infants be onely in the outward covenant, and baptism seal another covenant, then title to this seal comes not by bare interest in that. If it be a mutuall engaging seal, then it is no seal of an infant who doth not ingage; if it seal the conditional covenant, and it belongs to all, then all may be sealed, if covenant interest intitle to the seal, if baptism seal absolutely to none till he believe, then baptism is no compleat seal, and so no Sacrament to a man till he believe; if it seal the threatning as well as the promise, then those should have the Sacrament to whom the threatning belongs, as well as those to whom the promise; if it seal absolutely onely Gods generall truth, then it seals nones particular interest, and then none can claim title to it. 4. That most of their speeches are meer dictates without shew of proof, and that from the metaphor of the seal of the covenant, which the Scripture no where useth, and *Mr B.* thinks it *the way to lose our selves and not to edifie, to make it the subject of tedious disputations, and to lay too great a stress on it.* As for what he wisheth me in his Apol. against *Mr. Bl. Sect. 80.* to take notice of it, I reply to what he saith against my distinction of actuall & aptitudinal seal, I think it not worth while to reply to it, si hI used that distinction onely to shew how *Bellarmin* might be answered without *Mr Blakes* way of conditionall seal: It is little material whether the Sacrament be called a seal actuall or aptitudinall, or no seal at all, the explication of my meaning before given is enough to justifie my words against any thing *Mr B.* hath or can object. As for that which he saith, *That the question is not about the internall seal of the Spirit, but onely the externall seal of the Sacrament, which are two distinct things*, I answer, the question is about my words whether they be true, which deny that God sealeth in every right administration of baptism, and affirm that he sealeth not but when it is admistred to a believer: And though it be true the seal of Baptism and the Spirit be two distinct things, yet I say God never sealeth by Baptism without the Spirit, nor can baptizing without the sealing of the Spirit

be rightly according to Scripture language and truth, called Gods sealing. Let's see what Mr. *B.* opposeth.

His opinion I prove unsound, thus, 1. *If the Sacrament rightly administred to an hypocrite, have all in it that is essentiall to Gods actuall sealing, then it is his actuall sealing, &c. But, &c. Therefore, &c. A seal is an engaging or obliging sign, or at least a testifying. He that actually useth a sign to such an end, doth actually seal. Now* 1. *God useth this sign.* 2. *And to this end. He useth the sign while his Ministers use it in his Name at his command; for immediatly he never useth or applyeth it to any.* 2. *He commandeth it to be used to this end, to engage himself to make good his promises. For* 1. *To what other end should God command them?* 2 *Else he should command them to be used to one end to one, and to another end to another, which cannot be shewed that he hath done, (I speake of the end of the Ordinance, not of the event which God hath decreed shall follow.)*

Answer. The *Minor* of this Argument is denied. And to the proof I say, 1. That it is not alwayes true, That *he that actually useth a sign to such an end, doth actually seal.* For if actuall sealing be actuall assuring (as it is conceived to be meant, *Rom.* 4. 11. whence this phrase is taken) the actuall sealing must be denom[illegible] not onely from the end but also from the event, as if God use a sign to [illegible]rt, he doth not actuallly comfort except the person be comforted. 2. That it is not universally true, that *God useth the sign while his Ministers use it in his name at his command*, but then when they represent his person. As for instance, when *Aaron* offered sacrifice, burned Incense, &c. which were to signifie Christ, they did these things in Gods name, that is, to his honor, at his command, yet I do not conceive it can be said that God did offer Sacrifice or burn Incense. And for baptism, though I confesse it is commanded by God to be done by his Ministers, and that it is to be done into his name, yet it is no where intimated as if they did it in stead of God, or Christ, as their act. 3. But let it be granted that baptism done rightly according to Gods command by his Ministers, is his act; how is it proved that it is *used by God to this end, to engage himself to make good his promises?* For my part I read not any where in Scripture, that God used baptism for this end, to engage himself to make good his promises, nor doth Mr. *B.* prove that end by any passage of Scripture. And to his reasons I answer, 1. To the first, though neither I nor Mr. *B.* know any other end, yet doth not this prove, that that is the end. Besids, if I should assign no other end, yet it were enough to answer Mr. *B.* his question to say, It is to try obedience, as in *Abrahams* offering his son. But Mr. *B.* might easily know if he would heed the Scripture, that there are other ends of God in commanding baptism; to wit, the owning of Christ as our Lord, 1 *Cor.* 1. 13. *Gal.* 3. 27 joyning all Christians into one body, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. *Ephes.* 4. 5. The 19, and 27 Article of the Curch of *England* acknowledge this to be one end of baptism, to be *a sign of profession*, and to be a mark of difference of Christians from others. To the second, though it were granted to be absurd, that God should command the Sacraments to *be used to one end to one, and to another end to another*, yet this doth no whit prove that this is the end which *Mr. B* assigns for the fore-going reasons. Yet sure if Infant-baptism were granted, baptism must needs be to one end, to wit, a sign of profession

fession to the aged, which it is not, nor can be to an infant. Lastly if it yeelded that the end of baptism were to engage God to make good his promisses, it is a good argument against Mr. *B.* that God seals not actually to an hyppocrite, sith he doth not promise, and consequently not to engage himselfe, by the Sacrament to make good his promise unto them. But *Mr. B.* adds thus.

" 3. If the promise be to others besides believers, then so is the seal (for " to whom God promiseth, to them he engageth himselfe to performe, but " the promise is to others therefore &c. This will be evident if it be once un- " derstood that it is only the conditional promise which sealeth by the Sacra- " ments [if thou believe in the Lord Iesus thou shalt be saved] For this " promise is made to unbelievers, though the good promised is not to be " enjoyed by any but performe not the Condition. Thus I have fully prov- " ed in the forsaid Appendix to my Aphorisms: and will fall under the next " question.

Answer: I read, that to *Abraham & his seed were the promises made or said*, Gal. 3. 16 *That the promise through the faith of Christ might be given to them that believe* v. 22. *If ye be Christs then are ye Abrahams seed & heires according to the promise* v. 29. *Whereby are given unto us exceeding great & pretious promises* 2 Pet. 1 4. *The children of the promise are counted for the seed* Rom. 9. 8. *Strangers from the Covenants of promise* Ephes. 2. 12 But this is to use Mr. B. His own words of my doctrine, *strang* and *wild doctrine* to say that *God promises to unbelievers, the promise of salvation is made to unbelievers, that to them he engageth himselfe to performe:* nor do I see how he can avoid Antinomianism, which he so much abhors, to wit the justification of Infidels, if i be true, that this promise is made to unbelievers. Nor is he relieved by saying, *the promise is made to them though the good promised is not to be enjoyed*, For what is this but to say the promise is made to them by God, but not performed, which is to make God false? Nor is he relieved by saying *it is made conditionally only to unbelievers* (*if thou believe thou shalt be justified.*) For this is equivalent to this, he that believeth shall be justified, and so the promise is made only to the believer: though it may be said to be offered, tendered, propounded as a Law, or ordinance of God to unbelievers. yet neither Scripture language, nor any other approved Authors speech, will I concieve warrant this speech, *God promiseth, engageth himself to performe, this promise* (of salvation, justification,) *is made to unbelievers.* As for his dictates in his appendix, and the next question, the futility of them is already shewed. He goes on thus.

" 2. If God do no more in his actual calling to believers, than he doth " when the Sacrament is rightly applied to hypocrites, then he actually sea- " leth to hypocrites. The major is proved by the enumeration on the seve- " rall acts. 1. God maketh the promise. 2. He commandeth ministers " to publish it. 3. He hath instituted the Sacraments as mutual engaging " signes or seals. He commandeth ministers to deliver or apply them to those " that profess their consent, and desire to enter or renew the Covenant, " (This I need not stand to prove, beeing Mr. T. Here yeilds that the " giving of the Sacrament is the right act of the administrator, which it could " not be except it were commanded) as also the initiating seal to the children

of

" of those believing parents that will enter him into the Covenant, as is prov-
" ed before. Now what act more than these doth God performe to the elect
" or believers.

" *Answ.* It was assayed to be proved before, but not proved that God commandeth ministers to deliver or apply the Lords Supper to them that desire to renew their Covenant, or baptism to believers infant children; what I said of the right act of the administrator I spake perticularly of baptism. Nor is it true that God maketh promise to hypocrits, or commandeth ministers to publish it, and how is it from Scripture speech, or truths to say, God hath instituted the Sacraments as mutual engaging signs or seals, and how destructive this is to infant baptism is shewed before. To this question, I answer, The witness of the spirit is a further act of God necessary to his sealing as I meant my words, and express my self in my *Postscript. Sect.* 21. *Pag* 153. what saith Mr. B. to this?

If it be said that he add the seal of his spirit; that is nothing to the question, seeing we are speaking only of the outward seal. Answ. though Mr. *B.* spake only of the outward seal, yet he should have spoken of the inward also. If he would have opposed my saying, he should have proved that God actually seals by the outward Sacrament without the inward testimony of the spirit, till then, he spake nothing to the question.

But saith he. *If it be said that he assureth the conscience of the truth of the promise, and maketh the outward seal effectual. I Answ.* 1. *That is still the inward seal, and so nothing to this. Answ.* He should rather have said it is all in all to this, sith my words denie Gods actual sealing without.

" 2. That is the making of the seal successful, which is nothing to the
" sealing: If you seal a deed of gift to three men and one believeth it, and
" another doth not believe it, and another doth half believe it, yet this doth
" not make it no sealing to him that believeth not; you seal equally to them
" all.

Answ. 1. However it be in mens sealing, yet Gods actual sealing is still effectual, they seal only to the eye, he to the heart, 2 Cor. 1. 21, 22. 2. He makes no deed of gift but to believers, nor seals to any but them *Ephes.* 1. 13. and 4. 30. *Rom.* 4. 11. and 8. 15, 16.

" 3. And God doth not alwayes assure the elect or believers, but they oft con-
" clude hardlyer against themselves than others do that have. So that I desire
" Mr. T. to produce any one act which God performes to believers, and not to
others, which may appropriate the name of sealing to them.

Answ. though God do not alwayes actually seal to believers, yet this doth neither prove that his actually sealing is uneffectual, nor to any others.

Mr. B. hath answere to his demand, and were it not that I much pitty the souls of many ministers and people who are by this notion of [seal of the Covenant of grace] partly perverted to uphold and continue as manifest a Corruption as ever was in the Christian church, I mean infant-baptism, being by all, most by Mr. *B.* Confessed to be without institution and example in Bible, parly perplexed about delivering and receiving the Lords-supper, it would much trouble me that I have spent so much time *de lana Caprina*, a new devised notion. But over shoes over boots, I must needs add

a few

few lines more in answer to Mr. B. whose page 116 saith thus.

" And by this the former question about sealing conditionally may be " decided: which Mr. *T.* darkneth with a maze of words; and addeth " [That God seals not conditionally in this sense, as if he left it to a mans " liberty to whome he had sealed to agnize or recognize that sealing or to free " themselves if they please, and so nullifie all: yet so as to afford them awhile " the favour and privileige of being in Covenant with him, which *Mr. M.* " He concieves meant by his conditional sealing] Heare are more things " heapt up, then will be satisfied in one answer: therefore I say 1. it is " improperly called liberty of the will which consists in an indifferency to " good or evils as Gibeouf and Bradwardin &c. will teach you. 2. more " improperly is the nullifiing of the Covenant called a freeing themselves " which is an enslaving themselves. 3. And the violating of the Covenant " is not fitly called a nullifying of it. 4. Yet if you will needs use those " terms; I say that God sealeth the conditional promise to thousands that " shall perish, and leaveth it to their own choise, whether they will recognize " and continue, and be faithfull to the Covenant (giving them onely the " common grace:) which men do prove unfaithful to, & break the Covenant, " and so perish for treading the blood of the Covenant under foot. And " doth *Mr.* T. thinke that no wicked men perish as Covenant-breakers " with Christ?

Answer. I am so used to Mr. *B.* his snarling at me, that I think it not worth while to take notice of all the noise he makes, and methinks a wise Reader should be no whit moved with these frivolous accusations of me, as *darkning the thing with a maze of words* (which is a pretty phrase) which are very few and very plain, intimating as if *I would needs use those terms though improperly*, which were used of necessity when I was to set down M *M.* his meaning, not as mine, but his, even his very expressions, except it be to observe the quarrelsom vein he was in when he wrot that book against me. If the expression be not proper, let him blame Mr. *M.* yet let it be observed, that the speech of the nullifying the covenant, was neither mine nor Mr. *Ms*, but nullifying all, which is to be understood of the sealing and priviledge mentioned. As for his reference of me to *Gibeouf* and *Bradwardin* to shew the impropriety of the use of the term [Liberty] I am not likely to be taught by them, except I had the books (one of which I have lost by the plunder of above three hundred bookes never recovered) and Mr. *B.* had given me better directions where to find my Lesson. I conceive it liberty of will properly so called, whereby men are moved to chuse evill, though the persons be in a state of servitude, *John* 8. 33. Else it were not penall to chuse evill. And for what Mr. *B* asserts, I have shewed before that Gods covenant of grace is neither made nor sealed by God to any but the elect; and I say, that though wicked men may perish as covenant-breakers with Christ, that is, as breaking their own covenant or promise with Christ, yet no man ever breaks the covenant of grace, that is Gods new covenant or promise of saving grace in Christ, it being the very end of the making of the new covenant, that whereas the old occasioned God to complain of Israel as not continuing in it, there might be another covenant *established or made a Law on better promises*, that it might be ἄμεμπτος, which we read *faultless*; but more rightly *Plaintless*, that is, not occasioning God to com-

plain

plain by reason of the breach of it, as the Author to the *Hebrews* plainly shews, *Heb.* 8. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, *&c.* And this is expressly called *Gods covenant to turn away ungodliness from Jacob*, *Rom.* 11. 26, 27. So that to deny the promise of the first grace of regeneration, conversion, or effectuall calling to be properly Gods covenant of grace, and to make a conditionall after to be Gods Covenant of grace, and to say Gods covenant of grace may be broken, and persons with whom it is made not continue therein, is to alter or deny the new covenant, and to make voyd the grace of God and the comfort of his people, and to my understanding to symbolize with Arminians.

Mr. B. adds, 5. *It is unworthily said, That God affordeth these but a while the favour and priviledge of being in covenant with him, seeing it is their own wilfull act to cast themselves out of this priviledge; they might have continued it, and proceeded further in it if they would.*

Answer. I agree that it is unworthily said; but by this censure though he aim at me, yet heedlesly he hits Mr. *M*, whose speech this was. But whoever be in the fault, it seems while the rod is in Mr. *B.* his hand, I must be lashed. Yet Mr. *B.* his reason is so far from proving it unworthily said, that it seems rather to be worthily said, that *God affords them but a while the favour of being in covenant with him, sith it is their own wilfull act to cast themselves out.* I rather think it unworthily said, because God should fail them to perform *his covenant of putting his fear into their heart, so as that they shall not depart from him*; nor his covenant be *everlasting* contrary to *Jer.* 32. 40.

6. Saith Mr. *B. Yet withall we affirm, That to his elect God freely giveth, as leave, so a will to enter sincerely into Covenant with him, and faithfully to keep covenant, and so the continuance of the priviledges of the covenant.*

Answer. If Mr. *B.* had as the Scripture doth, ascribed this to Gods covenant, and understood the difference between the covenant of grace under the Gospel, and the nationall covenant made with the people of Israel, much of the opposition between us had been saved. But sith things are as they are, I am resolved with Gods assistance to try his strength in what is yet unanswered of his second main argument, after I have examined the remainder of what Pædobaptists say after the old way of arguing from Covenant and Seal.

SECT. XXXVI.

Christianity is not by Birth, or the Church, nor the Church at Civill Corporations, as Mr. M. his equivocation in the use of the term Covenant of grace.

I Return now to Mr. *M.* whom I meet in his *Defence*, *pag* 119. *passing over my six Arguments*, and thus answering me, *I joyn with you that it is an error to say, that all infants of believers indefinitely are under the saving graces of the Covenant, for although I find abundance of promises in the Scripture, of Gods giving saving grace unto the posterity of his people, and that experience teacheth us, that God uses to continue his Church in their posterity, and that Gods election is more among their seed than others, yet neither to Jew nor Gentile was the Covenant so made at any time, that the spirituall part and grace of the covenant should be conferred upon them all.*

Wich

Which if true, then all have not interest in the saving grace of the Covenant, but so many as are elect, and then the baptisme of them all cannot be deduced thence: And for the conditionall covenant, it is either to all, or believers onely, and baptism by it must be of all men or onely believers. And for a third covenant, which they call outward, Mr. *Baxter* against Mr. *Blake*, pag. 66, 67, and elsewhere before cited, hath proved it to be a signment, and consequently there is no such to be sealed by baptism which may justifie baptizing of believers infants, as their priviledge. Nor, if the covenant of saving grace be not made to all believers seed, can the certainty of their salvation, dying in infancy, be thence gathered, nor is the promise of salvation made to a believer and his seed universally, then is the Anabaptists sentence no more bloody than Mr. *Ms*, then do Mr *Baillie* and others, in print and pulpit clamorously abuse them, accusing them of cruelty to infants of believers, & robbing parents of comfort concerning them, when in truth we are as favourable in our sentence of infants as they, and do give as much comfort as we truly can. As for the visible membership which he ascribes to infants of believers in the Christian Church, it will appear to be but a fancy in the examining what Mr. *B.* brings for it.

I objected, that if the child of a Christian be a Christian, then Christians are born Christians, not made Christians; whereas it was wont to be a current saying, *Christiani non nascuntur sed fiunt.* And if the Covenant of grace be a birth-priviledge, how are they children of wrath by nature? To this Mr. *M.* answers, *It is his birth-right to be so esteemed, to be reputed within the covenant of grace, or a member of the visible Church, and alledgeth*, Gal. 2. 15. Rom. 11. 21. *Naturall branches, that is visible Church-members.*

To which I say, were I to write as a Geographer, I should reckon the people of *England* old and young for Christians, but as a Divine I should not so speak: forasmuch as the Scripture no where calls any other Christians than disciples and professors of Christianity, *Acts* 11, 26. & 26, 28. 1 *Pet.* 4. 16. The term [*Jew by nature, Gal.* 2. 15.] is not as much as visible Church-member by nature, but by natural birth of that nation; nor is the term [*Naturall branch, Rom.* 11. 21.] as much as visible Church-members by nature, but onely descendents as branches from *Abraham* the root, that is the father by naturall generation. To be a visible Church-member I never took to be all one with; to be in the covenant of grace, but to be in the covenant of grace to be the same with a *Child of the promise*, which is expressly contra-distinguished to *a child of the flesh*, *Rom.* 9. 8. The distinction of the outward and inward covenant is shewed before to be vain, and to serve onely for a shift. I said in my *Examen* Christianity is no mans birth-right, and this I proved in that no where in Scripture is a person called Christian, but he that is so made by preaching.

I said, It is a carnall imagination, that the Church of God is like to Civill Corporations, as if persons were admitted to it by birth, which my words shew to be meant of the Church of Christians invisible, as well as visible. Nor is it to the purpose to prove the contrary that Mr. *M.* tells me, *The Jewish Church was in that like Civil Corporations.* For I grant it was, the whole nation being the same Politick and Ecclesiastick body, but this Church-state was carnall as their ordinances; whereas the Christian Church hath another con-

stitution by preaching the Gospel. Mr. *M.* his cavill at my words, [In this all is done by free election of grace] had been prevented, if the following words had been recited [and according to Gods appointment: nor is God tied, or doth tie himself in the erecting and propagating his Church to any such carnall respects, as discent from men, Christianity is no mans birth right.] Mr. *M.* shews not that God hath made it so in his Christian Church by any ordinance, that the child should be baptized with the parent, and therefore the objection still stands good.

The speech of *Mr. Rutherfurd.* are *Mr. Cotton.* and not to be reconciled without making contradictories true. *My answer beats not against the reason of the holy Ghost Gen. 17. 7.* Nor is it true but that *the holy Ghost makes this his argument why he would have the male children circumcised, and thereby reckon'd to be in Covenant with him, because their parents are in Covenant with him*, but it is refused by *Mr. M's.* own Concession pag. 182. That *the command was the formal reason of their being Circumcised.* Yet this was not it which I called a carnal imagination, but the speech that *it is in the church of God as in civil Corporations.*

Mr. M. pag. 123 takes upon him to defend his speech, *that in the time of the Jewes, if God did reject the parents out of the Covenant, the children were cast out with them.* Against which I excepted that parents might be Idolatries, Apostates from Iudaism, draw up the foreskin again, and yet the children were to be circumcised, which he denies not but saith, *Is it not evident in the Iewes at this day, that they and their children are cast out together.*

I grant it is, but this doth not make good his own assertion or overthrow mine. Then he tels me, *If I would shew the falsity of it I should have given some instance; not of parents, who remain Gods people in external profession, though their lives might possibly be very wicked, but of some who were cast off from being visible professors, and yet their Infants remain in the visible society of the church, or of some who were visibly thus taken in, and their infants left out.*

Answ. If he meanes this of the christian church it is easie to give instances of Infants of those who have turned Papists, Mahometans, excommunicate persons, who are accounted baptizable by vertue of their Ancestors faith, or for defect thereof because *they are of a chosen nation* as *Mr. Rutherfurd* affirms in his *Temperate plea* ch. 12. concl. 1. arg. 7. But *Mr. M.* his speech was of the time of the Iewes, and of their times before Christ he must needs say the same unless he will acknowledg Idolaters such as *Ahab, Ahaz*, &c. to have remained still Gods people in external profession. He concluds the reply to the fift Section of my *Examen* thus, But instead of this you still go on in your wonted equivocation of the word Covenant of grace taking it only of the Covenant of saving grace, not including the external way of administration with it.

Answ. I do confess I do so take the word Covenant of grace, not knowing any other Covenant of grace under the Gospel, but that which is of saving grace and concieving I should speak false, and nonsense if I should include in the Covenant of grace the external way of administration. But to charge me with wanted equivocation whom he accuseth elswhere for destinguishing so much, and equivocating in the use of a terme only one way is a ridiculous

charge,

charge, it being all one as to accuse a man of nonsense because he speaks good sense, to say I do equivocate because I do not equivocate. For he that useth a word onely in one sense doth not aquivocate, equivocation being when a word is used in more senses than one. *Fallacia aequivocationis est quando ex unius vocis multiplici significatione sophistice concluditur.* Dr. Prideaux Hypomn. Log: tract: 4. c. 7. Sect. 2. Arist: Sophist: Elench. l 1. c. 3. reckons ὁμωνυμίαν or equivocation ὅτι τοσαυταχῶς ἂν τῖς αὐτοῖς ὀνόμασι καὶ λόγοις μὴ ταὐτὸ σημαίνωμεν, when with the same names and vowels we signifie not the same thing. which evidently proves Mr *M.* guilty of equivocating from his own words. For in the *first conclusion* of his *Sermon* he distinguisheth the covenant of grace for substance (which he makes the Covenant of saving grace) from the externall way of administration, and yet blames me for not including it. And if he by covenant of grace include the way of externall administration, how could he say in his *Sermon*, pag. 26. in the recapitulation of his two first conclusions, *If the covenant be the same, and the children belong to it.* Sure he will not say the way of externall administration is the same: Wherefore from his own words he is deprehended to equivocate in the term *Covenant of grace*, in the first conclusion meaning by it the covenant of saving graces, and distinguishing it from the externall administration, but in the second conclusion when he saith, *children belong to it*, he understands not the inward but the outward covenant, not the covenant of saving grace, but the way of externall administration. And yet he dare not say, the infant children of Gentile Christian believers belong to it, that is the same way of externall administration, for that is in the Jewish Legall Rites. *Assembly's Confess. of Faith, chap. 7. Art. 5.* Therefore he sophistically equivocates in the use of that term, which is his frequent manner, and yet he is not ashamed to accuse me of that, of which his own words acquit me, as if he had learned the Artifice in scolding to call another that first of which himself might be detected. Nor is Mr. *M.* clear from equivocating in what follows, in which I find much confusednesse and ambiguity.

CHAP. XXXVII.

That the promise Gen. 17. 7. *proves not an externall priviledge of visible Church-membership, and initiall seal to infants of Gentile believers, as Mr. M. asserts*

After twenty pages spent about the explication of his second Conclusion, having varied it five or six times, and as I have shewed in every of them still speaking ambiguously even then when he tells us, *he speaks as plain as he can possibly*, I pitch upon this which is pag. 116. as his second Conclusion, Having said,

Infants of believers are made free according to Abrahams *Copy*, he thus expounds himself, *True, according to the promise made to* Abraham, *I will be a God to thee and thy seed, that look as* Abraham, *the Proselytes and their seed upon their visible owning of God and his Covenant, had this visible priviledge for their posterity that they should be accounted to belong to Gods kingdom and houshold with their*

parents, so is it here. By which words it appears, that Mr. *M.* took this to be *Abrahams Copy* (as he calls it, that *according to the promise made to Abraham, I will be a God to thee and thy seed, Abraham and his seed, the proselytes and their seed upon their* (the parents) *visible owning of God and his Covenant, had this visible priviledge for their posterity, that they should be accounted to belong to Gods Kingdom and Houshold with their parents.* 2. *That so it is in the Christian Church by vertue of that promise I will be thy God and the God of thy seed*, Gen. 17. 7 *Gentile believers upon their visibly owning of God and his Covenant, have this visible priviledge for their posterity, that they should be accounted to belong to Gods Kingdom and Houshold with their parents.*

Concerning which Conclusion I say still Mr. *M.* useth ambiguities of speech, there being divers Covenants of God, to wit, the Old and the New, and divers wayes of visibly owning God, as by sacrificing, circumcision, &c. by Baptism, the Lords Supper, frequenting the Church meetings of Christians, &c, divers kingdoms and households of God, as the whole world, and his Church, the visible or invisible, which might occasion various senses of Mr. *M.* his words. But I ghesse his meaning to be thus; As the Jewes and proselytes being circumcised, their children were to be so also: so Gentile believers being baptized, their children are to be baptized as visible Church-members; which being the same with the Antecedent of Mr. *M.* his *Enthymeme*, and the consequent, it is evident Mr. *M.* his argument is a meer trifling tautology, as I have often said. But I shall not insist on it, having in my *Apologie, Sect.* 10. and elsewhere shewed it, That which I shall consider chiefly in his glosse on *Gen.* 17. 7. which to me seems as (or more) absurd than the glosse of Papists, *Thou art Peter, and on this Rock will I build my Church*: i. e. The Bishop of *Rome* shall be my Vicar generall of the Oecumenicall Church. For 1. according to Mr. *M.* his Glosse, [*Thee*, that is, *Abraham*, to whom the words were spoken] is put for without all rule of Grammar or Divinity, or as they speak in Logick *supponit by* [every Jew, or Proselyte, and every believer or Christian Jew or Gentile, who doth not visibly own God and his Covenant.] 2. According to this glosse the naturall seed of proselytes though but visibly owning God and his Covenant, are called *Abrahams seed*, without any use of Scripture, which speak of no other seed of *Abraham* but 1. Christ, *Gal.* 3. 16. By excellency so called, 2. by grace the elect, *Rom* 9. 7. 3. Believers, *Rom.* 4. 11, 12, 16, 17. *Gal.* 3. 29. 4. By nature, *Gen.* 21 12. *Psal.* 105. 6. *Gen.* 15. 13. 18. Neither o. which are proselytes who do or only own God and his covenant.

3. The promise of God to *be a God to Abrahams seed* is thus expounded, *The naturall seed of Abraham and the naturall seed of Proselytes, and of Gentile Christians visibly owning God and his covenant, shall have this visible priviledge, that they should be accounted to belong to Gods Kingdom and Houshold with their parents.* In which paraphrase I note what he calls *to be accounted to belong to Gods Kingdom a visible priviledge*. Now [*to be accounted*] I must refer to some person who doth so account, and the accounting must be either an act of opinion, or science, or faith, and then to be accounted to belong to Gods Kingdom, is not a visible priviledg, but invisible, it being in the thoughts of another, and the sense should be, *I will be a God to thy seed*, that is men as *v.* 9. administrators shall in their thoughts take proselytes and their children to be-

long

long to my Kingdom, or it is some outward transeunt act, and then it is an initial seal, or I cannot conceive what it should be: if an initial seal either of Circumcision or Baptism, if either of these, then this promise [*I will be thy God and the God of thy seed*] hath this sense, I will bring it to passe that thou, thy seed, proselytes, believers of the Gentiles and their seed, even infants, shall be circumcised or baptized. If any can make any other sense of the words, I shall be his debtor. And if this be the sense, then the promise is made a prediction of infant-Circumcision and Baptism, which whether it be not a ridiculous exposition, I leave it to any considerate man to judge. The Apostle, *Rom* 9 6,7,8. where he expounds this very Scripture, understands *being a God*, of saving grace according to election, and by *Abrahams seed* the elect onely. *Rom.*4 11,12 13,16 *justifying of believers by faith, Gal.* 3. 16. 29. *inheritance and blessing to believers thro gh Christ Jesus.* Our Lord Christ, *Luke* 20, 36, 37, 38. *Of being the children of God and of the resurrection.* Mr. *M.* his self in his *Sermon*, pag. 7. makes these words *a promise of salvation to the infants of believers dying in their infancy.* pag. 10. he saith, *The substance of the Covenant on Gods part was to be Abrahams God, and the God of his seed, to be an all-sufficient portion, to be an all-sufficient reward for him, to give Jesus Christ to him, and righteousness with him, both of justification and sanctification, and ever-lasting life:* And this he distinguisheth from the administration of the Covenant. Yea in his *Defence of his Sermon*, pag. 98. he conceives the right allegation of an expression of *Cameron*, *That Circumcision did seale primarily the temporall promise, sanctification secondarily, to have an untoward look, as being ingrafted to a covenant of grace in Christ to ratifie temporall blessings, which they may have that shall have no portion in Christ.* Hath it not then a more untoward look to make this pretended visible privilege to proselytes children though but visibly owning God and his covenant, of having an initiall seal Circumcision and Baptism communicated to them, meant by the promise, *I will be thy God and the God of thy seed*, Gen. 17. 7. Much more to call this *the Copy of Abraham* the Father of believers? Not that I deny temporall promises in that Covenant, which I have proved to be mixt, but I allege these passages onely to shew the inconsistency of Mr. *M.* his speeches. Besides, the promise were not true so expounded; for if this were the sense; *I will be the God of the posterity of proselytes owning God and his Covenant, that they shall be accounted to belong to Gods Kingdom and his Houshold with their parents*, then God doth promise that visible privilege to them (for the words are a promise of an event, not a declaration of a right, and shew what God would do, not what they might claim) which in many he performs not, there being may of the seed of proselytes, that never had the privilege, and many of the children of Christian gentile believers, who never had the visible privilege of being accounted to belong to Gods Kingdom, whereas the word of God must be so expounded that it do not fail, as about this very text the Apostle resolves, *Rom* 9.6.

Mr. *M.* *Defence part*, 3. pag. 127. saith, *It was not a personall privilege to Abraham, no nor to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to have their posterity taken into covenant by vertue of that promise, I will be the God of thee and thy seed*, and p. 129. *This I add to make it more clear, that that promise Gen.* 17. *I will be the God of thee and of thy seed, is a Gospel promise, which from age to age holds forth some benefits even to the naturall seed of believers.*

Answer.

Answer. 1. What Mr. *M.* means by *Taking into covenant*, is somewhat doubtfull to me by reason of his using the term *Covenant* sometimes for the outward covenant or administration, sometimes for the promise of God, and confounding these terms [*taking into covenant, being in covenant, belonging to the covenant, being covenanters, entring into covenant*] sometimes meaning these terms of the promise of grace, sometimes of the initiall seal termed by him the Covenant, and taking into covenant, being in covenant, belonging to the covenant, sometimes being understood, (as they should always be) in order to Gods act, who alone takes into covenant, and puts a man into covenant with himself; but frequently, though abusively, by another mans act, as the administrators act of Circumcision and Baptism, very seldom of being in covenant, or belonging to the covenant by the circumcised or baptized persons own act of promise, though in respect of it onely, in right speech, a person is said to be a Covenanter, or to enter into covenant. Of which thing I have often, though in vain complained, it causing obscurity which a man who is a teacher of others should avoid. But concerning the promise, *Gen.* 17 7. *I will be a God to thee and thy seed after thee in their generations.* 1. I deny that *Abrahams naturall posterity were taken into covenant*, that is, circumcised, (as I conceive he means) *by vertue of that promise*, as I have often proved, and is in effect confessed by Mr. *M. Defence pag* 182. when he saith, *The formall reason of their being circumcised, was the command of God.* 2. I deny that under the term [*Thee*] is meant any other than *Abrahams* individual person. 3. I deny that under the term *Thy Seed*, is ever meant in Scripture the naturall seed of proselytes, or Christian believing Gentiles. 4. I deny that by the promise, *I will be the God of thy seed*, can be concluded that which Mr *M.* affirms, That this promise Gen. 17.7. *I will be the God of thee and of thy seed, is a Gospel promise, which from age to age holds forth some benefits even to the naturall seed of believers, or that this was Abrahams Copy, That upon his and the proselytes visibly owning God and his Covenant, their posterity should have this visible privilege, that they should be accounted to belong visibly to Gods Kingdom and his Houshold with their parents.* Nor doth Mr. *M.* prove this sense of that promise, Gen 17.7. either from the words, or their coherence, or by comparing it with any other Scripture as yeelding that exposition of it elswhere: but saith something *pag.* 127, 128. of his *Defence*, to which (though I have answered it sufficiently in my *Postscript* to Mr. *Blake, Sect.* 6. *pag.* 119) yet I repeat it with addition, because much of pleading of Pædobaptists is hence.

First, saith he, though *Abraham* was the Father of the faithful, and so "in some sense [the root as you elsewhere call him] yet the Covenant was "made with him for his faiths sake, and believers are his children, and "heires, and partake of those privilledges and promises which were made to "him: and therefore look as Abrahams faith justified him before God, "and gave him interest in the spiritual graces of the Covenant, and none but "himself; yet it was so beneficial and advantagious to his children, that for "his sake they should be accounted to belong to Gods Kingdome and houshold, and partake of the external privilledges of it, and thereby be trained "up under the discipline of it, and so be fitted for spiritual privledges and "graces which God doth ordinarily confer upon them, who are thus trained up, so shall it be with them who become followers of Abrahams faith,

Answ.

Anſ. 1. Priviledges of *Abraham* in that promiſe [*I will be thy God and the God of thy ſeed*] are either Evangelical belonging to *Abrahams* ſpiritual ſeed, that is elect perſons or true believers; or domeſtick and political, as that of multiplying his ſeed, the birth of *Iſaac*, continuation of his church in and from him in his inhereting poſterity till Chriſts comming. the birth of Chriſt, deliverance out of Egypt, poſſeſſion of Canaan, theſe belong to *Abrahams* natural ſeed, yet not to all but to the inheriting, not to *Iſhmael*, nor the ſons of *Keturah*. The former all are partakers of it who follow the faith of *Abraham* whether Iews or Gentiles, but none are in refference to theſe promiſes reckoned *Abrahams* ſeed, but thoſe who are real believers in Chriſt. A Proſelyte owning barely God and his covenant viſſibly is not either *Abrahams* ſeed or partaker of the ſpiritual priviledges of ſanctification, juſtification, ſalvation. The latter ſort of promiſes belonged to *Abrahams* natural poſterity, yet not to all but to the ſeed inheriting, nor to all of them, but to the Iewes, and in them for one of them to the line from whence after the fleſh Chriſt came. None of theſe were made to the bare viſſible Proſelites and their children, though I grant their children where taken into the pollity of Iſrael, and were to be circumciſed and to eat the Paſſover, yet neither did this priviledge belong to them by vertue of the covenant, but the command, nor for their faiths ſake as the immediate adequate reaſon (for then theſe ſhould have belonged to proſelites of the gate who believed in God as *Cornelius* the Centurion, who was a believer, but they did not, for he was not Circumciſed, nor to be circumciſed with his children if he had any, nor blamed for defect of it) but meerly (ſo far as is expreſt in Scripture) becauſe it was Gods will to have it ſo. Now Mr. M. brings not a word to prove either that the children of proſylites viſſibly owning God and his covenant, or the natural poſterity of chriſtian profeſſors of the Gentiles are either *Abrahams* ſeed, or have ſuch an Intereſt in external church privileges as Mr. M. aſſerts by vertue of that promiſe, or that what agrees to *Abraham* in reſpect of external church privileges for his faiths ſake muſt agree either to only viſſible proſylites, or chriſtians, or real believers, but ſpeaks like a dictator not a diſputer. Nor is there any good conſequence in this, what, agreed to *Abraham* for his faith's ſake agrees to every believer, For then every believer ſhould be Father of the faithful as *Abraham* was for his faith's ſake. It is true that if the truth of *Abraham's* faith were the immediate adequate reaſon of external privileges as it was of juſtification, it would follow them, what external privileges agree to *Abraham* for his faith's ſake ſhould agree to every believer, but ſuch believers then muſt be true real believers as *Abraham* was, not bare viſſible proſylites or chriſtian profeſſors. But ſurly Mr. *M.* means no more by [for *Abraham's* faiths ſake] but this, that *Abrahams* faith was the motive or occaſion God took to enter into covenant with him, nor was it ſimply his real true faith, but his remarkeable exemplary faith deſcribed *Rom.* 4. 18, 19. which was the motive or occaſion of Gods entring into covenant with him, which is not veretied of every true believer, and the motive or occaſion was not barely the truth, but the eminent degree of his faith. In my *Poſtſcript* Pag. 119. I gave a like inſtance *Matth.* 16. 18, 19. *the keyes of the kingdome of heaven, binding and looſing were given to Peter* for his confeſſion ſake, yet it follows not the keyes are given to every one that makes the ſame confeſſion as he did.

And

And the reason because the confession was eminent and exemplary at a special time, and it was but the occasion, not the immediate adequate reason of that gift to him; for that was onely the special grace and purpose of Gods will.

3ly, saith Mr. M. *had it been a perculiar privilege to Abraham's natural seed proselites of other nations could never by vertue of their becomming followers of Abraham's faith have brought their children into covenant with them so as to have a visible Church-member-ship, as we know they did.*

Answ. I do not know that the proselytes natural seed had the visible church-member-ship *Mr. M.* Mentions by vertue of the promise *Gen.* 17. 7. and their parents faith, but of *Gods* command *Exod* 12 48.

"3ly saith he, And we know also that this promise of being the God of believers and their seed was frequently renewed many hundreds of years after "*Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, were dead and rotten, as *Deut.* 30. 6. "so *Esa*: 44. 2, 3. so likewise *Esay* 59. 21. and this last promise your self "acknowledg *Pag.* 54. to be intended chiefly of the nation of the Iewes, "at their last calling in: And whereas you use to elude these texts by saying "these things belong onely to the elect, when they come to believe, and reach "not to any privilege which is external; I reply, by the same answer you "might cut off the seed of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, for to believers "then as well as believers now were these promises made.

"*Answ*: That which I say is no elusion of the texts, but so plain and evident, that Pædo-baptists of note do concur with me. *Mr. Rich. Baxter.* "in his letter to *Mr. Bedford* in the friendly accommodation between them. "To this and that which followeth I answer; 1. These following arguments "perswade me that you erre; 1. no such promise (that giveth certainly *Cor novum* or the first effectual grace to all the rightly baptized or to all the "children of believers) can be shewed in Scripture; I will circumcise thy "heart and of thy seed, seems to me to be none such 1. because elst it should not "be the same circumcision that is promised to the parent of the child: but there "is no intimation of two circumcisions in the text: one to the father, being only an increase or actuating of grace; and the other to the child being "the giving the first renuing grace: 2. the text seems plainly to speak of [their "seed] not in their infant state but in their adult *Deut.* 30. For. 1. v. 2. The "conditon of the promise is expressly required, not onely of the parents, but of the children themselves by name. 2. And that condition "is the personal performance of the sam acts which are required of "the parents viz: to returne to the Lord and obey his voice with all their "heart and soul. 3. The circumcision of heart promised is so annexed to "the act that it appeareth to be meant onely of those that were capable of the "act v. 6. The Lord thy *God* will circumcise thine heart and the heart of thy "seed to love the Lord thy *God* So that it is not ment of those that are uncapable of so loving, And after, A new heart is given to the elect onely. By "this doctrin you feign a new heart not to be proper to the elect, which is "contrary to all the Anti-arminians that I know of. Out of which it plainly appears that *Deut.* 30. 6. Speaks not of an external privilege, but a spiritual grace proper to the elect, nor can be meant of the seed of believers in their infant state, but in their adult.

In the text *Isai.* 44. 2, 3. speaking of *Gods pouring his spirit on the seed of*

Jacob

Jacob his servant. And Jeshrim whom he had chosen (whom he bids not to fear) and his blessing on his off-spring and that they shall spring up as amongst the grass &c. the terms *Jacob* and *Jeshurim* are taken not personally (for it were in vain to bid *Jacob* dead long before not to fear) but Collectively either for the nation of *Israel*, or the church of God called the *Israel* of God. *Gal. 6. 16.* In the former acception the seed and off-spring must be ment of the children of *Israel*, that is the Israelites by natural generation, and then the sense is (as *Mr. Gataker* in his Annot. on that text) my spirit, that is my blessing "(the one expoundeth the other) whereby they and their state should thrive "and flourish, and multiply, and increase, that had been almost clean "exhaust and exceedingly impaired in a manner beyond al hopes of recovery "before ch. 26. 19. *Ezek.* 37. 3. 11, 14. So of their land ch. 32. "15. and of their seed ch. 61. 9. He followeth still the comparison taken "from grounds well watered as ch. 58. 11. and the seed sown in soil ch. 32. "10. In the latter saith he, it is a type of that spiritual growth and increase "of Gods church, and the members of it under the Messiah, by the graces "and comforts of his spirit *Acts 9. 31. Ephes. 4. 12. 15. Col. 2. 19. 2 Pet. 3. 18.* See ch. 27. 6. and 37, 31. and 61. 9. 21. Take it "either way it makes nothing for an external visible privilege from age to age "belonging to the natural seed even of Gentile believers: but in the first ac- "ception it notes a future multiplying of the Jewes then much waisted, in the "later spiritual graces and comforts to the elect.

"And for the last text *Ames. Coron: Acts. 5 c. 2 versum vicesimum, quem in hanc partem Remonstrantes trahunt, in alteram partem accipit Apostolus Paulus Rom. 11. 27. promissionem absolutam & electorum propriam in eo Contineri manifestis verbis confirmans: Externum nihil sonat spiritus meus qui est in te. Semini etiam inculcatio solos electos & efficaciter vocatos notari docet Apostolo sic hunc titulum interpretante Rom. 9. 8. Gal 3. 16. & 4. 28. Mr. Gataker annot: on Esai. 59 21. thy seed] the faithful the seed according to the promise Deut. 30. 6. Rom. 9. 6, 8. Gal. 3. 16. 29. See Dr. Owen of Perseverance ch. 3. Sect. 41. ch. 4. Sect. 3. ch. 5. Sect. 9. ch. 7. Sect. 23.*

And for what Mr *M* counts absurd I yeild is that my answer cuts off *Abraham's Isaac's* and *Iacob's* natural posterity from these promises except they be elect. And as for Mr. *M.* deprehending me in absurdity and trifling such as I conceive in Mr. *Cottons* words, I tell him that his discourse runs upon a mistake of my words and meaning (which he doth almost in every thing he repeats of mine and censures out of hast to frame his book as I am willing to conceive.) For where do I say that which he ascribes to me, and from which he would infer like trifling and absurdity as was in Mr. *Cottons* speech, that God made this promise to *Abraham, Isaac,* and *Jacob* to be the God of them and their seed in all generations? And yet if I had said it, such trifling as Mr. *Cotton* used, would not have followed on those words ascribed to me, unless I had said also, that *Abraham, Isaac,* and *Jacob* were put for every believer and [*their seed*] had been meant in that proposition ascribed to me, of their spirituall seed by faith. And for the close of that discourse in which he tells me, *Thus by your own argument you cut off all the Jewes but such as were elect and inwardly holy, as much as you do the Gentiles from having any visible communion in externall privi-*

leges,

leges, I lay Mr. *M.* fathers on me his own brats, first a proposition I deliver not, then an argument which was none of mine as he makes it, and then a conclusion I never owned, nor would follow on that proposition or that argument he would father on me. For if it were granted that I asserted that God promised to *Abrahaham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, to be the God of them and their seed in all generations, and that my reasoning on Mr. *Cottons* words would prove this proposition must be meant onely of the elect, and inwardly holy (as Mr. *M.* falsly imagines) I do not cut off the Gentiles from having any visible communion in externall privileges, unless I had said the elect Jewes or Gentiles onely had visible communion in externall privileges by vertue of that promise, Gen. 17.7. whereas I never said that externall privileges, as v. 9. of the initiall seal of Circumcision was proper to the elect, and inwardly holy, or derived it from the promise, Gen. 17. 7, but onely from the command, v. 9, 10.

SECT. XXXVIII.

Animadversions on the third Chapter of the first part of Mr. T. Cobbets Just. Vindic. Sect. 1, 2, 3. *about* Gen. 17. *whereby his positions about Church-Covenant and externall privileges of the covenant of grace are refelled.*

TO how little purpose Mr. *M.* hath alleged the promise, Gen. 17, 7. hath been considered; I shall now view what Mr. *Cobbet Just. Vindic. part* 1. *chap.* 3. brings for his doctrine of federal holiness of Church-members children from thence. First he begins, *Sect.* 1. with certain distinctions, *The Covenant of grace*, saith he, *is considered either nakedly or as invested with a visible politicall Church covenant, if not explicite, yet implicite. We are to consider this place*, Gen. 17. *not so much in the former as the later sense; God making of it with reference to the Church which was to remain in the posterity of* Isaac, v. 18, 19, 20, 21. *albeit at present it be to be contained in* Abrahams *own family, whence also he ordaineth an initiatory seal, and way of restipulation, to which they submitting together as one selected body collectively, and as members thereof distributively, they did implicitly make confession and promise to God and bind themselves in a nearer religious tie one unto another. Hence then renewed* Deut. 29. 2 Chron. 15. & 30. & 34. Nehem. 10. Ezek. 16, 8.

Answer. It had been well if Mr. *C.* had defined the covenant of grace in this sense, and how it is fetch't from Gen. 17.7. that I might have known whether he takes it in the same notion which I do, whose *Examen Mr. Cotton* in his letter to me certified me that he was to examine. A covenant in the proper acception is a promise single or mutuall, the covenant of grace is Gods covenant or promise of grace, a term not used in Scripture, though agreeably enough to it. Every covenant of God may be well enough termed *A covenant of grace*. It was of his grace, that is, free favour, that God made any covenant with man in innocency, that he entred into covenant with the Israelites at the giving the Law at Mount *Sinai*: yet commonly Divines oppose the covenant of grace to either of these covenants. It is true there are who make the covenant at Mount Sinai the covenant of grace with a different administration, which to

to be a mistake, is shewed in that which follows. Usually difference is made between the covenant of grace and the covenant of works, or of the Law, which is agreeable to the Apostles expressions, Gal. 3.17. & 4.24. The one promiseth justification by keeping the Law, the other by believing in Christ. I for my part take the covenant of grace for Gods promise of Evangelicall saving grace, to wit, regeneration, justification by Christ, &c. according to the doctrine of the Author to the *Hebrews*, *chap.* 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. & 10, 16, 17. which our Lord Christ calls *The New Testament*, *Matth.* 26. 28. I acknowledge also, that *Gen.* 17. 7. and elsewhere, this covenant was made to *Abraham* under covert expressions, which in their first and most obvious sense held forth other things. But I am put to ghesse what Mr *Cobbet* means by the covenant of grace, and in which words, *Gen.* 17. and in what sense he placeth the covenant of grace there. He speaks of a visible politicall Church-covenant, and conceives the covenant of grace, Gen. 17. to be invested with it either explicit or implicit. The visible politicall Church-covenant (as I conceive from sundry writings of the *New England Elders*) is, that promise of members in a particular Church gathered in a Congregationall way wherein over and besides the promise they make of faith in God, and in the Lord Christ, they explicitly or implicitly promise to each other to walk in holy communion of Gods Ordinances, and subjection to those that are over them with the members of the congregation to which they adjoin themselves as members.

Mr. C. supposeth this covenant as elsewhere so here, Gen. 17. to be included, I with many others see no clear ground for such a covenant there or elsewhere. Besides, what he means by the covenant of grace considered as invested with a visible politicall Church-covenant, if not explicit, yet implicit, is obscure [Invested] is as much as clothed, and it is used as a term of Law, as in the great question about investures into Bishopricks in former ages, and so it notes a legall admission. But in what sense the covenant of grace is said to be invested, is somewhat dark. This I conceive is the meaning, That the covenant of grace, Gen. 17. 7. is made *to Abraham and his seed* considered as joyned by a visible politicall Church-covenant. But I conceive such a position neither true nor safe: Not true, for no mention either explicit or implicit of such a Churchcovenant is there or in any of the places he cites. None there: For though God made the promise in reference to the Church which was to remain in the posterity of *Isaac*, v. 18, 19, 20, 21, yet that Church might be joyned by common profession of the same God, without a promise explicit or implicit of walking together in communion under an eternall politie. God ordained Circumcision as a sign of the Covenant made with *Abraham*: But in what words or fact there's any implied way of restipulation, confession, or promise to God, I am yet to seek, much more wherein they did bind themselves in a nearer religious tie one to another. For though God intended by Circumcision to bind them to leave sin and keep his precepts, and to direct them to look for the *Messiah*, yet that they by any word or act of theirs, did promise to do so, I find not there, nor is it likely that *Ishmael* did make any such profession or promise to God or to others of the family, considering his after carriage to *Isaac*, and his expulsion from *Abrahams* house. As for the other texts, *Deut.* 29. 12, 13, there's mention *of entring into covenant with the Lord*, not a word of entring into covenant one with another, much less of submitting to any

outward Ecclesiastical governors or government. The same may be said of the Covenant, 2 *Chron.* 15.12,13. 2 *Chron.* 34, 31,32. there's a covenant to God mentioned, but not a Covenant to each other called a Church-covenant. 2 *Chron.* 30 There's no mention of any covenant, but of keeping the Passover. *Nehem.* 10. 29, 30. it is said, *They clave to their brethren, their Nobles, and entred into an Oath to walk in Gods Law*: but that they entred into a covenant one with another, I find not. If the words, *They clave to their brethren their Nobles*, be meant of a promise to them, yet a promise of subjection to them as Ecclesiasticall superiors, of holding communion with them in ordinances for admission to Church-membership, I find not there, but an engagement with them to reform certain abuses: And then *Ordinances* (not a Covenant) *were made to charge themselves with* for the service of the Lord, *Ezek.* 16. 8. There's no mention of mans promise to God, or to one another, but the promise of God to them, that *he sware to Israel, and entred into covenant with them, and they became his.* Nor is the position safe, that the Covenant of grace, *Gen.* 17. 7. is made to *Abraham* and his seed considered as joyned by a visible politicall Church-covenant: for then should not the proselytes of the gate, as for instance, *Cornelius* the Centurion be included in the promise of being a God to him, because it is certain he was not joyned by a visible politicall Church-covenant to the Jewish Church, sith he was uncircumcised, and counted unclean, insomuch as that *Peters* going in to him, *Acts* 11. 3. was conceived as unwarrantable for that reason. And what can be the issue of this doctrine, if received, but perplexing superstitious fears of their salvation in some, if they be not in Church-covenant, for without the promise of being God to a person, no man is saved, and injurious censures of those not in Church-covenant, as out of the way of salvation, which will make it like the *grand Imposture* (as Dr. *Morton* calls it) *of the Romish Church That out of communion with it is no salvation.* I do not make such a Church-covenant unlawfull, for what we are bound to do, we may lawfully promise to do, nor do I deny its expediency and usefulness, especially if it be not in too strict and intangling a form. But I think there's no sufficient proof that it is of Divine Institution, or the form of a particular Church either in respect of its truth or purity, much less that it is a condition of interest in the covenant of grace, as if the promises thereof were made under that condition. But I conceive this speech of Mr. *C.* here together with that other excepted against me by me in the first part of this *Review*, pag. 92 are very dangerous. I go on.

Again, saith Mr. *C. That Covenant of grace is considered either in it self, or its administration; to which purpose Circumcision is called the Covenant, partly because it was the sign and seal of the covenant of grace*, Gen. 17 11, 12, 13 *partly too, because it was the covenant of grace in the administration of it*, Ier. 13. 11. *& Isai.* 24. *& Zach.* 11. 10. *hath reference to the covenant of grace, both as invested with the Church-covenant, and in respect of Church administration thereof.*

Answer. The administration of the covenant of grace is to me no way intelligible but thus, that by it is meant the administring the promise it self, which I know not how it should not be done but by making or writing, or some other way representing or recording it, or the things promised in the covenant of grace, to wit, justification, &c. which may be done either by Divine authority & power conferring or bestowing, and this none can do but the eternal Father,

Son

Son and Spirit, or by way of signification, revelation or assurance of them, so I confess the preaching of the Gospel, and in some sense the Sacraments (as they are called) may be termed Church-administrations of the covenant of grace.

But this seems not to be Mr. *C.* his meaning, for he saith, *Circumcision is called the Covenant, partly because it was the sign and seal of the covenant of grace,* Gen. 17.11,12,13. *partly too because it was the covenant of grace in the administration of it.* Which words are an inept tautology, if to be the covenant of grace in the administration of it, be not somewhat beyond being a sign and a seal of it; and sith circumcision is said to be both, circumcision must not onely sign and seal the covenant of grace, but must be the administration of it, which how it should do but by conferring the grace of it, I know not. If it be that way, it must do it either *ex opere operato*, or *ex opere operantis*: if this later way, then how do infants receive grace by it, who believe not, nor do any other act pre-required? if the former, it is the same with the tenent of Popish Doctors. And for the text, *Gen.* 17.11, 12,13. his own words, *pag.* 43. refute him when he saith, *Every one that hath read Catechetically doctrine will say, that when in one verse it's said of Circumcision in their flesh, that it was his covenant in their flesh: It is an usuall Metonymy in speaking of Sacraments to call the outward sacramentall sign and seal by the name of the thing signified and sealed:* pag 44. *Circumcision is but a branch of the covenant, or condition of the covenant on their part.* As for the text *Jer.* 13.11. there's not a word of circumcision in it, onely it is said that *God had caused to cleave to him the whole house of Israel, as the girdle cleaveth to the loyns of a man,* but to refer this to circumcision is frivolous. God had by his Covenant, Providence and actings for them in wonderfull manner made them to cleave to him, *That they might be unto him for a people,* as it follows in the verse. In the other text, *Isai.* 24 5, it is said the Iews *had broken the everlasting covenant*, which if it be understood of the covenant of grace, then may it be broken, and persons may fall from grace; if of circumcision, as Mr. *C.* seems to understand it, then it is no more but they had uncircumcised themselves, which were both false: for at that time and after, even unto this day, the Iewes keep the ordinance of circumcision very strictly, and frivolos, as if this had been the great matter for which *the earth mourned, did fade away, languished, was utterly emptied and spoiled.* But the covenant here is meant of the covenant of the Law at mount *Sinai*, which was *everlasting*, that is, to continue as long as their polity stood, *Exod.* 24.7, 8. as *Exon.* 27, 21, & 12. 24. & 28. 43, 2 *Chron.* 6. 2. 2. & 7. 16. the word [*for ever*] is used for a long time, or the continuance of the Iewish State. So *Jer:* 11, 3, 4, *Jer:* 31, 32, they are accused to break the covenant at mount *Sinai* by disobedience, chiefly by idolatry, and therefore neither of the Text s yeild any thing to prove circumcision to be the covenant of grace in the administration of it. That Gods *breaking of his Covenant*, Zach 11.10: hath no reference to the Covenant of grace, either as invested with Church-covenant or Church-administration thereof, is shewed above, *Sect* 25, in the right administration of it.

The distinction he makes of *being in the Covenant intentionally and actually I allow*, nor do I deny the distinction of *being in Covenant internally and savingly, and onely externally in respect, of men*, though I find not *Ishmael* any where said

ſaid to be *in the Covenant*, and *the promiſes Rom.* 9. 4. are meant of the peculiar promiſes to the nation of Iſrael, by the *Covenants* are meant the tables of the Covenant as *Beza* in his Annot. on that place, however all there ſaid is meant of the Iſraelites only as is ſhewed before Sect. 29. and therefore this place makes nothing for Chriſtian Gentile profeſſors being externally in the Covenant of grace as Mr. C. imagines. Nor do I know any Text in the Scripture wherein that phraſe is uſed of being in Covenant or having the Covenant belong to them externally only.

The diſtinction of *being in Covenant externally in their own or their pareuts right* hath no proof in the new Teſtament, however it have in the old. *The ſeed of Abraham by proportion* is a new invented ſort of *Abrahams* ſeed, no where *Proſelytes of old (not true believers) in their Generations. and (were) viſible inchurched beleivers in their Generations ſcil. parents & children together* are terms *Abrahams ſeed* in Scripture. That *Deut.* 29. 14. notes *the ſorts of perſons, not the individuats* cannot be true; for [*him that is here and him that is not here*] note individual perſons diſtinguiſhed according to their preſent and future exiſtence. That *Gen.* 17. 7. *is meant of a Church ſeed indefinite or by proportion*, is ſaid, not proved by Mr. C. and denied by me. I paſs on to his Concluſions.

Sect. 2. I grant the firſt concluſion according to the explication I give in my *Exercit.* Pag. 2. in my *Examen part.* 3. *Sect.* 2. that *the Covenant Gen.* 17 7. *was a Covenant of grace, and the ſame in nature with that Covenant of grace now held forth to us.* But Mr. C. hath a further meaning to wit that the Covenant as it is a Covenant of Evangelical grace contains a promiſe to a Gentile believere of the external privilege of an initial ſeal or external right to outward ordinances to them and their natural ſeed, and accordingly ſaith Pag. 41 *The Covenant then of the Goſpel hath outward privileges of Gods Tabernacle annexed as wel as Abrahams Covenant, yea in that it's the ſame with it.* Which concluſion in this ſenſe were manifeſtly falſe, for the Lord hath of purpoſe taken away ſuch a Tabernacle according to Chriſts prediction *Iohn* 4. 21. that there might be no diſtinction of Iewes and Gentiles all *having one acceſs by one Spirit to the Father Eph.* 2. 18. As for his proofs I intend not to contrive every ſpeech of Mr C. there being many of them if they be good ſenſe yet very darke, but onely ſhew the impertinency of his Texts to this purpoſe.

Le i. 26. 11, 12. Containes a promiſe proper to the Iſralites obeying God, as v. 13 &c. and ſhewes, and it is a promiſe of that which is not now to be performed to us of ſetling his Tabernacle among us, the Tabernacle and Temple being now taken away ſince Chriſts incarnation. God hath ſetled no Tabernacle now among us but Chriſts body or heavens *Iohn.* 2. 21. *Heb.* 8. 2. and 9. 24 or the Church of God. 1 *Cor.* 3. 6, 17. and 6. 19. and his ſetling this Tabernacle or Temple is by ſaving grace, hath no reference to outward Church privileges, ſuch as Mr. C. means.

Revel. 21. 3. Is a promiſe of ſomething to be performed in the laſt time whether at the calling of the Jewes, or after the judgment. whatever it be it notes another thing than external right to outward ordinances common to Elect and Reptobate, though it be expreſſed by a terme alluſive to the material Tabernacle of the Jews.

Ephe

Ephes. 2. 11, 12. It is said the Gentiles were *without God in the world* after their Conversion; not because their children wanted an external right to an initial seal, for *Cornelius* the Centurions children and such Proselytes of the gate wanted such a right, and yet were not without God in the world; but because *they knew not the true God, and his will concerning them that believe in Christ*, Piscat: *Analys: loci*, or *or worshiped not the true God after his will* as the *new Annot.* even as *Galat.* 4. 8 the Galatians before their Conversion are said *not to have known God, but to do service to them that by nature were not Gods.*

Exod. 29. 45 is a promise to the Israelites *whom he brought out of Egypt* v. 46. and from whom he had sanctified *Aaron* and his sons.

Revel. 21. 4. as v. 3. is neither meant of outward ordinances, nor of an estate which is yet pertaining to the godly who are still under persecutions.

Levit : 26. 41, 42, 45. Certain promises of restoring the Israelites from Captivity and bringing them back to Canaan as v. 43, 44. shew.

Zech. 9. 11. whether meant of temporal deliverance or spiritual it is another thing than outward ordinances, in the former sense it is proper to the Jewes carried to Babylon, in the latter to the elect onely. The like may be said of *Gen.* 17. 5. 5. 8 *Psal.* 111. 5. *Jerem.* 33. 21, 51. (likely v. 35. 36.) 2 *Cor.* 6. 16, 18. *Exod.* 3. 6. compared with *Levit.* 20. 37, 38. *Heb:* 11. 6. In none of which their's a word of a right of Infants or meer professing parents to the visible administration by vertue of Gods Covenant *Gen:* 17. 7. *to be Abraham and his seed*; nor doth it follow because God saith *my Covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting Covenant Gen:* 17. 13. therefore outward ordinances and right to them as then are to be perpetual, for then Circumcision of which those words are spoken must continue still, but rather as *Mr: Ley* in his *Annot:* on *Gen:* 17. 13. *The Covenant may be said to be everlasting in respect of the spiritual part for which Circumcision was ordained, and in respect of the long continuance of the outward ceremony.*

If *Ezek:* 37. 25, 27. be meant of the Jewes calling in the time yet to come, and the same phrases be used, yet that either the promise should be meant v: 25. of their childrens having an initial seal, v: 27. their having a material Tabernacle or Temple and outward ordinances as in the former time is but a vain conceit: For then they must by the same reason have *David* the son of *Jesse* to be their king. wherefore as by *David* is meant *Christ* typified by *David*, so Circumcision is continued in the mortifying of sins *Col.* 2 11. and Gods placing his Tabernacle is as *Piscat: sch.* in *Ezek:* 37. 27. *The gratious inhabiting of God in the hearts of the elect* 2 *Cor:* 6. 16. And if because in the new Testament such allusive phrases are found as are in the same language with those used in the old, therefore such outward things are imported by them as were in the Law, then outward privileges, offices, rites should be meant by presenting our bodies as Sacrifices, being Preists to God &c. It is in my apprehension a manifest Anti-evangelical and Judaizing assertion which Mr: C. hath, that *the Covenant of the Gospel hath outward privileges of Gods Tabernacle annexed as well as Abrahams Covenant*, yea in that it is the same with it.

Sect: 3. when he saith *Con* : 2. that *the Covenant of grace Gen*: 17. *is to be considered as invested with Church Covenant*, it is such an ambiguous expression as I know not well how to understand what I imagine to be the meaning I have refuted before in this *Section*. Nor doth that which is here said, *that there is mention of this Covenant to be kept by them* v: 9. *and further expressed in one particular thereof* v: 10. *and that this was required as an initiatory sign incorporating them into one instituted Church body, whereby they were made capable of further Church-ordinances and other duties which lay upon them virtually by it*, prove the Church-covenant he speaks of, unless it be proved (which I think he cannot do) they did tie themselves thereby to walk with one another in holy Communion with subjection to their Superiors as a distinct visible political Church.

SECT. XXXIX.

Animadversions on Sect: 4. *of the same Chapter: whereby the Conceits of Mr. C about external being in the Covenant of grace are shewed to be vain.*

Sect: 4 Mr. C. sets down this conclusion, that *there is a bare external being in the Covenant of grace of persons who possibly never shall be saved*. But he no where shewed in Scripture either the term *Covenat of grace*, or the phrase of *being in the Covenant of grace externally* or internally. Did *Mr: C.* and other Pædobaptists distinctly set down 1. What they mean by [*the Covenant of grace*] 2. What they mean by [*being externally in the Covenant of grace*] whether it be any other thing than to be Baptized or Circumcised, and what it is distinct from one of these or Title to one of them. 3. By what act it is that a person is externally in the Covenant of grace, whether Gods or his owne, or others as v. 9. The administrators, parents, or the Churches, we might more easily judg of his position. If he mean no more than this, that there is a being in the Covenant of grace in respect of men, that is, men as administrators and others do think or judg some to be in the Covenant of grace, that is, that God hath promised saving grace to some to whom he hath not, I grant it, and I might say in the like manner, some are exeernally elected, regenerated, justified, adopted who are not so savingly. And I should grant that such as are taken to be in the Covenant of grace by reason of their own profession of faith in Christ are rightly judged by us to be in the Covenant of grace and may be baptized, though perhaps they shall not be saved. But such as are taken by us to be in the Covenant of grace without Gods promise or act of their own Profession of faith, by an administrators of baptism and others mistake. Concerning the promise *Gen*: 17. As if it were made to every believing Gentile by profession inchurched, and his natural seed as *Abrahams Church seed* (as Mr: C. calls them) are not therefore rightly judged to be in the Covenant of grace, nor rightly judged to be fit subjects of baptism which appears to be Mr: C's. meaning by his words *Pag*. 51. when he saith, *the Covenant is theirs externally and quoad homines considered as invested with Church Covenant, and in reference to Covenant-ordinances whereof they are capable as of old they were of Circumcision and are now of baptism*. Let us consider what Mr. C. brings to this purpose.

what

what he saith *the promise is said to belong to those Jewes Rom*: 9. 4. *on whom yet the word took no saving effect* v: 6. is not right. For v: 4. is not meant by [*the promises*] the promise by excellency called *the promise of the spirit Gal*: 3. 14. given to *Abraham* v: 17. distinct from the Law v: 18. But the peculiar promises which are made to the Israelites upon the obeying of the Law that they should possess *Canaan*, liue long in it, and prosperously as *Deut*, 5. 16. and 28. 3, &c. For all that which is said *Rom*: 9. 4. is meant of what was proper to the Israelites after the flesh. But the Covenant of grace is *established or made a Law on better promises Heb*: 8. 6. And the phrase *Rom*: 9. 6. [*not as if the word of God had taken none effect*, which is word by word, *not as if* or κχ' οἷον *it may not be, that is*: it is not possible, or it may not be yeelded *that the word of God fell* or was not verified] is meant not *of the promises*, v: 4. but of *the promises mentioned* v: 8. to wit that *Gen*: 17. 7. Which he doth not say *did belong to any externally on whom it had no saving effect*: but suppose it to have been verified and made good to all to whom it was made, who in Gods intention were only the elect, called therefore *children* of the promise v: 8. that is those that were begotten by the promise, not to every child of *Abraham* by natural generation, in particular not to *Ishmael*, nor *Esau*. Nor is it right which he adds, Hence *Rom*: 9. 4. *By opposition to the Gentiles, they* (the Jewes meant v: 4.) where those which were not strangers to the Church, but of it, if he mean it of the Christian Church.

I grant the Jewes were not *strangers to the covenants of promise, but in the same*, Eph. 2: 11, 12. But that *all the Gentile believers and their children were then that which they were not before*, is not a right collection. For as they were ἀκροβυστία, *uncircumcised in the flesh*, so they were still; nor were they ever *of the polity of Israel*. And if *the Covenants of promise* be meant of the Tables of the covenants, and if the word [*promise*] be placed thus (as some place it) *not having hope of the promise*, they might be still said to be strangers from the Covenants. However, if then they were acquainted with, and partakers of the Covenants of promise, this can be understood of none but true believers and the covenant as it was spiritual, which is nothing to the being externally in the covenant of graces.

Mr. *C*. adds, *Hence God makes his covenant with them all*, Deut. 29: 10, 12, 13, 14, 15. *speaking there of that solemn renewall of the covenant of grace, as* Deut. 30: 6, 10, 12, 13, 14. *compared with* Rom. 10, 6, 7, 8. evinceth.

Answer. The more ample discussing this place, and vindicating my Exceptions from what Mr. *B*. replies, I reserve till I answer his *Plain Scripture proof, &c. part* 1. *c*. 17 and his *Corrective, Sect*. 5. For present I say, If God did make his covenant with them all, and it appears to have been the covenant of grace, as *Deut*: 30. 6, 10, 12, 13, 14. *compared with Rom*. 10. 6, 7, 8. *evinceth*, then all must be not onely externally in the covenant of grace, but also internally: For the promise *Deut*. 30. 6. is to *circumcise the heart to love the Lord*, cannot be expounded of the external being in the covenant of grace, but internal. Mr *B*. in his *Friendly Accommodation*, *A new heart is given to the elect onely*, which is all one with the circumcised heart.

"He goes on, So *Ezek*. 16. 8. He made a covenant with that Church and "people, many whereof proved very base, as that chapter sheweth. Now this "was a covenant of grace, albeit invested with Church-covenant, as appears

" in that v. 60. That God for that his Covenants ſake conſidered as his, will
" deal ſo graciouſly with them after all their provocations, as v. 62, 63. Al-
" beit he did not thus properly for the ſake of that inveſture of his covenant
" annexed, ſcil. thy covenant, the Churches covenant abractively conſidered,
" v. 61. See more *Ezek.* 36. from v. 17. to the chapters end.

Anſwer. The thing that Mr *C.* ſhould prove is an externall being in the covenant of grace *quoad homines.* But *Ezek.* 16. 8. neither ſpeaks of the covenant of grace, but the covenant of the Law, which was made in mount *Sinai Junius the new Annot: refer to Exod.* 19. *&* 24. *Piſcat. Schol. in locum, viſitavi te per Moſen, educendo te ex Ægypto, & pangendo tecum fœdus, atque ita ducendo te in uxorem*: Nor is this meant of externall being in covenant in reſpect of men, but of Gods promiſe to them, as the words plainly import, , *I ſware unto thee and entred into covenant with thee, ſaith the Lord.* As for the reaſon why the covenant v. 8 muſt be the covenant of grace, *becauſe he will deal graciouſly with them for that his covenant*, v. 60. it goes on this ſuppoſition, that the covenant v. 8, is the ſame with the covenant v. 60. But *Piſcat. Schol.* on the place reckons that v. 60, *to be the covenant made in the times of Araham, Iſaac, and Jacob, and Levit.* 26. 42, leads to it. But were it granted to be the covenant by *Moſes*, it follows not that the covenant muſt be the covenant of Evangelicall grace. For in *Moſes* his renewing the covenant in the land of *Moab*, there's a promiſe of reduction of them, *Deut.* 30. 3. which being upon condition *of their returning to God, and obeying his voyce according to all that Moſes commanded that day*, muſt be underſtood of the Covenant of the Law, which had its promiſes of ſuch temporall favours, and not of the covenant of Evangelical grace. That which Mr. *C.* ſaith, *That he did not thus properly, for the ſake of that inveſture of his covenant annexed*, ſcil. *this covenant, the Churches covenant abſtractively conſidered*, v. 61. I know not what ſenſe to make of it. There's not a word of Church-covenant, or inveſture with it. The plain meaning is either this, *Not by that covenant of the Law which thou haſt broken, but by the new covenant of the Goſpel*, as *Junius* in his *Annot. in locum, Diodati, the new Annot.* or this as *Piſcat. Schol. in locum, not becauſe thou art worthy of this aggregation of the nations, as if thou hadſt kept covenant with me, as if he had ſaid, but of my grace or free favour*, or as *Grotius*, *It is a Metonymy as if it were ſaid, not becauſe on thy part thou haſt ſtood to the covenant.*

I have ſeen *Ezek* 36. from v. 17. to the chapters end, and I ſee nothing there to Mr *C.* his purpoſe to prove a bare externall being in the covenant of grace. There's not the word *Covenant* in all the paſſage: But on the contrary, there are promiſes, v. 25, 26, 27. of *a new heart giving his Spirit*, which as Mr. *B.* ſaith truly, *is proper to the elect*, and notes an internall being in the covenant of grace. There's little but muddineſs and impertinency in the reſt.

He ſpeaks *of an externall being in Chriſt, John* 15. 2. (which is not denied in reſpect of profeſſion of thoſe that are ſo) and of *an externall partaking of Chriſt*, for which it's likely he cites (not as it is printed, *Heb.* 13. 14.) but *Heb.* 3. 14. But ſure that partaking is a ſaving partaking to which is required *the holding faſt to the end the beginning of our confidence.* For an external partaking may be without condition.

The Jewiſh refuſers, *Iſa.* 1. 11. are called *Chriſts own*, either by kindred or right to them from the old engagements of them to be his by their Anceſtors,

or by vertue of his redeeming them from Ægypt, the land of the North, or some other way. Surely not because *they did externally belong to Christ, or were externally in the covenant of grace & were to be baptized.* For they expresly denied Christ, *and rejected the counsell of God against themselves being not baptized by Iohn*, Luke 7:30.

I grant there is an *externall being called*, Matth: 22.14, but this not competent to infants: I doubt whether *Heb:* 10, 29, be to be interpreted of *an externall being sanctified quoad homines in respect of others by the blood of the Covenant.* The *New Annot:* say thus, *In regard of the meritorious sufficient satisfaction purchased by it. Piscat: Schol. in locum per quem videbatur esse sanctificatus quamdiu*, scil. *Christum confitebatur. Dictum* κατὰ δόξαν, I think it is meant of the same sanctification of which he speaks in the same chapter, *v.* 10. 14. ch. 13, 12, to wit, an effectuall sanctification by remission of sins, and *purging their consciences from dead works*, chap: 9, 14, (which alone, and not an externall sanctificacion I find ascribed to the blood of the Covenant) and the person there said to be sanctified with this sanctification not in reality but according to his profession and opinion of himself, as *Luke* 15. 7. some are said *to be just persons that need no repentance*, that is, according to their own profession and opinion.

The purging from sin, 2 *Pet.* 1. 9. was externall I grant, not inward in the heart, yet it was not a mere purging by the outward ordinance of baptism, but their own profession, and partiall reformation of themselves not competent to infants.

2 *Pet:* 2. 1 It's doubtful whether it note an external being purchased by Christ, or a purchase by Christ onely sufficient, or an effectuall purchase, yet said of them onely according to what they professed and conceived of themselves, as *Luke* 15,7, *Heb:* 10,29, or others conceived of them.

That *Deut:* 33. 3, should be meant of *an externall Saintship*, is supposed, not proved, though it it were applied to the body of Israel, yet it might be understood in respect of the better part, that the people were called *Gods Saints.*

Psa: 50,5, *The Saints of God, and those that had made a covenant with him by Sacrifice were Israel.* vers 7, & it is true there were many hypocrites; but as the new *Annot: God in respect of his elect calleth the whole body Holy, Saints, and his people*, not meerly from an externall Saintship. To which I add, if it be referred to the covenant, *Exod:* 24. 8. to which Mr *Ainsworth* in his Note on the place directs, it was the covenant of the law, not the covenant of grace which is meant, *Psal:* 50, 5,

It is true, *There are invisible Churches, which are as Isaac was, Children of the Promise*, Gal: 4, 28, *Children of the Gospel-church*, v. 31, & 26. But that this should be verefied in all the members of the Galatian Churches, unto whom *Paul* wrot that Epistle, *Gal:* 1, 2, is not true, nor is it proved by Mr *C*, that *the Apostle spake what he saith*, vs 28. 31, *of every member of the Churches of Galatia.* It is true that *Ierusalem above is the mother of us all:* but that [*us all*] *should* signifie every profession of the faith in the Churches of *Galatia*, is false: for then every one of them should be *born after the spirit*, v: 29. and *inherit*, v. 30. The new *Annot:* on *Gal:* 4. 24. 6. therefore say, *The Christian Church is the mother of all the faithfull who are heirs of the kingdom of Heaven whether they be Iewes or Gentiles.* So that to be *mother of us all*, Gal. 4. 26. is not to be mother

of every professed Christian in *Galatia*, but of so many as held the right faith with *Paul*, and were *born after the Spirit*. Thus in like maner *Rom:* 8, 3, 21 when it is said, *who spared not his own Son, but gave him up for us all*, it is not meant of every professor of Faith in *Rome*, but all the elect and true believers, as that which follows in the same verse and verse 33 shewes: So that we need not assert either that *every professor of faith in the Galatian Churches was a child of the Jerusalem above effectually and savingly*, or that *there were some particular visible Churches in which were no hypocrites* (which yet may be true notwithstanding the Parables *Matth:* 13 and 25. or 1 *Tim:* 3, 15. compared with 2 *Tim:* 2, 20) or that *such as are savingly interessed in the Covenant of grace, should fall from grace*, or that *all were externally and according to men children of the promise*, as Mr *C.* speaks.

Heb: 4, 1, 4, proves not that *the promise of grace and glory may be to one as his legacy or portion externally and according to men, of the saving good whereof it is possible one may fall short.* For though there be mention of *a promise left*, yet not of a promise left to any that come short of it, unless by *being left* be meant propounded or tendered onely.

Antipædobaptists do grant they admit false brethren to baptism and the Lords Supper, called by Mr *Cobbet seals of Church and Covenant fellowship*, but it is not in them to admit them into the fellowship of covenant, meaning the covenant of grace; for that is Gods peculiar. We admit them to baptism on this ground, not because to us they are in covenant (we suspend any judgement about their Interest in the covenant, as being out of our cognizance, and no Rule for us to admit or keep back from baptism) but because we know them to be professors of faith in Christ.

If by *Blanks* be meant such as to whom the promise of the covenant of grace is not made, and by *Seals*, Baptism and the Lords Supper, we think we do ordinarily put seals to a blank, nor do we make scruple thereof, or think it true that *the seal must follow the covenant*, or that *Gen:* 17. 9, 10, 11, 13. *Acts* 2, 38 39. 1 *Cor:* 11, 25 prove it. That it is not taught *Gen:* 17. 7, 10, 11, 13, *Act:* 2 8, 39, is shewed in the fore part of this *Review*, *Sect* 5. and in this part, *Sect* 5. 8, 13, 20, 21, 22, 23, 37, and elsewhere, 1 *Cor.* 11, 25 *the cup in the Lords Supper* is called *the new Testament in Christs blood*; but that all, or onely those who are in the covenant of grace must have the the cup, is not proved thence, and the falshood of it is shewed above often.

We do not say when we admitted persons to baptism, we judged them to be in the covenant of grace, else we had not admitted them; but we knew they professed faith in Christ, and so were Disciples of Christ, and thereupon admitted them according to our Rule, *Matth.* 28, 19, leaving it to the Lord whether they be in the covenant of Grace or no, we being not directed to enquire whether they were in the covenant of grace, but whether believers and disciples by profession.

I for my part agree not to it, that *either according to Scripture, or the best Protestants any are said to be children of the promise, or that the covenant of Evangelicall grace in the* N. T. *confirmed by Christs blood, is made to them, or belongs to them besides the elect.* Such Doctrine gives great advantage to the Arminians, undermines perseverance in grace, and the Polemicall Doctrine of our choice Divines, as I shewed *Examen part* 3. *Sect*, 4. and elswhere in this part of

the

the *Review*. Mr. *Norton*, Mr *C*. his Colleague, commended by Mr *Cotton* with Mr *Cobbet*, as a prime writer in the *New English* Churches, *Resp. ad syl. quæst. Apollon. p.* 30. saith, *Objectum fœderis gratiæ sunt soli electi, objectum fœderis Ecclesiastici sunt tum electi tum reprobi*

My own *Tertullian* in his book *de Anima, chap.* 21, 22, when he urgeth that Text, 1 *Cor:* 7, 14, *for a peculiar cleanness of believers children by privilege of seed*, means not the federall holiness Mr *C*. teacheth, but holiness by reason of the freedom from that unholiness in their procreation, which the Infidels children had from the many grosse idolatrous superstitions, by which they were defiled, and as it were ded cated to the Divell, as I shew in my *Apologie, Sect* 16, *page* 85. *Paræus, Peter Martyr, Bucer, Melanchon*, Mr. *Philpot*, are all Neotericks. *Cyprian, Gregory, Nazianzen, Jerom, Austin*, though they did plead for Pædobaptism from the Argument of Circumcision, yet did not maintain Infants covenant-estate, as Mr. *C*. but a necessity of baptism to Infants ready to die, because of the Text, *The soul that is not circumcised shall be cut off from his people, Gen:* 17, 14, Instances whereof in *Augustine* and others are many cited by *Chamier Paustr. Tom:* 4, *l:* 3, *c.* 3, *Sect* 39, 40 41. And they thought the Infant dying baptized was infallibly saved, whether believers child or not: As for others, they denied their entring into the kingdom of heaven, as I shew you in my *Examen, part.* 1. *Sect* 7, 8, 9, 10.

I have often considered *Zech:* 11, 10, and I conceive the sense as Mr C. makes it *of the covenant of grace in respect, at least, of the externall administration thereof amongst them*, as verse 9, *and their externall right in that his covenant*, to be very vain: For if it be meant of the covenant of grace, then it is as much as to say, That *I might not write my Lawes in their heart, forgive their sins, &c. as I promised them, Jer.* 31. 33. and then God should break his promise, there should be falling from the covenant of grace, &c. If the sense be of *the covenant of grace in respect of externall administration thereof amongst them, and their externall right in that his covenant*, then it is as if he had said, *That I might take away Circumcision, the Passover, and the rest of the Temple-service, and the peoples right to them.* (For what is the externall administration of the covenant of grace; but the seals, as they call them, and the rest of the service of the Sanctuary?) Now this neither agrees to the phrase; for Circumcision is never called *Gods covenant with all the people*, and to break circumcision, what is it but either to draw up the fore-skin, and to forbid circumcision? If this be referred to the time of Christs coming, this had not been a prediction of an evill to them, but of a benefit to be eased of that yoak, verse 9, mentions not *externall administration of the covenant of grace, or externall right thereto.* But whenever it was accomplished, whether at the siege of Jerusalem, or at some other time, it was the taking away of some who might be their protectors, whereby they were exposed to destruction; which whether they were the *Maccabees* or some others, may be doubted. However, it is so frigid an interpretation to interpret it as Mr *C*. doth, that methinks he should be ashamed to blot paper with it.

The Covenant ch 10. whether it were that *Gen.* 17. or that *Exod.* 19. or 24. or *Deut.* 29. it is certain it is meant not of the Covenant of grace common to

all

all believers Gentiles or Jews, but of the covenant which he made with the Israelitish nation, *which he brake* by takingaway their Leaders whether Governors or Teachers *Maccabees* or some other, and so exposing them to ruin by the *Grecian* or *Roman* Lords or some other.

Psal. 44.17. *Dan.* 11.30, 31, 32, 33. *to deal falsly in Gods Covenant*, and *to forsake the holy Covenant*, and *to do wickedly against the Covenant*, do not intimate that Mr. *C.* would infer that *there are some said to be in the Covenant of grace only externally*. For *to deal falsly in Gods Covenant* is no more than not to keep Gods Commands, as the term *Covenant* is oft put Synecdochically *Psal.* 25.10. and 131.12. *To forsake the holy Covenant*, is to forsake the Law, to *do against it*, is to do against the Law, as *Anticohus* had *imagination against the holy Covenant*, that is the Law of the Jews. And that this is the meaning is apparent *Psal.* 44.18. where v. 17. is thus explained, *our heart is not turned back, nor our steps declined from thy way*. This Covenant then was no other than the Law of *Moses*, the Covenant made in *Horeb*, specially the Decalogue, whence the Ark called *the Ark of the Covenant* 1 *Kings* 8.1. the Decalogue *the words of the Covenant Exod.* 34.28. And it is apparent in that *Antiochus* endeavored to compel them to break that Law, as to sacrifice to Idols, to eat Swines flesh and now this Covenant was not the Covenant of grace. For the Apostle plainly distinguisheth *the Law from the promise 400 years before Gal.* 3 17. and the Covenant at Sinai is opposed to that of grace called the Jerusalem above *Gal* 4 24. Nor is there any difficulty in that which Mr. *C.* objects, that *believers then might be in a free Covenant of grace, and at the same time under the contrary Covenant of bondage*. For the believing Jews to wit *David* and the rest of those that believed *Heb.* 11. were under the command of the Covenant in *Sinai*. yet under the Ceremonial part, yea were not under the sentence or judgment of the Covenant of the Law so as to be justified or condemned by it.

The everlasting Covenant *Isai.* 24.5. is no other than the Law as is proved above. It is said *Rom* 3.3 (not 7. as it is printed) *If some believed not, shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect?* But the inference of Mr. *C.* is trivolous, *the faith of God was plighted to them, and they were externally in the Covenant, though the faith of God took saving effect only in the elect and in the believing*. For I would know what the faith of God was whether it were the Covenant of saving grace, or the outward Covenant? If it were only the outward, how did it take saving effect in the elect? Did the faith of God take effect in that which was never promised? The outward Covenant me thinks Mr. *C.* should not say did promise saving grace, but externall right and administrations, therefore saving grace is not the effect of that Covenant.

And indeed the outward Covenant is but a meer notion (except understood Meronymically as Circumcision is called the Covenant as being the sign of it) there being no faith of God plighted to any Gentile believer and his seed, wherein God promiseth that they shall be accounted visible Church members, and as having external right or enjoyment of Church administrations. If he should it would be false, many of them never attaining them or having right to them. If it were the Inward Covenant in which God plighted his faith, then it took effect only in the elect and they only were in covenant.

Nor

Nor doth *Rom.9.6.* intimate what Mr. *C.* dreames; *that the word, or Covenant of grace, took effect in all the Jews, in some externally, in the elect savingly.* But as the stream of Protestant writers (whereof some are alleged in my *Examen part.3, Sect.4.* and others before in this part of the *Review*) and the very words shew it took effect only in the elect, who are therefore called *v.8, the Children of the promise* distinguishingly from others, and the Apostle plainly resolves that *the seed Gen.17.7.* as not *Ishmael* but *Isaac*, not *Esau* but *Jacob*, and consequently no believers natural seed, except elected.

As for *Rom.9.4.* it is often shewed that *the Covenants* there are meant of the Tables of the Covenant and *the promises*, the special promises made to the Israelites after the flesh, as is manifest *v.4.5.* expressing peculiar privileges to them distinct from what the Gentiles, though believers, have.

which Mr. *C.* saith, *the Covenant of grace and an outward Covenant are not two distinct Covenants: but the Covenant of grace made with the elect in respect of their saving interest in that, I will be a God to them, the same is made with others in respect both of visible interest and the visible administration of it,* I see no truth in it. For there is no Scripture that ever expounds, *I will be a God to them*, that is, they shall have visible interest, and the visible administration of it, that is, they shall be circumcised &c. many have the promise of saving intrest who neither have, nor ever had visible or visible administration as their language is of the Covenant of grace, and on the contrary many have no saving Interest, yet have the visible intrest and administration Mr. *C.* speaks of which in truth follows the command, not the Covenant. Nor is it consistent with Mr. *C's.* own suppositions, *that a man may be in the external Covenant who is not in the Covenant of grace savingly that the one is only the visible interest and administration, the other the promise of saving grace*, if they be not two distinct Covenants, For they must needs be distinct Covenants which are made to different persons of different things, as these are supposed to be by Mr. *C* himself. Nor doth Mr. *C.* prove by any text that *there is any other way of entring into the Covenant of grace ordinarily, but by a true and lively faith.* It is true *Ezek.16.20, 21, 23.* the children of the Israelites were *Gods children* by special right as his *servants Levit.25.55.* because *he redeemed them out of Egypt*, and *he had entred a special Covenant with them*, and *they the whole nation had also engaged themselves in a special Covenant to be his*, and it is true *the Covenants and promises were theirs Rom.9.4* and they were *the children of the Prophets*, and *the children of the Covenant which God made to Abraham Act.3.25.* that is, the people among whom and out of whom Christ came, to whom he was at first made known, to whom the Prophets were sent; but this doth not prove that *they were all internally or externally in the Covenant of grace.* They had no right to be babtized, yea the greatest part of them (for this is spooken of the people of the Jews whether believers or not, even of them that offered their sons and daughters to Divils) denied Christ, and were *broken off by unbelief Rom.11.20.*

Gal.4.28. is impertinently brought to prove a bare external being in the Covenant of grace. For it is meant only of believers *born after the spirit v.29. who by the spirit do wait for the hope of the righteousness which is by faith Gal.5.5.*

It is not true that any of the true members from the Church of Ephesus *Acts.*

Acts 20. 30. *are said to be purchased by the blood of Christ.* It was judged an abuse in *Stapleton* by Dr. *Rainold*, *Apol. Thess. Sect:* 20. *to interpret the flock of God redeemed by his blood, of any reprobates.* Of 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. I have spoken before.

An externall being in the covenant of grace, *quoad homines*, by the parties profession, I never denied, but an externall being in the covenant of grace of believers infants by vertue of the parents faith in the New Testament, I still deny.

"Mr *C.* takes upon him to answer my *Dilemma*, *Examen* pag. 52. and tells "me, The covenant is theirs externally and *quoad homines*, consi- "dered as invested with Church-covenant, and in reference to covenant-or- "dinances, whereof they are capable, as of old they were of Circumcision, "and are now of baptism. Thus it is theirs at present in respect of the vi- "sible faith and interest of the parent or parents in the covenant, and for the "future it's theirs in the further grace of the covenant upon condition of "their believing if they do live to years of discretion.

Answer. The position I intended to prove by the *Dilemma*, was set down page 48. That the Covenant of saving grace in Christ expressed *Gen* 17 7. in these words, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed*, is not made to a believer and his naturall seed, to which Mr *C.* his answer is, by telling me, *The covenant is theirs externally &c.* which is to answer nothing to the Argument which proceeded against the asserting Gods Covenant, *Gen.* 17.7. as a promise of saving grace to belong to a believers naturall seed. Nor doth he prove, but dictate that *Gen.* 17. 7. "There's a promise concerning the exter- "nall covenant, or to any Gentile believers naturall seed, or that there is a- "ny mention of Church-covenant, or that title to Church-ordinances, as "Baptism and Circumcision is derived from interest in the promise *Gen* 17. "7. *Or that* the parents visible faith or interest in the covenant, makes it the "childrens: *or* that the covenant is such an ambulatory or revocable con- "tract, as to be the infants for the present in respect of the parents faith; but "for the future it's theirs in the further grace of the the covenant upon con- "dition of believing if they live to years of discretion.

These Dictates are hatched in Mr. *C.* his nest, but have nothing in the Text for them, nor doth he attempt to prove them in that chapter which is termed, *The Explication of Gen.* 17. 7, &c. In like manner he dictates in that which follows.

I had said, if the covenant of grace to believers seed be absolute, then either God keeps it or not: if he do not keep it, then he breaks his word, which is blasphemy; if he do keep it, then it follows, that all the posterity of believers are saved, contrary to *Rom.* 9. 13. Or if some are not saved though they be in the covenant of grace, there may be Apostasie of persons in the covenant of grace.

"In answer to which he tels me, God may be said absolutely to covenant "with believers seed collectively and specifically considered, and yet all the "individuall children not saved. It is absolutelely made, and made good "that, that sort of persons shall be and are saved by virtue of Gods covenant, "for some of them are infallibly saved: the covenant is to the indefinite "collective seed or children in respect of internall saving interest: else none "of them dying Infants should be saved.

Where-

Whereto I reply, The promise is to *Abrahams seed*, *Gen.* 17. 7. But that the promise is to be a God to any Gentile believers naturall indefinite collective seed in respect of the internall saving interest, as such, is not true. The promise is not made indefinitely but definitely to *Abrahams seed*, under whom none but believers of the Gentiles, or elect persons are meant, nor is it made specifically to a sort of men, but to such and such numericall persons as were *Abrahams seed* by nature or grace: Nor is it made collectively to any of them as part of the whole number of Gentile-believers naturall seed, but as *Abrahams seed* by grace, and if any of them be elect, it is made also to Gentile unbelievers naturall seed under the same consideration. It is true, some of the believing Gentiles seed dying infants are saved, nor can we say that none of the unbelievers infants, dying in infancy, are saved, notwithstanding the Arguments brought to prove their perishing. But none of them are saved by virtue of a promise made to that sort of persons, that is, believers naturall children (for there is no such promise) but by vertue of Gods election, conformable to which is the promise of saving grace, *Gen.* 17. 7. as the Apostle expressly determines, *Rom.* 9. 6, 7. 8, and consequently as election is of individuall persons (not of a collective indefinite specificall seed as Mr. *C.* speaks) so is the covenant. M. *C.* goes on thus.

Supposing they are the Israel of God, a part of the elect seed, yet the means of saving effect in and upon them, is the word of the Covenant, Rom. 9. 6. *It's through the effectuall word and engaged truth of God that that part of the Church are savingly purged*, Eph. 5. 25, 26.

Answ. I grant this to be true, yet conceive that *Eph.* 5. 25, 26. speaks of the word of promise, not barely as made, but also as accomplished in Christs performance, and published by preaching, whereupon baptism follows, by both which Christ sanctifies and purgeth his Church savingly by the one as the means, by the other as the sign.

He adds, *The covenant is to the individual seed of all and each of them in respect of externall interest, and yet many of them not saved.*

Answer. This is an exposition which is without proof, or example of the like, 1. That where God saith, *I will be a God to Abrahams seed*, he means other believers, even Gentiles naturall seed. 2 That he means this in respect of externall interest onely to some. 3. That some of those to whom he promiseth to be a God according to the covenant of grace in Christ, may not be saved. 4 That by *Abrahams* seed he meaneth in respect of saving effects, the indefinite collective seed of Gentile-believers, so as that it is onely made good to that sort of persons (which were true if none but *Isaac* and *Iacob* were saved; For if the promise of salvation be onely to the sort of persons, it is made good in one or two of believers seed) but in respect of externall interest to the individual seed all and each of them, yea though the parents be but hypocrites, and not savingly in the covenant of grace themselves. He goes on.

Nor yet is Gods faithfulness impeached or impaired, nor need the faith of believers be shaken, if this or that child should prove, live and die wicked, the force of the covenant is not to be measured by the fatall miscarriage of many of Abrahams Church-seed.

Answer. Neither is Gods faithfulness impeached, nor need the faith of believers be shaken, though all their children die wicked. It is not true, That

the Apostles reasoning, Rom. 9. 4, 6. compared mentions any such Church-seed of Abraham, or takes them in as such, but onely the elect. Mr C. doth falsly charge his adversaries doctrine, *as denying any interest at all to any believers infants in the covenant.* I have often granted it to the elect, but to none as believers infants. Mr *Baillie* charged me with this thing, to which I answered in my *Letter to him, Sect.* 1. our doctrine is as comfortable as theirs when they speak truth. It is no Gospel but a dream to affirm what Mr. *C.* doth of *Abrahams* sancied *Church-seed*, though it be Gospel to say, God will be a God to *Abrahams* spirituall seed elect and true believers.

SECT. XL.

Animadversions on Sect. 5. *of the same Chapter, shewing that Mr.* C. *his supposed visible interest in Gods covenant is not the rule in baptizing.*

SECT. 5. Mr. C. sets down this conclusion, *That the Church in dispensing an enjoyned initiatory seal of the covenant of grace, looketh unto visibility of interest in the covenant, to guide her in the application thereof. Nor is the saving interest of persons in view, which is her rule by which she is therin to proceed.*

Concerning which I say, that I grant it if the terms be altered into plainer expressions as thus: The baptizer in the admitting a person to baptism, is not bound to stay baptism till he know a person hath saving interest in Gods covenant of grace; but it is sufficient, if he be a visible disciple or believer to admit him to baptism. And that M. *C.* may cease his wonder, he who confessed that it's not to be denied that God would have infants of believers in some sense to be counted his, to belong to his Church and Family, & not to the Divels as true *in facie Ecclesiæ visibilis, &c.* doth not oppose his fourth Conclusion reduced to the plain terms I have set it down in. Yet there are sundry things in which I oppose him. 1. That he makes it the Churches business to dispense the initiatory seale (as he calls it) of the covenant of grace, which I take to belong to him that is sent or used to make disciples by preaching the Gospel, not to the Church

2. That he maketh the rule of baptizing to be visible interest in the covenant, which according to the institution is visible discipleship, or faith.

3. That he takes that person to have visible interest in the covenant of grace, so as to have right thereby to baptism, who neither by extraordinary revelation from God, nor by any act of his own, but barely by his parents profession hath a pretended visible interest in the covenant. But let's examine what he saith, because he seems to be the selected man in *New England* to plead for Infant-baptism.

Whether John the Baptist did admit to baptism those which he knew would prove false and fruitlesse, is doubtfull. Mr *Norton* Mr *Cs.* Colleague. *Resp. ad Apollon.* Prop. 2. seems to hold the negative, and cites to that purpose, *Paræus* and *Aretius*. Together with Mr. *C.* in his position, *That persons may be baptized upon visible profession without knowledge of the saving state of the party, yet I do not think Ananias and Sapphira, or Simon Magus were known hypocrites when they were baptized, nor do I think the Texts Mr C. allegeth, Acts*

21. 20, &c, or 22, 20, &c. or 23, 12, 13, prove, that any of those baptized, *Acts* 2. 41, or 4. 1, 2, 3, 4. were *of the number of them that opposed Paul, or proved false. If Christ did say to Iudas that his body was broken or given for him, and his blood shed*, it will be hard to avoid thence the proof of universall redemption. I think it the safest and most likely tenent that *Iudas* went out afore the Lords Supper. For the Passover it was not administred to *Iudas* by *Christ*, nor do I know what warrant we have to make it a seal of the covenant, or to belong to a Minister of the seals, as they speak. It was a rite instituted to remember the delivery out of Egypt, and appointed to be used by each family without any other administration than the providing, slaying, dressing and bringing to the Table: If the Priest did any thing in it, it was at the Temple not at the Table, each person was to take himself according to his eating, *Abraham* and *Isaac* did circumcise *Ishmael* & *Esau* rightly according to Gods command, which is the rule in administring ordinances, not covenant-interest. But that *they did circumcise as Prophets or Priests at that time, to the Church in their families*, it is said without proof. The business of circumcising was not the work of a person as a Prophet or Priest to his family, but did belong to the parent or some other in his stead, though no Prophet nor Priest. *Chamier Paustr. cath. tom. 4 l 5 c. 14 sect 9, 10*, saith, *We read of no certain Minister of Circumcision either in the institution or elsewhere, so that there's no obstacle but that Zipporah, and the woman in the second of Maccabees, c. 6. might circumcise.* So there is nothing read by which the immolation of the Paschal Lamb was wont to be done in each family, is prohibited, though no Priests were used. *Ishmael and Esau, and Iudas, were not visibly interessed in the covenant*; being discovered by God and Christ to be such as had no interest in it. That *a Minister cannot of himself admit to baptism, or reject from it regularly, but by and with the Churches consent*, is dictated without proof. I grant that *if particular persons having interest in Gods covenant and promise of grace, were the Rule to baptize by, administrators could not observe the rule in faith, but doubtingly.* But that such visible interest in the Covenant as Mr *C.* means, is therefore the rule to baptize by, follows not. What or where *A. R. suggests to the contrary* I find not, nor doth Mr *C.* tell us. What he adds, *I say visibility of the parties interest in the covenant, I say not meer visibility of faith and repentance*, is quite besides the Scripture, which never appoints persons to be baptized because of their visible interest in the covenant, but their visible faith and repentance.

"He tells us, "The initiatory seal is not primarily and properly the seal of "mens faith and repentance, or obedience, but of Gods covenant rather; "the seal is to the covenant, even *Abrahams* circumcision, was not primarily a "seal to his faith, of righteousnes, but to the righteousnes of faith exhibi- "ted and offered in the covenant; yea to the covenant it self, or promise "which he had believed unto righteousnes. Hence the covenant of grace is "called the righteousnes of faith, *Rom.* 10. 6, 7, 8. The righteousnes of "faith speaketh on this wise, v. 8. and the word of faith. Hence albeit *A-* "*braham* must walk before God, who is now about to enlarge the covenant "to his as well as to make it to him in a Church-reference, *Gen.* 17. 1, &c. "yet the initiatory seal in his as well as their flesh, is Gods covenant, v. 13. "or a sacramentall sign firstly and expressly of Gods covenant, v. 11. & 7. "compared; albeit it implicitly oblige him and them to other duties for-

formerly mentioned. Hence *Acts* 2. 38, 39, the seal of baptism is put to the promise as the choice matter and foundation in view, and as that was a ground of repentance it self; repent and be baptized for the promise is to you, not, for you have repented as if that were the thing to be firstly sealed by baptism, but the promise rather.

Answ. The inititory seal is a late devised term not found in Scripture and it is used upon an erroneous conceit as if the nature of Sacraments were to be seals of the Covenant, and baptism were the initiatory seal. But the term [*initiatory seal*] is chosen rather than the word [*baptism*] (though it be the Scripture term) by Mr. *C.* and others, that they may shuffle what they say in and out under the term of ininitiatory seal, sometimes understanding by it Circumcision sometimes baptism as if they were the same and what is said of the one were meant of the other, which is meer fallacious arguing. But setting aside Mr. *C's* lately devised term, the end of Christian baptism is in the first place, that thereby the party baptized may testifie his repentance, faith and hope in Christ, love to the people of God, and resolution to follow Christ to the death. And this is proved in my *Exercit:* in the twelfth reason of my doubting about Pedobaptism pag. 33. in the 2 *part* of this *Review Sect.* 5. from these Scriptures *Rom.* 6. 3, 4. 5. 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. *Gal.* 3. 26, 27. *Ephe.* 4. 5. *Col.* 2 12. 1 *Pet.* 3. 20. where the phrase of *the answer of a good conscience*, as *Beza* rightly observes in his *Annot.* on that place, alludes to the manner of the primitive baptizing after the answer to the questions propounded concerning the parties repentance, faith and obedience: which were held so necessary to baptism in the first ages of the Christian Church that none was baptized without it, yea and when infant baptism came up even till our dayes, and in some places according to the *Common prayer Book* even to the infants the same questions are propounded, yea the *Lutherans* confesse that *without faith in infants it is in vain to baptize them. The continuance of which questions*, as *Lud: Vives Comment: in Augustin: de civit: Dei l.* 1. c. 27. rightly saith, *proves the original use of baptism to be of those only that could answer those questions.* In respect of which *Basil* and others call baptism *the seal of faith*, *Tertullian of repentance*, *the sealing of faith*, *Chamier: Paustr: Cath. tom.* 4. *l.* 2. *c.* 8 cites the treatise *of the spirit* under the name of *Basil ch.* 12. saying, *Confession goes before bringing to salvation, baptism follows sealing our consent.* whence he infers thus *manifestly salvation is ascribed to confession, but baptism is the seal of confession.* No where that ever I could find among the Ancients is baptism termed the seal of the Covenant. *Bucer* on *Acts* 2. 38. *To be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, is by the sign of baptism to testifie that we are the believers in Christ for remission of sins. Grot: Annot:* on *Mark.* 16. 16. [*and is baptized*] *he that believeth, and by baptism maketh profession of his faith.* So that the profession of faith by it is the primary end and use of baptism nor is there any place of Scripture that I know which doth make the end of baptism to be the sealing of Gods Covenant to us. And here by the way it is to be noted what shifting is used in this matter by Pedobaptist. They say *the seal follows the Covenant and the parties interest in it, and this Covenant they make the righteousness of faith* as Mr. *C.* here, but when they are pressed that then in vain are infants non-elect and non-believers baptized, who are not in that Covenant, they fly to an imaginary external Covenant, and visible

sible interest in that as sealed by it, and there by a right to be baptized; which yet by their own confession is not the Covenant of grace, nor by sealing that interest is the Covenant of grace sealed, for that is Gods Covenant of righteousness by faith, not the baptized persons Covenant, or his right. As for Mr. *C's.* observations here they are false and slighty. For neither is it true that it is hence (because baptism is not primarily the seal of mans faith and repentance, but of Gods Covenant rather) *Abrahams circumcision* was called *a seal of the righteousness of faith*: but the contrary rather is true. For if it were *a seal of the righteousness of faith which he had yet being uncircumcised*, it sealed rather his own faith, and the righteousness by it already obtained, than Gods covenant to him of something to come. And if circumcision be called *Gods Covenant*, yet it follows not that *baptism is rather a seal of Gods covenant, than of mans faith and repentance.* That which he saith of *Acts.* 2. 38. 39. is as vain: For *the promise is* not alledged there as sealed in baptism, or giving any right to baptism, but meerly as a motive to them *to repent and to be baptized* in the sense I give *Antipædobapt. part.* 1. Sect. 5. In this part of the *Review Sect.* 5. 8. 21, 22, 23. wherein Mr. *C's* frivolous interpretation is examined. And though the Apostle do not bid them be baptized because they had repented, yet he bids them first *to repent* and then be baptized.

Infants have no visible title to baptism because they make no visible personal profession. Parental faith in the Covenant made to them and their children is but a delusion. What ever may be said of the texts *Deuteronomy.* 26. 17. *Deuteronomy.* 29. 10, 11, 12. &c. Concerning taking it of children (of which in the examining of Mr. *B's* remainder) there is no visibility of infants Church-membership in the Christian churches mentioned in Scripture. I know not how the believing Gods testimony is *the assent of charity.* I still say there is no judgment of charity concerning infants who do nothing which may be interpreted to the better or the worse Mr. *C.* if he had recited my words fully in my *Examen Pag.* 41. might have found my words to yeeld him no help for his fourth Conclusion. I pass on to the fifth.

SECT. XLI.

Sect. 41. *Animadversions on the sixth sect. of the same ch: shewing that Christ is not head of any unsound members, nor parents profession of faith unites children to Christ so as to entitle them to baptism.*

SECT. *sixthly* he sets down this conclusion, *That Christ is in Scripture considered as head of the visible Church in which are many members of Christ the head in that respect, which prove unsound, as well as in other respects he is considered as head of the visible Church, wherein are none but elect ones.*

Concerning which I say, that part of the invisible Church which is on earth professing faith, being both visible and invisible, visible in respect of their profession, invisible in respect of their sincere believing, it must needs follow that Christ is head of the visible, being head of the invisible Church in respect of those persons which are of both. And I grant that Christs headship being a Metaphor and nothing, sundry things as Superiority, Goverment, dire-

direction, union, participation of the same life, sense, motion &c. In respect of some of these Christ may be said to be head of that part which is only visible, as in giving them officers, outward order, direction, help against persecutors &c. But that *in Scripture Christ is made head to any unsound members I find not.* Mr. *C. urgeth Gal.* 3.16. *that to Abraham and his seed were the promises made; that is to Christ, yet not to Christ personally, for the promise of pardon of sin did not belong to him, and to Christ personall were not the promises made, but in him confirmed,* Gal. 3.17. *with* 16. *But rather of Christ collectively head and members, Gentiles and Iewes, v.* 14.28. *as* Gen. 3.15. *The seed of* Eve *is Christ, with his members in and with him.*

Answer. I stick not to grant *Gal.* 3.16, by [*Christ*] to be meant not onely Christ personally considered, but also collectively, as *Beza, Piscator,* & others conceive; yet I do not think the Arguments brought by them so cogent for that sense, but that it may be understood of Christ personall as a common person receiving promises for all his members. For the scope of the Apostle to prove Gentiles and Jewes to have one manner of justification, is obtained by understanding the promises made to his person as a common person in behalf of all as well as to them as in him, and eternal life is promised to all the members of Christ if it be promised to Christ as a common person standing in their stead as the second *Adam.* As for Mr C. his reasons, the former is against his own opinion. For *if by Christ be meant Christ collectively, that is, Christ and his Church,* then the promises be made to Christs person with his Church; for what is Christ collectively but Christs person with his Church. And if the pardon of sin be a promise, then it must be made known to Christs person included in Christ collective: Therfore either it must be said, that the promises were made to Christ collective respectively, to wit, some to his person, as that he would uphold him, raise him from the dead, give him glory, others to his Church, to pardon their sins, renew their nature, &c. or that Christs person had the premise of pardon of sin made to himself as a common person, but not for himself as needing it, but for his Church or in their stead, as 2 Cor. 5. 21. The promises might be said to be given to Christs person as a common person, Gal. 3. 16 and yet confirmed in Christ as a surety of them, *v* 17. yet in this place the term [*Head*] is not used, and therefore not apposite to Mr. *C.* his purpose.

"But Mr *C.* propounds a question, "Whether this in *Gal.* 3. & 1 *Cor.* 12. "12, 13. be spoken of the visible or invisible Church, and answers it, that it "seems the places admit of the consideration of the Church as visible. First, "in that the Apostle speaketh of all the *Galatian* Church-members as well as "others as one in Christ, *Gal.* 3. 28. Now were all these members elected "will any say? I suppose not yet all are one in Christ their head.

Answer. Mr. *C.* a little before said, *The promise Gal* 3.16, *could not be made to Christs person, because the promise of the pardon of sin is not made to Christ personall,* which goes upon this supposition, that the pardon of sin is promised to the seed, *Gal.* 3.16. But sure this promise is made onely to the elect, not to all *Galatian* visible Church-members. Yea the very scope and coherence of what goes before and after, shew that the promises *v.* 16. were *of the spirit, v.* 14. *of the inheritance, v.* 18. *of life, v.* 21. which are proper to the elect. And therefore to apply the speech, *Gal.* 3, 16. to the unsound members of the visible

visible Church, sheweth meer oscitancy. Nor is it necessary that because it is said, *Gal.* 3. 28. *Ye are all one in Christ Iesus*, that this must be understood of every *Galatian* Church-member, but of all those of whom he had said, *v.* 26. *That they were all the sons of God by faith in Christ Jesus.* And after, *v.* 29. *that they were heirs according to the promise*, which is true onely of the elect of them. And for what he adds, *Secondly in that he speaks of them all as sacramentally one with Christ in baptism, Gal.* 3. 27, 28. *compared, so* 1 *Cor.* 12, 13, as if because he saith, *they were all baptized*, he meant it of all that are baptized, it is refuted from the very words [*by one spirit made to drink into one spirit, put on Christ*] which, if there were no more, do shew that these speeches though indefinite, yet *pro subjecta materia*, must be limited to those visible baptized persons, who were sincere believers, and united to Christ by his Spirit, and so those words, *Ephes.* 1. 23 & 4. 6. *Col.* 3. 11. and many more are to be understood. And to the other reasons, *That Christ hath headlike influences into the Officers and Members, many whereof are not savingly joyned to him, and that it is the Church wherein he hath set diversity of Officers, which is the visible Church, not the invisible.*

I answer, Christ as a Superior, and in some other respects, may have headlike influences of command, governing, &c. on some not savingly joyned to him, but not the influence of union by his Spirit, which is that which makes *any members of Christ, of his flesh and of his bones, Ephes.* 4. 4. & 5. 30. Nor is it true, that *Christ doth not set Officers in the invisible Church*, though it be true that he sets no Officers in the Church that is onely invisible, but indeed he sets Officers in the Church invisible, and chiefly to and for them, while they are visible. And therfore the Apostle, 2 *Tim.* 2. 10. said, *He endured all things for the elects sake. Hence*, saith Mr. *C. Profession of Faith unites a man to Christ as head of the visible Church without sincerity.* But the Scripture saith not so, that any is united to Christ as head without the inhabitation of the Spirit. Mr. *C.* adds.

" Hence also a parent, making profession of Faith in the covenant of grace as
" invested with Church-covenant in reference to his children, it doth unite
" them also to Christ as head of the visible Church so far as to give right to
" solemn initiation of them into the fellowship of the church in circumcision
" as of old, or baptism, as now. Parents acts in this case being in the face of
" the visible church, their childrens acts; the places quoted, *Deut.* 26. 17,
" 18, & 29. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, & 16, 16, 17, declared.

Answer. Mr. *C.* tells us, *Hence, &c.* and this is the consectary he would inser from his fifth *Conclusion*, and minding discourse about it: But how from any thing said before [*That Christ is the head of the visible Church, that visible Professors, though not sincere, are united to Christ as visible head*] this follows, That *Parents profession unites the child to Christ, so as to give him right to baptism*, is a riddle to me. If it were formed into an Argument thus, If the visible professors confession of faith unites him to Christ as visible head, Then it unites the child so far as to give him right to baptism: But the visible professors, &c. *Ergo.* I should deny the consequence of the *Major*, and expect it to be proved *ad Graecas Calendas*, nor is there any proof in that which follows: For were it granted *that the parents act were the childs act*, yet it follows not that it is the childs act to give a right or title to baptism without an

institution.

Institution. None of the texts produced, no nor any other do shew, that the parents act of professing faith, did entitle the child to circumcision, much less to baptism. *Cornelius* his child was not entitled to circumcision, though *he and his house feared God, was a devout man, gave much alms to the poor, and prayed to God alway, Acts.* 10. 2. Even in circumcision the use of it had its rule onely from the command, as I have often proved. Not one of Mr. *C.* his Texts mentions the parents acts as entitling the child to fellowship of the church, but obliging to duty, *Deut.* 16. 16, 17, theres an injunction, That *all the Males should thrice a year appear before God*; but this was enjoyned not to parents onely, but also to children married or unmarried.

And if it prove any thing like what Mr. *C.* would, it proves rather the males act to stand for the females, than the parents for the children. More likely in this the younger males did appear instead of the aged weak, & so the childs act went for the parents. However here's nothing of the parents act giving right to initiation into fellowship of the Church, there was nothing required to that in the national Church of *Israel* but their descent. *Deut.* 26. 17, 18. there's no mention of a parents act for his child intitling him to solemn initiation into fellowship of the Church. What is said [*Thou hast avouched this day the Lord to be thy God*] is not said to be done by the parents for the children, nor to be done to entitle them to solemn initiation into the fellowship of the Church. *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. whose act soever is mentioned whether of the *parents*, or *Captains, Elders, Officers*, or *men of Israel*. It was an act done in behalf of the nation both those born already and those to be born after, not to entitle them to initiation into fellowship of the Church, but to bind them the more firmly to their duty, and therefore none of these instances are to the point of parents acts in the face of the visible Church taken as the Childrens acts for solemn initiation in Church fellowship. Yet if they had, that this had been enough for baptism and Church-membership in the Christian Gentile Churches will not be proved, till the rule about Circumcision, and the constitution of the Jewish Church be a rule to us about baptism, and the Church-membership of the Christian Church, which neither agrees with Christs or his Apostles appointment or the practise in the N. T. nor with the new english principles of Church constitution & Goverment, but Judaizing notions opposite to the Gospel. What he saith *the parents omission to circumcise his child is counted the childs act of breaking Gods Covenant Gen.* 17. 14. depends on this that the parents omission of circumcision is the childs act of breaking Covenant. but many Protestant Divines and others understand it of persons of years as *Piscat. Schol. in locum. Diodati, new Annot. Grotius &c.* And though *Chamier* counted it to be understood of the Infant *Tom* 4. *Paustrat: Cath. l* 3. *c.* 2. *Sect.* 20. *&c.* Yet he expounds the verse passively thus, *the male, the flesh of whose foreskin is not circumcised that soul shall be cut off from his people: my Covenant is broken.* Either way expounded it is impertinent to Mr. *Cs.* purpose. they that expound it [as *Aben Ezra, apud Christoph. Cartwright* on the place) of the parent understand both the fault and the punishment to be his. It is true *John.* 4. 50, 51. *Matth.* 15. 22, to 29. *Mark.* 9. 12, to 18. *parents believing is accepted for the cure of children, and so Mark.* 2. 5. the faith of the bringers of the palsy man was accepted, but this doth not prove a title to baptism by the parents

confession

confession any more than by the Midwives or Gossips bringing to the Font. nor was it the confession of faith, but reality; though not known to men, which Christ looked on, so that if this be a good reason, the Fathers praying in Secret though not in the face of the visible Church should give Title to Baptism.

" After many dictates without proof he telsus, " As the Covenant laid " hold on by the lively faith of gracious parents as made with respect to their " elect children hath mighty force to effect very gracious things in the elect " seed, yea albeit dying young, as sundry of those elect ones of Abrahams " race did *Rom.* 9. 6. yea so as to make their outward washings to become " effectual in Christ to an inward cleansing *Ephes.* 5. 25. 26. yea so as to " bring in and bring home many of such covenant-children. Whence those " revolters beloved for their covenant-fathers sake as such, *Rom.* 11. 28. and " hence made as a ground of their return, *v.* 15, 16. so is there such validi- " ty in the covenant invested with church covenant, albeit but unworthily " oft-times held forth by the parents, which doth beget upon the children an " externall filiall relation unto God and to his Spouse the visible church; " whence that respect of children of God and his church, by vertue of that " espousall covenant, *Ezek.* 16. 8. Even in the children of idolatrous mem- " bers, *v.* 20. 21 23. Great is the force of this way of the covenant so clo- " thed. Albeit many unworthy members are girt up in it, to hold them and " theirs in externall communion, *Jer.* 13. 11. untill either the church be di- " vorced from God, or the particular members be disfranchised by some " church-censure of such a covenant-privilege.

Answer. Though this reasoning contain nothing but dictates unproved, and incoherent, yet sith it carries some shew of an Argument *à comparatis*, I shal say somwhat to it. 1. There's not a word in the texts alleged, that shews what Mr *C.* here asserts, that *the covenant laid hold upon by the lively faith of gracious parents as made with respect to their children, hath mighty force to effect very gracious things in the elect seed*: Nor is there a word in those Texts to prove such a covnnant made to any gracious parent concerning his naturall children. It is true, *Rom.* 9. 6 it is said, *the word took effect*; and this I deny not to be the word of promise to *Abraham, I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed.* But then it is expresly said, *v.* 7, 8. that *this seed of Abraham* is not his children by natural generation, but the speciall choice seed whether they were his seed according to nature, or ingrafted: there's not a word of the efficacy of this covenant by the lively faith of the parents, but by vertue of Gods election, *v.* 11. The Text, *Ephes.* 5. 26. seems to me to contain not onely the word of promise, as sanctifying or purifying the Church, but also the word of narration contained in the Gospel, as *Luke* 1. 2 *Acts* 8. 4. & 10. 36. 44. *Joh.* 17. 8. 17. *Rom.* 10. 8. preached and believed, not by the parents but the parties purified, *Acts* 15. 9. who as they hear the word and believe, so are baptized upon their believing. It is true that the Jewes hereafter to be ingrafted again, are said, *according to the election to be beloved for the Fathers*, *Rom.* 11. 28. But this is meant of the Jewes onely, and it is not at all meant of the immediate parents of those Jewes reingrafted (for they doubtless will be Infidels) but of the ancient Fathers, *Abraham, Isaac, Jacob*, out of the remembrance of their following God, and Gods covenant to them, which were both singular, and

therefore cannot be verified of every believers natural children as it is there meant and shall be verified of them. 2. There's not a proof for the other part of the comparison, that *there is any such validity in the Covenant invested with Church-Covenant albeit unworthyly oftentimes held forth by the parents to beget upon the children an external filial relation unto God and to his spouse the Church visible.* For *Ezek.* 16.8. mentions *Gods covenant which he swear*, not their's, by which *they became his*, and those whose *sons and daughters were born to him* v. 20. are said *to sacrafice them to be devoured, had caused them to be slain*, and *delivered them to pass through the fire for them.* Mr. *C.* confesseth *they were Idolatrous members*, and the text mentions their Idolatry to be of the highest kind, even the sacraficing their children, and if these were in the Covenant of grace and in Church-covenanant, and did thereby beget an external filial relation to God, and to his spouse the visible Church, then may the worst of men even open Idolatrers that offer their children to *Moloch* and sacrafice them to the Devil be in the Covenant of grace, and in Church-covenant, and therby in those whom God hates and who go a whoring after Idols, yea the Devils in a most horrid manner, there may be validity in this horrid estate to beget an external filial relation unto God & to his spouse, the visible Church for their children. *Horrendum dictu!* The meaning of the text, and the impertinency of its allegation by the *Assembly*, by Mr. *C.* and others hath been often shewed. *Jerem.* 13.11. makes nothing to the purpose. God in the wilderness *had made the whole house of Israel to cleave to him* in the Covenant at mount Sinai, and by his special deliverances and providences for them. What is this to prove that the Idolatrous posterity of that people *are by the Covenant clothed with Church-covenant held to God they and theirs in external Church-communion until either that church be devorced from God, or the particular members disfranchised by some Church censure of a Church covenant privilege?* 3. were the first part of the comparison proved, that *the Covenant laid hold on by the lively faith of the parents as made with respect to their elect children hath mighty force to effect very gratious things in the elect seed*, yet there is no validity that the other part should be true, that a bare dissembled profession should make such an external relation to God and his Church, as if because *Peters* faith and confession obtains from God a special privilege, *Judas* his profession must obtain something of God for his children though he were a Devil. If there be strength in these dictates of Mr. *C.* their's weakness is nothing. The answers to the objections of I. S. proceed upon a conceit of *a relative grace*, and *implicit calling*, and *of in-being in Christ* without either Christs spirit, or faith, or profession of faith, which are things that have no Scripture grounds. The absurdity objected against his opinion that it *entails grace to generation that it upholds a national Church*, he puts off only thus, *He knows not in N. E. which hold the one, yet do not maintain the other in the usual sense of a national Church.* But this shewes not how he will acquit his doctrine from maintaining that by consequence, which is disavowed by those of N. E. For if there be such a covenant and Church covenant now as there was *Deut.* 29.10, 11, 12. and *Ezek* 16.20, 21, 22. of validity to beget an external filial relation to God and to his visible spouse the Church, it cannot be denied, but that the worst Idolaters even Papists are visible Church-members, and by consequent the whole nation elder and younger are in the Church. Which

what

what it makes less than such a national Church as was of the Jews I understand not.

SECT. XLII.

Animadversions on Sect. 7: of the same chap. shewing that the body of the Jewish Church even the worst of them was not under the Covenant of grace in respect of external Interest therein.

IN *the seaventh Sect.* Mr. *C.* sets down this conclusion, *that the body of the Jewish Church was under the Covenant of grace as invested with Church Covenant, in respect of external interest therein.* In which as almost in all his writings about this point, there's much ambiguity. He neither sheweth whom he means by *the body of the Jewish Church* whether every Jew or some only, and if some who those are whether the most part or the chiefest; nor what he means by *the Covenant of grace*, what promise they are under nor how they are under it: Nor doth explain what he means *by Church-Covenant* or *investing with it*, nor what is *the external interest therein* which they have, nor how *they are under the Covenant of grace as invested with Church covant in respect of external interest therein, and not with respect to internal interest.* For my part so far as I am able to discern his meaning this is it, that all the Jews from the promise made to *Abraham I wil be thy God & the God of thy seed Gen.*17.7. have this privilege; that all should be accounted members of that Church and the males circumcised. But I know not how it comes to pass, this author either affects, or it is his vein to use ambiguous expressions when he might use plain, and to talk in a new phrases hard to be understood of the Covenant, seal, Church-seed &c. And not to explain his conclusions afore he proves, nor to shew how he proves out of the text he allegeth, but leaves his reader to fish out his meaning as he can from scattered passages. However I shall view his dictates.

He denies that the Jewes had only a Covenant of grace among them which was made to some choice ones among them. And yet the Apostle directly teacheth that the promise *I will be a God to thee and thy seed* as a promise of saving grace was not made to all Israel, but the elect only *Rom.*9.6, 7, 8. And clear it is that the Covenant made with the body of the Israelites at mount *Sinai* was the Covenant of workes, as is plain from *Rom.*10.5. 2 *Cor.*3.6, 7, 9. *Gal.*3. 12, and 4.24, 25. *Heb.*8.9, 10, 11. &c. and 12.18, 19, 21.

It is false that he hath any where proved that *the external & Ecclesiasticalright to circumcision came from the circumcised persons interest in the Covenant of grace invested with Church-covenant.* Neither did God *appoint all them to receive the visible seal thereof meaning* Circumcision: for he did not appoine the females or males under eight dayes old to be circumcised though in the Covenant as well as the infant male of eight dayes old.

He bids us see *Gen.*17. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. and 26.3, 4, 5. and 28.12, 13, 14. But I can see none of his dictates in those texts. I find there that God made a covenant with *Abraham.* after renewed it to *Isaac* and *Jacob* assuring to their inheriting posterity the inheritance of Canaan, the multiplying of them &c. that God injoyned circumcision to them for a me-

morial and assurance of that covenant. This covenant as containing the promise of Canaan &c. to the natural posterity of *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, is expressed to be by reason of *Abrahams obedience Gen.* 26. 5. circumcision is required *Gen.* 17. and *Exod.* 19. *Levit.* 26. obedience is required to the laws given by Moses. They that term the Covenant *Exo.* 19. a covenant of works speak suitable to the Apostle *Rom.* 10. 5. *Gal.* 3. 12. yet I deny not but in Covert expressions *Gen.* 17. and elswere God promised *Christ* to the elect whether Jews or Gentiles and *blessing* that is righteousnes and eternal life by faith in him *Gal.* 3. 16. &c. which *Abraham* and all the ancient Saints expressed by faith *Iohn.* 8, 56. and elswhere. Now it is not true, that *those covenant Fathers Abraham, Isaac and Iacob recieved the covenant Evangelical in referrence to their natural children*: nor in respect of justification before God and external life *had a contrary covenant of life and death, grace and workes made with them.* For though the Jews succeeding were under the whole law of *Moses* because of *transgressions*, yet not so as to have life by it *Gal.* 3. 17, 18, 19, 21. nor is it any absurdity to say that the legal justitiaries who rested in the law were at one and the same time externally under the blessing of God in respect of their outward prosperity in Canaan, and yet internally under the curse of God *Gal.* 3. 10. as seeking righteousnes before God by their observing the Law.

It is, no where said that any other than *Abraham* is the root or first fruits to his seed *Rom* 11. 16. nor they termed his seed, lump, branches any other way than either naturally or spiritually, that is by natural generation or by following his faith by vertue of election *Rom.* 11 16. doth not say, *Abraham was the root as recieving the covenant for the branches*, but as propagating the branches. Nor need we say that he either received a covenant of works alone, in referrence to them all elected, or that he recieved the Covenant of grace with Ecclesiastical respect to them all. The plain doctrine of the Scripture is set down above, Mr. *C's.* dictates are meer phantasms without Scripture.

The substance of the Covenant is a novel expression, and ambiguous. I deny not the covenant *Gen.* 17. to be evangelical. yet I concieve it not purely such, but as I say in my *Exercit.* pag. 2. mixt, that is containing political and Evangelical promises. I deny not but it was the jews covenant-right to have the Tabernacle of God or their ordinances as their privilege, yea and his presence therein until the *Messiah* came, yet so as that when thay set up Idols the glory of God departed from them *Ezek.* 11. 22, 23. They had also Gods oracles with them, deliverance from Egypt, Christ to be with them in the wilderness: nor do I deny these to have bin by vertue of Christs mediation, yet so far as these were national mercies they were proper to the Jews. What ever be meant by *the Covenant & the promise Rom* 9. 4. they do not agree to Gentile believers. And though I say they were by vertue of Christs mediation, yet I concieve the mediation of Christ was directly for the elect only, for others only obliquely, by consequent, and by accident by reason of the Cohabitation of them on earth. I deny not that *filling the Temple with smoake Rev.* 15. 8. allusively to that which was 1 *Kings.* 8. 10, 11. *Isai.* 6. 1, 2, 3, 4. might resemble the presence of God in the Churches after Christs ascension in a way of mercy to his people, and for their sakes in a way of justice against his and their enemies.

I neither

I neither do, nor need say that *Canaan was all which God promised the Jews* I grant it was promised to them as *an everlasting possession Gen.* 17.8. But the word עולם which the *Gr*: translate αἰωνιον, *everlasting*, notes frequently but a duration of some age or ages as 2 *Chron.* 2.4. &c. I deny not but the Patriarchs looked futher than *Canaan* Heb. 11.9, 10. I deny not that *the promise of Canaan was in some sense ratified in Christ*, and *all other temporal blessings to the elect now* 1 *Cor.* 3.21, 22, 23. that *Christ is said to drive out their enemies Exod.* 23.20, 21. and that *the land they possessed was called Immanuels land Esai* 8.8 that *sundry were excluded from thence for unbelief Heb.* 3. last *compared with ch.* 4 2. though if it be not warily explained *Moses* and *Aaron* should be guilty of the Gospel sin of unbelief. *If God promised to be a God to them, and as one branch thereof instanceth in giving them Canaan Gen.* 17.7, 8. then the promise of *Canaan* is a branch of the promise, *I will be a God to them*. If *the Proselyted strangers were to have Abrahams Covenant sealed to them and their by circumcision, yet had no lots in Canaan*, then persons were to be circumcised *to whom the promise belonged not*.

I grant that *Christ was mediator of the Covenant with Abraham* so far as it contains evangelical promises, but deny that *it was held out to all the Jews by the sacrafices*. For though the typical sacrafices in respect of purifiing the flesh did purge the whole Congregation, yet none were purged by Christs blood, but the elect. *The high Preist bare the names of the* 12. *tribes* and these represented the elect for whom Christ made intercession, and atonement not every Israelite *Rom.* 9.6.

What Mr. *C.* saith, *the Covenant of works holds out pardon or mercy to transgress* I do much question. It seems to me that *Abab*, though under a Covenant of works yet had some mercy 1 *Kings* 21 29. And whether the offence against some of the laws were not in some respect forgiven *Levit.* 4. to them, who had not faith in Christ, for the sacrafice they offered (*which were all offered according to the Law Heb.* 10.8.) I do make question. Nor do I think but that by the Covenant of the law in respect of temporal evils there was some pardon by vertue of obedience to legal prescriptions, though some sins as of presumption *Num* 15. were not, no not to them that were in the covenant of grace, as its likely in *Eli.* his Case 1 *Sam.* 3.24. see *Gerhard. Ioh. Voss. resp. ad Judic. Ravensp.* c. 22. 23. Concerning the Covenant of the Law though it require no faith in Christ, or repentance for justification, yet whether according to the covenant of the law some repentance were not accepted for revoking some temporal evils contrary to the promises of the Covenant with the Iews at mount *Sinai* may be doubted from *Deut.* 29 21. 25. and 30. 2, 3, 8, 9, 10. But of these Chapters more hereafter in answer to M. *B.* I grant *no salvation but by Christ*, but denies that *therefore al the Iews best & worst had salvation & external covenent-right*: nor though *al the Iews best & worst, had the same dispensers of the covenant mentioned Exod.* 19.5.6. & 24.7.8. will it follow they had all right at least externally in the covenant of grace. For that speaks of the covenant of the law. I grant that *the first Covenant of works was made withal in Adam*, and *that the Covenant Gen.* 17. *was a particular covenant made with the seed of Abraham*, yet the Covenant at mount *Sinai* was not made with all men, without distinction, but only with *Israel*, whom he brought out of *Egypt*. the Jews *Ro.* 11.20. were broken off from the invisible church of true believers, which was in that nation in

their

their progenitors, as I shew in the first part of this *Review Sect.* 2. &c. I agree with Mr. *C.* that the *Covenant in Horeb Deut.* 29. 1. 2. *with Deut.* 30. 6. *had the stipulation of, do this and live,* and *that the Covenant of the law was different from the promise, Gen.* 17. *that it held out temporals, this externals.* How the Gentiles were ingrafted in the room of the Iewes, and not into the externall right & privilege, as by Mr *C.* imagines, is shewed in the *Review, ubi supra, That the covenant of Sinai was without mercy,* I question as above. And methinks, *Ezek.* 16. 60. proves, *That God would remember his covenant with Israel in the dayes of their youth,* and shew them mercy for it.

Now the covenant made with Israel in the dayes of its youth, is meant of the covenant made with them when they came out of Egypt: for so the whole description of their pitiful estate (which can be referred to no other than the time of their bondage in Egypt, *v.* 4, 5, 6, 7. after which was his covenant in *the dayes of their youth, v.* 8) shews the covenant in the dayes of their youth to have been the covenant at mount *Sinai.* And so the new *Annot.* on *Ezek.* 16, 8, "[*I sware unto thee*] I made a solemn covenant with thee that I would take "thee to be my people, *Exod.* 19 & 24 chapters, *Ier.* 2. 2. *Piscat. Schol: in v.* "7. *nudissima*] i. e. *destituta omni ope pressa, sc: servitute in Ægypto, in v:* 8, "*visitari te per Mosen educendo te ex Ægypto & pangendo tecum fedus atque* "*ita ducendo te in uxorem. Grot. in Ezek.* 16. 5, *Populus enim in Ægypto na-*"*tus est in v.* 7. *& sic exprimitur miseria Gentis in Ægypto in v.* 8, *& in-*"*gressu sum pactum tecum*] *in Sinai.* As for Mr *C.* his paraphrase on *Ezek:* "16. 60. I will remember my covenant with [Thee] not with this or that "particular Jew, but with them all in an Ecclesiastical way, and in respect of "externall right: albeit some onely had the saving benefits thereof, as being "the select covenanters mainly intended, *He therein supposeth that* some had "the saving benefit of that covenant, *which is contrary to* Rom. 3 20. That "by the deeds of the Law shall no flesh be justified in Gods sight. *And he* "*supposeth* the covenant was made with them all in an Ecclesiasticall way, and "in respect of externall right.

Which what it is else but this, that they should all have a right to circumcision, and other Ecclesiastical privileges, I know not: Whereas the covenant was of prosperity in Canaan, continuance of long life, &c. to them upon obedience to the law he gave them by *Moses*, which notwithstanding they had broken, & were carried captive; yet he would remember his covenant made with that people when he brought them out of Ægypt, and upon the prayers of *Daniel, &c.* restore them to their own land, *Esay* 48 1, 2, 3, &c. teacheth the Jewes, that notwithstanding they were evill, yet *he would for his names sake, that the heathens might not say that God could not deliver them and bring them from the north, v,* 10, 11, 14. The like is, *Ezek.* 20, 14.

The objection from *Rom.* 9 7, 8, is ill framed, and as ill answered: 1. it is proved from the Text, that the promise of fulfilling, of which the Apostle speaks, was the promise to *Abraham, I will be the God of thy seed, Gen.* 17. 7. from the terms used *Rom.* 9. 7, 8. which shews that the question was, how Gods word could be true concerning *Abrahams* seed, if the Jewes were rejected, as the Apostle supposeth, *v.* 3. 2. That the answer is directly this, that this promise was not made to all Israel, or to *all the children of the flesh*, that is, begotten of *Abraham* by *carnall generation*, for it was not promised to *Ish-*

mael

mael and *Esau*, but to the elect as *Isaac* and *Jacob*, whence this proposition ariseth, They onely are *children of the promise* (that is by an usuall Hebraism) subjects of the promise to whom it belong, as *children of wrath* to whom wrath belongs, a *son of perdition* to whom perdition belongs) who are elect, therefore not all the naturall seed of *Abraham*. And consequently the promise. *Gen.* 17.7. belonged not in the Evangelicall sense to *the body of the Jewes, even the worst.*

" Now what doth Mr. *C.* answer? " He distinguisheth between children " of the promise, in respect of externall filiation, and externall salvation, " *and applies it thus*, In the later they were not, but if you take it of the " Church-seed of the promise, and such as were externally adopted of God, " and instated in the covenant of grace as invested with church-covenant, so " they were children even of the free covenant of blessing in Christ, *Acts* 3, " 25,26, and had the promise indefinitly, as *Deut:* 30. 6, *Jerem:* 31.37, " *Gen.*17.7.

In which answer. 1. he makes a distinction to include them in the promise whom the Apostle excludes from it. 2. Whereas the Apostle determines the elect onely to be included in the promise taken in an Evangelicall sense, Mr. *C.* includes the elect and non-elect, even the worst of the Iewes whom the Apostle excludes. 3. He abuseth *Acts* 3.25,26, *Deut:* 30. 6, by interpreting them as *belonging to the worst of the Jewes in respect of externall right*, which are expres about turning from iniquities and circumcising the heart,

The second objection is better framed, yet not so fully as had been requisite: Mr *C.* his conclusion is, " That the covenant of grace as invested " with church-covenant, belonged to all the Iewes even the worst of them, " in respect of externall right to outward ordinances.

But that is false: For it did not belong to *the children after the flesh, to the Jerusalem that then was, which was in bondage with her children, they were to be cast out being of the bond-woman, Gal.* 3.23,25,28,30,31. *Ergo*, the covenant of grace, &c.

Again, They to whom belongs the covenant of grace as invested with church-covenant in respect of externall right, are children of the promise, *Gen.* 17.7. But many of the Iewes were not children of the promise, *Gen.* 17.7. as is proved from *Gal.*4.28,29, *Rom.* 9 8. *Ergo*,

Now what doth Mr. *C.* answer? He tells us, " That they are called " children of the flesh, not begotten by naturall generation, for then *Isaac* " also should be a child of the flesh. But he is called a child of the flesh, who " though born by naturall generation of *Abraham*, yet sought righteousnes " by the Law, which was not Ierusalem of old, but Ierusalem which was " when *Paul* wrote this, long after Christs time.

Ref. But was not it true also of the Ierusalem that was when Christ was? Did not our Lord Christ deny them to be *Abrahams* childrē, & told them they were the Divels children, *Iohn* 8.39,44, though he granted them to be *Abrahams* seed by natural generation, *v.* 37. and yet Mr *C* calls them *Abrahams Church-seed, or Church-seed of the promise instated in the covenant of grace, as invested also with Church-covenant, children even of that free covenant of blessing in Christ, Acts* 3. 25,26, *and had the promises indefinitly, as Deut.* 30,6. *Jer.* 32,37. *Gen.*17.7. &c.

&c. belonging to them, Rom. 9. 4. and were children of God, Christs, Matth. 15, 26. I deny not but Iohn 1. 12. those that rejected Christ are called Christs own, but not because of their right in him, or promise to them to own them as in the covenant of grace, but as they were ingaged to him in respect of his deliverance out of Ægypt, and other mercies to them, and their nearness of consanguinity to him, as Paul calls Israel his flesh, Rom. 11. 14, Christ being from them according to the flesh, Rom. 9, 5. But to say that even then they were in the covenant of grace when they received not Christ, is to conceive they were in the Olive when they were broken off. And yet I deny not that they had in Christs time a right to circumcision, but no externall right to the covenant of grace, as Mr C. dreams.

SECT. LXIII.

That the Covenant at Mount Sinai was a Covenant of Works, and not of Evangelical grace, and that the Iewish Church and State were but one body.

A Third objection against Mr C. his sixth Conclusion is, they were under the old and first covenant which was formerly, &c. and not under the new, or in the covenant of grace.

" To this he answers, " That even *Sinai* covenant could not disannull that " covenant formerly made with them in *Abraham*, and being much later " than it, *Gal:* 3. 16, 17. *And after*, when the covenant is said to be new " and old, it is not *divisio generis in species*, but *subjecti in adjuncta*. So the " phrases [first and second] *Heb.* 9, note not two Testaments specifically " different, but numerically. Besides, it's called a first and second Testa- " ment, *scil:* in order of succession: so the former is said to be faulty com- " paratively, not absolutely. In a word, in way and manner of dispensation, " that was different from the covenant now dispensed in respect of ceremony " of administration, not in the essentials.

Reply, The answer of Mr C. I conceive is reduced to these two points, 1. *That the Jewes were under both covenants, that of* Sinai, *and that of* Abraham: 2. *That these two covenants the first and the second, the New and Old, mentioned* Heb: 8, & 9. *differ in the way and manner of dispensation, in respect of ceremony of administration, not in the essentials.*

To which I reply, 1. That this is contrary to the Apostles supposition, that the same men which were under the covenant of mount *Sinai*, should be under the promise: For he supposeth them to be cast out, *Gal:* 4. 21, 30, and saith, v. 31, *we are not children of the bondwoman*, that is, under the Law, v: 23, *but of the free*, that is, the promise. Yea, cha: 5. 18, *If yee be led by the Spirit ye are not under the Law*. The like whereto is said, *Rom:* 6: 14, *Gal:* 3, 10, 11, 12. I deny not but that the Iews who were under the covenant of grace, that is, believers in Christ were both under the obedience of the Law, and the hope of the Gospel, and under the covenant of the Law so far as concerned their prosperity in Canaan, but not in respect of righteousnes and life, or any other Ecclesiasticall privilege.

As for the other part of the answer, I find Mr *Perkins* on Gal: 5, 24, 25, saying,

saying *it is a main pillar in Popish Religion, that the Law of Moses and the Gospel are all one in substance, &c.* Which I know not well how to distinguish from Mr *C.* his position, that the new and old covenant differ not in essentials. But let's examine it, The essentials of a thing are the *genus* and difference: It is granted that the new and old, first and second covenant differ not in the *genus*, no more doth the covenant with *Adam* in innocency with *Noah* after the Flood, they are all covenants of God: But that there is no essentiall difference distinguishing between the covenant at mount *Sinai*, and the new covenant; *and that they differ in way and manner of dispensation, in respect of ceremony of administration, not in the essentials*, is I am assured, a manifest error both against Scripture, and I think the Authors themselves, though not only Mr *C.* here, but also the *Assembly Confession of Faith, c. 7. Art. 5.* saith, *The covenant of grace was administred, &c. and is called the old Testament*, which to be meant of the covenant of mount *Sinai*, I conceive from these words of Mr *M: Defence* page 188. "Alas Sir, why do you run into "this needless and erroneous digression? I said in my Sermon that the Mo-"rall Law was added 430 years after the covenant with *Abraham*, not as a "part of that covenant, but as a School-master to whip them to Christ, that "they finding the impossibility of keeping the Law, might more earnestly "long after Christ, exhibited in those shadowes of rites and sacrifices, &c. "But to say that this covenant mentioned in the eighth of the *Hebrews*, was "the covenant of works, is a most erroneous doctrine: Look into the text "and you shall find that the covenant which is there mentioned (which God "finds fault with, and calls the first covenant, in opposition to this better co-"venant) had ordinances of divine worship, had a Sanctuary, a Ta-"bernacle,, Priests and High-priests, Sacrifices and other rites belonging to "the administration of it. Sir, was this the covenant of works? I hope "you will not own it in your next.

Mr *Anthony Burgess*, another Assembly man, *Vindic. Legis, Lect.* 24, maintains with a distinction, *the Law at mount Sinai to be a covenant of grace*, Like whereto are the opinions of Mr *John Ball of the covenant of grace.* ch. 7, page 102, Dr. *Samuel Boulton, True bounds of Christian freedom*, page 130 *&c.* Mr *Thomas Blake, Vindic Fœder.* c. 24, *&c.* But as in other things there is much dictating besides the Scriptures, in the received writings of men, so in this. Mr *C.* saith, *The difference between the old and new Covenant, is in the way and manner of dispensation in respect of ceremony of administration, not in the essentials.*

Concerning which it is to be observed, that to *dispense* is to lay out as a Steward doth lay out money. To dispense a Covenant may be understood either by making it known, or performing the things promised on either side; the same may be conceived to be meant by *administration. The ceremony of administration* I understand not what it is, unless by it be meant the rites of the Old and New Testament. This then seems to be either all or the main difference Mr *C.* makes between the covenant made with *Israel* at mount *Sinai*, and the new covenant confirmed in the blood of Christ with Jewes and Gentiles; that the former had Circumcision, the Passover, Sacrifices, &c. by which the covenant of grace was made, or the things promised conferred, the new covenent had Baptism and the Lords Supper. *A Covenant* is a pro-

miſe, and ſo an action; and when mutuall there's a reciprocall action. I know not what other predicament to place it in. The eſſentials of a thing are in corporeall ſubſtances, matter and forme, in other beings thoſe things which in proportion to them ſhew what it is, and wherein it is differenced from others under the ſame *genus*, which eſſentials the Logicians call the *genus* and *difference*. The eſſentiall difference of one action from another, is the *terminus* or effect, as heating from cooling, in the object, ſubject, end. A Covenant being eſſentially a promiſe, differs eſſentially from another promiſe, when the things promiſed are different, as the promiſe of land differs eſſentially from the promiſe of life; and when the conditions are different, though the things promiſed be the ſame, as the promiſe of land to one for ſo much money is eſſentially different from the promiſe of land upon the condition of thanks. *The covenant of works and of grace*, are terms not uſed in Scripture. But *Rom.* 11. 5, 6, *Election by grace and of works*, Rom 4, 4, it is ſaid, *to him that worketh the reward is reckoned not according to grace, but according to debt*, Epheſ. 2. 8, 9, *Yee are ſaved by grace, not of works*, 2 Tim: 1. 9, *who hath ſaved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpoſe and grace*, Titus 3. 5. *He ſaved us not by works of righteouſneſs which we have done, but according to his own mercy*. Yet I think the diſtinction right and good of the covenant of grace and the covenant of works. And the difference between them is, 1. in the thing promiſed, the one promiſeth life upon obedience to the Law given, but not ſtrength to do it; the other promiſeth the Spirit to inable for doing. 2. in the condition the one promiſeth life upon perfect obedience, the other upon faith in Chriſt. Theſe differences are confirmed from ſundry Texts, *Rom:* 10. 5. 2 *Cor.* 3. 6, 10, *Gal.* 3. 10, 12, 22, &c. I think in a promiſe the different end of the promiſer makes not an eſſential difference. I think it is the ſame promiſe eſſentially when one promiſeth land upon condition of giving thanks, to ſhew his bounty; and another to engage him to his party, though the ends be different. My determination in this Writing is as it was in the former *Exam.* *page* 102. That the new Covenant is not the old renewed, but that they differ ſpecifically in the eſſentials, and not onely in Rites, and that the Covenant at mount *Sinai* was a covenant of works: And this I prove,

1. From that Text which here Mr *C.* Mr *M.* the *Aſſembly* and others ſtand ſo much upon, to wit, *Heb* 8, 8, 9. & 10. The old covenant there meant, is the covenant made with *Iſrael* at mount *Sinai*, which appears in that it was the *covenant which God made with the Fathers* of the Iewes *in the day that he took them by their hand to bring them out of the land of Ægypt*. Now that covenant differs eſſentially more than in Rites from the new covenant; yea, as a covenant of works is diffrent from the covenant of Evangelical grace. 1. Becauſe the new covenant is ſaid *to be eſtabliſhed or ſetled as a Law on better promiſes*, *Heb:* 8. 6. Now if the promiſes be better promiſes, it is becauſe they be of better things; and if of better things then of different things, and ſo the difference is more than in Rites, yea it is in eſſentials: for promiſes of different things eſſentially, make different covenants eſſentially. And that the difference is in the meliority of promiſes: and that theſe promiſes be of better things, is apparent from the recitall of the promiſes, *Heb:* 8. 10, 11, 12. & 10. 16, 17. where alſo by the offering of Chriſt, that Teſtament is ſaid to be of

force. By this also the covenant at mount *Sinai* is proved not to be the covenant of Gospel-grace: For then it had had as good promises, yea the same promises. 2. If it had been the covenant of grace, they had abode in it. For that is a covenant, which they that are in continue in. But in the old covenant, or that at mount *Sinai they abode not*, v. 9. *Ergo, &c.* 3. That is not the covenant of grace which is faulty, or (which is the meaning of it) occasioning God to complain, for ἄμεμπτος, which we translate *Faultless*, is that which is without complaint, and the meaning is, the first covenant occasioned complaint of the Israelites, as it is v. 8. ἄμεμφόμενος γὰρ αὐτοῖς, *complaining of them* (he doth not say *it*, as Mr. *M.* seems to have understood it, as if God had found fault with the covenant; that's a mistake, he should then have found fault with his own act) *he saith*, therefore for remedy of such complaint and jarring, a second covenant was established, which should be ἄμεμπτος, *faultless*, and therefore the covenant of grace takes away occasion of complaint, or finding fault, because it provides for them to whom it was made, that they should not occasion God to complain by their breaking of it, as the first covenant had done, which was faulty, occasioning God to complain in that it was broken. Mr *C.* saith, *it was faulty comparatively, not absolutely*, and his meaning seems to be that the first covenant was faulty because of its imperfect manner of teaching the Gospel. But he is therein mistaken: For, as I shewed from the words, the first covenant is said to be faulty, because of the complaint of God against the Israelites, as not keeping it, as the holy Ghost expounds the word ἄμεμπτος, v. 7. by the expression v. 8. proving it *not to have been faultless*, that is, without complaint, *because he complained of them*, v. 8, to wit, *that they abode not in it*. v. 9. which if it had been the covenant of Evangelical grace, they should certainly have done, because that provides for the keeping and perseverance in it, *by writing the lawes in their hearts, and forgiving their sins.*

2. The same is further proved from chap. 12. 18, *&c.* where 1. the covenant at mount *Sinai* is set down as given with horror, to shew that it begat nothing but affrightments even in the best *Moses* himself, whereas the covenant of grace begets joy and gladness before God. 2. It is said the *Hebrew Christians were not come to*, therefore it was not the covenant of grace. 3. That *they were come to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant*, v. 24. in opposition to *Moses* the Mediator of the old.

3. From ch. 10, 29. where *the blood of the new covenant* is said *to sanctifie*. And ch. 13. 20. *Christ brings back the sheep by the blood of he everlasting covenant*. This everlasting covenant is that which was confirmed by the blood of Christ oppositly, or in contradistinction *to that which was confirmed by the blood of Calves and Goats*, Heb. 9. 19. Therefore that covenant was not everlasting, nor confirmed by Christs blood, and consequently not the Covenant of grace

4. The same is the express doctrine of *Paul*, Gal. 4. 24. where he saith, *Agar and Sara are two covenants*, and he saith, *Agar*, or *one Covenant, was from mount Sinai*, and that *this genders to bondage*, and *is in bondage with her children*, v. 25. calls them that are under it such as *are begotten according to the flesh*, v. 29. *to be cast out*, v. 30. and opposeth it to *Sarah*, that is, *the promise, the Jerusalem above who is free, mother of all believers, begetting children of the pro-*

mise, born after the Spirit, children of the free woman. Now what is this but the covenant of grace, and the other of works. For the covenant of grace never *genders to bondage, nor is in bondage with her children,* who *are not according to the flesh to be cast out, but free, the mother of believers, bringing forth children of the promise born after the Spirit, children of the free woman.* Therefore the covenant at mount *Sinai,* was not the same with the covenant of Gospel-grace, but a covenant of works.

5. In the same Epistle, chap. 3. 12. he saith, *the Law is not of Faith,* that is the covenant of the Law doth not promise righteousness before God upon faith, but by works. *v.* 13. therefore the covenant of the Law was not the covenant of Gospel-grace.

6. The same is expressed *v.* 16, 17, 18, 21, where the Law is opposed to the promises, *the inheritance* is denied to be by it, or that it *could* give life, or *righteousness* by it, therefore it is not the covenant of grace, for life, righteousness and inheritance is by it. The like is *Gal:* 2. 21. *Rom:* 4. 13, 14, 15, 16, & 3, 20, 21.

7. From *Rom* 10. 5. where the Apostle expresly saith, that *Moses described the righteousness of the law that the man that doth them shall live in them,* and this he makes opposite to *the word of Faith:* whence it follows it was the covenant of works, which was the Law: For what is the covenant of workes but that which promiseth life by doing the Law? Nor doth it make against it to say, the Apostle, *v.* 4. saith, *Christ was the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth:* for in whatsoever sense that be meant, yet it is certain the denomination of a covenant of grace or of works, is not taken from the end of the Covenanter, or the consequent on the covenant or command, but the promise and condition; therefore what ever end God had in giving the law, or what event soever fell out upon it, yet the covenant of the law promising righteousness upon perfect obedience to the law, and not otherwise, it is to be termed a covenant of works, not of Gospel-grace.

8. From *Rom.* 6. 14. where the Apostle saith, *Sin shall not have dominion over you, for ye are not under the law, but under grace,* which supposeth that they who are under the law, are not under grace; which cannot be understood of the command of the law, for men may be and are under the command of it, and yet under grace: therefore by the law is meant the covenant of the law, and then they which are under the covenant of the law, are not under grace, which they should be, if the covenant of the law were generally the same with the covenant of grace.

9. From *Rom:* 7. 4. *We are dead to the Law by the body of Christ,* iv. 6, *We are delivered,* or as I would read it, *we are discharged* (κατηργήθημεν) *from the law,* even the Moral law, *v* 7. not as a rule of obedience, but *as a Husband,* or *Covenant,* on which we depend for maintenance, help, supply, sentence, countenance, reward. But if the law were the covenant of grace, we should not be dead to it, or delivered from it: *Ergo.*

10. From 2 *Cor.* 3, 6, the covenant of the law is called *the letter which killeth,* opposite to *the new covenant* in *which the Spirit which quickneth is ministred,* and *v* 7. he expresly calls it *the ministration of death graven in stones, the ministration of condemnation,* v. 9, opposite *to the ministration of righteousness;* of which *Paul* denies himself to be a *Minister,* therefore it was not the covenant of Evangelical grace, but of works.

Yea

Yea Mr *Cobbet* himself, page 65. *The covenant in Horeb had the stipulation of. Do so and live, not so in the covenant of grace that was imbondaging, shewed the way of worship, gave not grace to act it, was against us, &c.* The *Assembly Confess. of Faith*, c. 7. *Art.* 2. *ch.* 19. *Art.* 1. cite *Gal:* 3. 12, *Rom.* 10. 5, *Gal.* 3, 10, which speak of the covenant of the law to shew *the covenant of workes made with Adam*, which shews they take them to be the same, or heed not what they cite, *chap.* 19. *Art.* 6. *True believers are not under the law as a covenant of works, not as due to them by the Law as a Covenant of works. Greater Catech:* page 25. *The regenerate are delivered from the Morall law as a covenant of works.* Yea Mr *M.* his words *denying the law to be part of the covenant made to* Abraham, *but as a Schoolmaster to whip them to Christ, impossible to be kept* (which are not to be said of the covenant of grace) doth in effect make it the covenant of works. Mr *Anthony Burgess* when he distinguisheth *vindic. legis, lect.* 24. pag. 223, saith *the law considered more largly, as that whole Doctrine delivered on mount* Sinai *with the preface and promises adjoyned, and all things that may be reduced to it, was a covenant of grace, but more strictly, as it is an abstracted rule of righteousnes holding forth life upon no terms but perfect obedience abstracted from* Moses *his administration of it; was not of grace but of works.*

In which words, he denies not that *it held forth life upon no terms but perfect obedience*, and *so it was a Covenant not of grace but of works.* 2 he shews not that it was given as a Covenant upon any other terms, or that it did propound or promise righteousnes before God upon condition of faith in Christ: but only tels us, *take the Law for the whole doctrine &c.* Which is in effect all one as to say, The covenant God made was of works, yet withal he delivered many things, which shewed he would also have them look at Christ, (which we grant true) but no where that he promised righteousnes through Christ in that Covenant Mr. *Blake Vindic. Fad.* c 24. pag. 174. *the Law is taken sometimes in that strict sense as containing a Covenant of works and holding forth life upon condition of perfect obedience.* So *Rom.* 10. 5, 6. and 3. 21, 22. *Gal* 3. 18. It were no hard matter to shew many of Protestant Writers who call the Covenant of the Law at mount *Sinai* the Covenant of works, but these suffice. What is objected to the contrary is not from the tenor of the covenant, but from some adjuncts of it. as 1 *because there were sacrafices & other rites appointed, it must be a Covenant of grace.* Answer. the sacrafices as they were commanded, so they did belong to the Covenant of works. But as God used them as shadows and types of Christ to come, so they signifie Gods purpose of Gospel-grace in Christ, but by another Covenant, not that at mount *Sinai.* 2 *Gods end was not to give life by the Law, but to direct to Christ.* Answer. 1 I grant the first and thence it appears he intended it not for a covenant of grace. 2. it directed not to Christ as it was propounded Covenant-wise, but by accident: in that it made known sin, and so made Christ appear necessary, and this also proves that it was of it self as propounded a Covenant of workes. 3 *God could not enter into a Covenant of works with man fallen.* Answer. True, so as to justifie him by it; yet for other ends he may, as to discover sin, shew mans impotency. As Christ said to the young man *Matth.* 9. 16. *if thou wilt enter into life keepe the commandements* though he knew he could not have life that way, and v 21. commands him to sell all; though it did but shew his covetousnes, not make him perfect. The covenant of grace is to be

judged

judged such, from the tenor of the promise and condition, not from Gods ends. For if so, then the Gospel it self, being sent to some to harden them, should be a Covenant of works, because the end was to to condemn them by it, 4 *That God begins the Decalogue with I am the Lord thy God &c.* Answ. 1 He is said to be *the God of the spirits of all flesh*: *Numb.* 16. 22. yet thereby is not proved all are in the Covenant of grace. 2 It may be understood, that *he was their God de jure*, that he had right to command them, because *he brought them out of Egypt*. 3 the plain answer is that he was *their God* according to the Covenant of grace made with *Abraham* antecedently to the giving of the Law, nor by the Covenant of the Law. And for that which is often objected *that in the second commandement God promised mercy to thousands, but he promiseth no mercy but in a Covenant of grace*, I know how that can be proved, I concieve that God did and doth shew temporall mercies out of his long patience, by the Covenant of the Law, though no man be justified by it before God. neither *Psal.* 105. 8. nor any other prove that the Covenant at mount *Sinai* was the same with that to *Abraham*, though the promise of *Canaan was to a* 1000 *generations*, yet on condition of obedience *Dan.* 9. 4 *Ierem.* 11. 4, 6, 7, 8. when they brake Gods Laws they were expelled, and so when they *slew the heir of the Lord of the vienard he took his kingdome from them and gave it to a nation bringing forth the fruits of it*, *Matth.* 21. 43. I do not say that a naturall covenant *ex natura rei*, is a covenant of works, but it is undoubted, that the covenant on mount *Sinai* was a covenant made with the whole nation of the Jewes, and it is proved before to have been a covenant of works. It is untruly said, *That the Gospel covenant, Gal.* 3. 9. *was of a national nature.* For that is a national Covenant, which is made with a whole nation, that is all the people descended from such a stock, whereas v. 9. the Apostle by saying, *so then they that are of the faith of Abraham are blessed with faithful Abraham*, plainly expounds who he means by *all nations* v. 8. to wit not whole nations, but believers of all nations. The Covenant of works at mount *Sinai* though it did not justifie before God, yet it held that nation in *Canaan* till they set up other Gods and revolted from the true God, and upon their forsaking Idols, they might plead it for the restoring of them to their own land, or continuance in it. Yea God did condescend so far that if there had been in *Ierusalem a man that had executed judgment and sought truth he would have pardoned it*, and not brought the Chaldeans upon it to burn it *Ierem*, 5. 1. It is true the *Gospel threatens and executes corporal punishments, and promiseth rewards to the disobeying or obeying of it*, but not an expulsion out of or setling in any one Country of an entire nation, but personal evils or rewards upon personal disobedience or obedience. *The Covenant of grace admits of no carnal hypocrites*, nor is it so said *Gal* 4. 21, 22, 23. though it's not denied but many who are admitted into the visible Church are such.

To the eight *objection, That was in the flesh, this in the heart*, Mr. *C.* speaks thus. *Answ. was that only in their flesh?* was not the word of Covenant as well in their heart as *Moses judging Ecclesiastically avoweth of Israel Deut.* 29. 10, 11. *&c with* 30. 11, 12, 13, 14. *so Isai.* 51. 7. *Gods covenant now is to write his Law in our hearts Heb.* 8. *but is not all that included in this, I will be your God? whence all is inclosed up in that phrase ibid. or was not the first made to the Iews after their return from Captivity more expresly, Jer.* 31. *as before more implicitely Gen.* 17.

Reply

Reply: The objection I conceive (though I do not well know whose it is) is this, that the covenant at mount *Sinai* with the Iewish nation, or the covenant with *Abraham. Gen.* 17. were not the same with the covenant, for that was in the flesh in circumcision, or with the fleshly Iew in that at mount *Sinai*, this is the heart by writing Gods Law there and comprehends onely them in whose hearts Gods Laws are written. And indeed this difference the Apostle makes between the Covenant of the Law and the Gospel, the one *was of the letter*, the other *of the spirit* 2 *Cor.* 3.6. *the promise of the spirit is said to be by faith* Gal. 3.14. and in the new covenant this is made the promise different from what was in the first which was faulty for want of it *Heb.* 8.10. *that God would write his laws in their hearts.* now what Mr. *C.* speaks seems to me no whit to infring this. For though it is true, *the word of Covenant was in their hearts*, yet it is true, if meant of sanctifying implantation, only of the elect, not all *Abrahams* natural seed, or the whole body of *Israel*. How *Moses* is said *to judg Ecclesiastically* I understand not. *Deut.* 29.10,11. &c. *with* 30.11,12,13,14. do not prove that *Moses* avowed of every Isralite that *the word of covenant was in their heart.* In some places doubtless the promise [*I will be your God*] *includs also the writing of Gods Laws in our hearts*, nor will I deny it included in the promise *Gen.* 17.7. But I do then not understand it of every Israelite in that sense: for if so then I must make Gods word fal, sith he doth not perform it to al. And for that which Mr. *C.* seems to hold, *that they had the promise dispensed unto them with execution of the covenant*, it is in my apprehension to charg God with falshood. if any say I wrong Mr. *C.* let him construe this passage otherwise if he can [*yea but God did not actually write such holy dispositions in them: suppose he did not: that is the execution of the covenant, as for the very berith or Covenant it self, it is the promise whereof dispensed to them, and this they had both Gen.* 17. and *Deut.* 30.6. *To circumcise the heart to love God is, to imprint gracious dispositions; to promise the same to them is a Covenant to imprint it and so he did covenant with them and theirs ibid*] In which words he seems plainly to make God promise to imprint in some the gratious dispositions he doth not actually imprint, which is to make God not keepe his word; nor is the matter mended by asking, *is not Gods Covenant now also sacramentally* on our bodies too, and *in many no further*? For I grant many are baptized, who are not regenerate, yet I do not believe Gods Covenant of grace is to any such, or as Mr. *C.* speaks *Gods Covenant to write his Laws in their hearts* is to any such. Nor do I think that either *Ierem.* 31.33. or *Deut.* 30.6. God promiseth to all Israelits to write holy dispositions in their hearts, but only to the elect; nor to these in his covenant at mount *Sinai*, though he made these promises to some of the natural seed of Israel. neither *Rom.* 11. from 16. to 24. *nor Gen.* 4.15,16. *Compared with Gen.* 6.1,2. *nor Gen.* 17.18,19,20,21. *compared with Gen.* 21.9,10,11,12. *and Gal.* 4. *nor Heb.* 12.15,16,17. prove that either Cain or Ishmael or Esau were ever in the Covenant of Evangelical grace, nor is there any text that proves that the new covenant is intailed to natural generations of the most Godly men. Mr. *C.* in answer to the tenth *objection* saith thus. *But it's false to say the Commandement gave right to Covenant Interest. since Covenant right was first promised and declared to be the ground of that commanded service of the initiatory seal Gen.* 17.7,8,9,10,11, &c. *Thou shalt therefore keep my Covenant.* He doth

doth not say you must be or are circumcised, and therefore I will be your God: But I will be a God to thee and thy seed, therefore thou and they shall be circumcised: the nature of a seal supposeth a Covenant to be sealed.

To which I reply, I confess it were ridiculous for any to say the commandement gave right to covenant-interest, or covenant-right. For what is covenant-interest, but interest in the covenant, and covenant-right, but right from the covenant? But setting aside Mr *C.* his inept phrasifyings, (which I count to be Pædobaptists gibberish) it is not false, but manifest truth, that it is the command of God onely that gave title to persons to be circumcised, and is the Rule to know who are to be circumcised and who not, as I have often proved and shewed to be in effect confessed by Mr *M.* As for Mr. *C.* his inference from [*thou therefore*, Gen. 17. 9.] it is answered often before in the first part of this *Review*, *Sect.* 5. and elsewhere, that neither is the reading certain [*thou therefore*] nor doth the inference arise meerly from the promise, v. 7. nor is the inference at all of a right to circumcision, but of a duty, nor is this duty urged from each circumcised persons interest in the covenant but Gods making it with *Abraham.* Nor is it true, *That the nature of a Seal supposeth a covenant to be sealed*, sith other things are to be sealed, as Letters, Books, Stones, Men, Fountains, &c. besides covenants, *Abrahams* circumcision, *Rom.* 4. 11. was a seal not of a covenant of some things to be done, but of *the righteousness of faith which he had yet being uncircumcised*, & if it were true, yet is it as little to the purpose, sith there may be a covenant sealed to a person that hath no interest in the promise, as when ones name is used onely as a Trustee for others. And for what is said, *That the commandment required only a male of eight dayes old to be circumcised*, (which Mr. *C.* seems to conceive false) meaning not before the eighth day, is so plain by reading the chapter, that I should make question of his wit or his forehead that should deny it. And the reason thus exprest is as frivolous, *The promise being made indefinitely to the seed whether male or female, and not to the eighth day old seed, but to the seed albeit but a day old* For though the promise be to the child of one day old, yet the command is not to him, nor is he to be circumcised, and therefore the seal follows not the covenant, but the command even where the promise goes before. What he adds, *Else what had become of them if they had died then, in respect of the ordinary covenant means of their good, Rom.* 9. 6. Methinks Mr. *C.* might have as easily answered himself as he would do a Papist pleading this very plea for the necessity of infants baptism to salvation, or about the case of famales, or still-born infants. Surely he would say, God supplies that without means, which he bestowes on others by ordinary means, and so infants of a day old may speed well without circumcision. To what purpose *Rom.* 9. 6. comes in here I know not: This and some other passages seem to be the inconsiderate speeches of a man dreaming.

To the objection, *with the Jews, the Church and State were the same, but not so now.* Mr. *C.* thus writes. *Answ. God never confounded Church and Civill State either then or now. Who dare make God the author of confusion which is the God of order? He then kept them severall, paling in the Civill State with the Judicials, with which the Church as such dealt not, but as Civil cases came under a Church consideration. She had her Ceremonials and Morals to regulate her Kings and Princes, Priests Levits, and Elders had their proper work, and word,*

onely

onely in their own Spheares. The Elders of the Assemblies knew and acted in their places Ecclesiastically without interruption from Civill officers, or intruding upon Civil Officers as such, as Josh. 9. & 16. 1, 2, Acts 14. Luke 4. *The matters of the King and of the Lord were carefully bounded and sundred,* 2 Chron. 17.11.

Answ. According to the constitution of the Jewish people by God, the Church was not one body and the State another, but all the same persons were of the Church, who were members of the Common-wealth, he that had the right of a Iew, had the right of a Church-member, nor were any taken in or cast out of the one, but withall he was taken in or cast out of the other. Nor hereby is *God made the Author of confusion*, but good order was setled & kept in this way of coincidency of State Civil and Ecclesiastical. Nor is it true that *God kept the Church and Civill State severall, or paled in the Civill State with Judicials*, by which it was divided from the Church. In the Church the Priest dealt as well in judicials as in ceremonials, the Priest and the Levite as well as the Iudge gave sentence *in matters of blood and plea*, as well as *between stroak and stroak*, Deut. 17.8,9. *Eli, Samuel, Iehoiadah judged Israel*, managed State-affairs as wel as Temple service. Nor do I know any such Iudicials, but that they did belong to the Church or Priests (who were Iudges) as well as to the Civill State, that is, the Princes. As there were ceremonials and morals to regulate Kings and Princes, so there were also lawes to regulate the Priests. But no where do we read of any Court kept by the Church, or Officers of the Church, that is, Priests and Levits, wherein to censure Kings and Princes for meer morall sins called now (somewhat besides the Scripture use of the word) *Scandals*) though we find Princes deposing Priests. It is true, *Priests, Levits and Elders had their proper work and moved onely in their own Spheares.* And so had Princes and Souldiers, but not so as to make two distinct Corporations in Israel. If by *Elders of the Assemblies which knew & acted Ecclesiastically in their places*, he mean any other than the Priests, and by *their Ecclesiasticall knowing and acting*, the taking cognizance of moral evils, and proceeding against them by Ecclesiasticall censure in a Court distinct from the Civill, I must confess I find not either such Assembly, or such proceedings in the texts brought by Mr *C.* or any other. I grant there was a distinction between *the matters of the King and of the Lord*, 2 Chro. 19.11. & that *Amariah the chief Priest was over the Iudges whom Iehoshaphat sent forth in all matters of the Lord, and Zebadiah the Ruler of the house of Iudah, for all the Kings matters.* But this doth not prove that these men did keep severall Courts, but that in the same *Synedrium* these persons were best fitted to direct, the one in one sort of matters, the other in the other; As in a Parliament, Senate, or Council of Lords, Bishops, Lawyers, Souldiers, though they sit and act together, yet one may be more specially for one business and another for the other. Nor doth it appear that *Iehoshaphat* assigned in the Cities some Iudges for one kind of causes, and others for others. But because there was occasion to have recourse in many difficult cases to the *Synedrium* at *Ierusalem*, he instructs them whom they should have there for their help, according to the law, *Deut.* 17. 8, 9, *&c.* But I leave the Reader to Mr *Seldens* books *de Synedriis Ebraeorum*, to resolve him in this point.

What Mr *C.* gathereth out of the words of *I. S.* that he saith, *That God*

made a covenant of grace in generall and so with the body of the Jewes infants and all, serves not Mr *C*, his turn, unless he meant his naturall seed in generall, which that he did grant in respect of Evangelicall grace, I do not believe. What he saith touching *Baptism, that it sealeth the Covenant indefinitely to all sorts, and that it sealeth an infants present, federall grace, and unto future grace: likewise unto grown ones it sealeth personall grace less principally, covenant-grace principally*, is meer fancy without any Scripture, which makes no such distinctions of federall grace and personall, of the sealing one grace principally, another less principally, of sealing an infants present federall grace, and unto future grace, of baptism, sealing the covenant indefinitly to all sorts, which the Scripture makes the act of the person baptized only to testifie his own repentance and faith.

I proceed to examine the ninth Section of that Chapter. *Sect.* 9 Mr *C.* sets down this Conclusion, *That the covenant-interest, at least externall and Ecclesiasticall of Infants of inchurched believers is Gospel as well as such Covenant-interest of grown persons.*

SECT. XLIV.

Animadversions on the ninth Section of the same Chapter, in which the Covenant-interest externall and Ecclesiastical of infants of inchurched believers is pretended, not proved to be Gospel, in which his allegations of Deut. 30. 6, *&c.* Gen. 17. 8. Luke 19 9. Deut. 29. 10, *&c.* Ezek. 16. 1, *&c.* Gen. 9. 25. 26. *and other places are examined.*

Answ: IN my *Examen* page 51. I said, They that say the Covenant of grace belongs not onely to believers, but also to their naturall children, whether believing or not, these add to the Gospel, and the Apostle saith of such, *Gal.* 1. 8, 9. *Let him be accursed.* And page 122. It is no wrong to say it, that it is a new Gospel to affirm that this is one of the promises of the covenant of grace, That God will be the God of believers and of their seed; that the seed of believers are taken into covenant with their parents, I cannot derive its pedigree higher than *Zuinglius*. To this Mr *C.* opposeth his seventh *Conclusion* with ambiguity and seeming hesitancy. For what else can be the reason of those terms [*at least as well*] which are not like the expressions of a man that is well resolved what to hold? But that we may rip up this *Conclusion*, 1. He supposeth that right to outward ordinances, or more particularly to an initiall seal, is covenant-interest from the covenant of grace, which is a mistake, as I have often shewed. 2. That such externall covenant interest of grown persons is Gospel without Scripture, which mentions onely justification by faith and life by Christ to be the Gospel, not such a covenant interest (as they call it) which may be to reprobates as well as to elect persons. 3. He speaks of believers inchurched by such a covenant as the Scripture mentions not. 4. He annexeth the covenant interest he speakes of to this Church-covenant as well as to the covenant of grace without any warrant but his own conceit, nor shewes how far it is annexed to the one with or without the other. 5. He asserts the covenant interest at least externall and Ecclesi-

asticall

astical of Infants of inchurched believers. 6. That this is Gospel. The first place he brings for his *Conclusion* is *Deut.* 30, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14, *compared with Rom.* 10. 6, 7, 8, and saith, *The matter of the promise*, scil: *inward power of grace sheweth it was a Gospel-promise like that Heb.* 8. 10, 11, 12.

Ans. This is enough to shew the impertinency of this text to prove the meer externall Ecclesiasticall interest of infants of inchurched believers. For it contains that promise of inward grace, which Mr. *B.* saith, *belongs onely to the elect. Friendly Accom.* pag. 362. 2 Saith he, *Now this was made to the seed or children of these church members*, as ch. 29. 14, 15 *here is not any evasion as is usuall in mentioning Abrahams seed, &c. this people to whom this was made, being not so spiritual themselves.*

Answ. I grant that the promise *Deut.* 30. 6. of *circumcising thine heart and the heart of thy seed*, is meant of the seed of those then assembled, but not of all their seed, but onely such as were elect, nor at all times, but a speciall time, upon their return to God when they were in captivity, nor at all to their infant-seed but to their grown seed, as Mr *B.* proves in the words and place above cited, *Friendly Accom.* page 361. And whereas Mr. *C. conceives the people to whom this promise was made, not so spiritual*, he is mistaken. For if God promised to circumcise their heart, they must be spiritual. 3 *That it was not a bare tender*, which I grant. 4. saith he, *Lest any doubt should arise how this should be ratified and made good*, Moses *prophetically setteth out Christ as dead and risen in whom this covenant was ratified*, v. 12, 13. *All which the Apostle further explaineth*, Rom. 10. 6, 7, 8

Answ. I do not conceive that either *Moses*, Deut. 30. 11, 12, 13. useth the words there to shew how the promise, *v.* 30. 6. should be ratified, or that he prophetically setteth out Christ as dead and risen, *Deut.* 30. 11, 12, 13. or that the Apostle, *Rom.* 10. 6, 7, 8. so explains it. He that reads the chapter may perceive, that *Deut.* 30. *v* 11, 12, 13, 14. are brought to this end, that *Moses* might prevent the excuse which might be made for their disobedience by alleaging that Gods lawes were at such a distance from them as that they could not come to them. And though it is true that the Apostle applies those words *to the word of faith*, *Rom.* 10. 6, 7, 8. yet it is manifest that it was not a prediction of Christs resurrection, as there the words stand, 1. from *Deu.* 30. 10. where the commandment mentioned *v.* 11. is said expresly to be [*Gods commandment and statute which are written in this Book of the Law.*] 2. That *it was that which was nigh to them that they might hear it and do it. v.* 14 which is meant of the Law, not of the word of faith concerning Christ dead and risen, which was not to be done by us, but to be believed. Rightly saith *Beza*, *Annot. ad Rom.* 10. 8. τὸ ῥῆμα, *Hebr.* הדבר *haddabar, quo vocabulo Moses intelligit legem quam Dominus voce sua promulgavit, audiente universo populo suo, ita ut nullam ignorantiam possit prætexere, cum ejus tabulas haberet descriptas, tanquam adeo singuli ex re citare possent, & intus haberent quasi in cognitione & animo insculptam: sed quod Moses dixit de lege, hoc totum Paulus ad Evangelium accommodat per allusionem. Piscat. Analys. alludit Apostolus ad verba Mosis, Deut.* 30. 12. *Diodati Annot. on Rom.* 10. 6. [*speaketh on this wise*] *S. Paul makes use of this passage, though spoken in another sense.*

The like to which he doth in the same Chapter: v. 18. alledging the words *Psalm.* 19. 4. concerning the preaching the Gospel in all the world,

which is undeniably meant of the course of the heavens. Nor is it of force to overthrow this exposition, to say, *that the word Deut.30.14. is said to be in their heart*, for *to be in their heart* is there no more than to be understood by them though they were disobedient, and might be true of the law as wel as the Gospel. Nor is it any disparagement to the holy writings, to say that sometimes holy writers accommodate to their purpose words that have other meaning in the places where they stand. Whence *I* infer that the words *v.* 11. [*the Commandement which I command thee this day*] do not prove that thereby is meant the very Gospel-Covenant ratified in Christ, but the Commandment given in *Horeb Deut.29.1.* nor is there any shew of likelihood that the words *Deut.*30.11,12,13,14 should be meant of the promise *v.6. of circumcising the heart of their seed*, for that was not to be done by them, but God. And though it be true that *Moses had that day propounded the Commandments as a mutual Covenant betwixt them and God, as wel as God and them the parents or rulers stipulating therein in behalf of themselves and Children* (or rather in the behalfe of the whole nation in present being and unborn posterity) *and so in reference to them also a conditional covenant that day in the plains of Moab, Deut.* 29.1.9,10,11,12,13,14,15,29, and 30.6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14. yet the covenant was on their part to keep the commandments of the Law for their prosperity *Deut.*29.9. not to believe in Christ (which few of them understood). And when it is said *Deut.*29.13. *that it was that God might establish them that day for a people to himself, and that he might be unto them a God*, It is not meant that they should be all believers, and God to them a justifying and saving God in Christ, Mr. *B's.* words in his *Friendly accommodation*, pag.361. *And for that which you urge* [*Ero Deus tui & seminis*] *I doubt you will not prove that it reacheth so far as you speak. It sufficeth that God will be to them a God of mercy and do for them all that is necessary to put them in statum salutis pro conditione parvulorum*, and Mr. *C's* own exposition, *I will be a God to some in respect of external interest*, shew that *to be a God to some* doth not necessarily infer they shall be regenerate and so the covenant of saving grace in Christ be gathered thence. And therefore I deny that *Deut.*30.6.11,12,13,14. *compared with Rom.*10.6,7,8. *doe evidently* or obscurely *prove, that the Covenant-interest* (external as he cals it) "of in-
"churched stipulating parents children is Gospel, *or* that the Apostles preached this doctrine, *or* that believers are to eye the covenant in such a latitude "as to their children with them by faith, *or* that the essentials of the Covenant of grace in the latitude of the extent thereof to covenant parents with "their children held forth in the old Testament was delivered and held forth "as valid to the faith of the Saints in the new and after Christs incarnation. "*Nor* doth *Peter* propound the word of true faith in such a latitude as with "reference to their children, (in Mr. *C's* sence) *Acts.* 2.38,39. And though *Paul* hold forth *Rom.*5. 14,15. the abounding of Christs grace (to them that are Christs) in the gift of righteousness, yet that any such thing as external Ecclesiastical covenant interest to the natural seed of believers is held forth *Rom.* 5.14,15. is Mr. *C's*, palpable dotage. And how *Acts.*2.38, 39 *Rom.*11.16,17,18,19. 1 *Cor.*7.14. are mistaken is shewed in the first part of this *Review* and in this third part. But Mr. *C.* fails to dispute thus, *That which believers, as such, have, do, and ought to believe as a branch of the*

Covenant

Covenant of grace, that is Gospel; but this is of that in nature, ergo. The major needs no proof: the former text also clearing the same: the major de jure is evident: they ought to believe the whole Covenant made with them, as is evident, faith must be as large as the object, the Covenant is the word of faith. And so he proceedes in more words.

Whereunto I answer, I grant his *major*, But Mr. *C.* seems not to heed his own Syllogism. For he tels us *the minor de jure is evident, they ought to believe* and by which words he seems to have conceived, that this was the *minor, that they ought to believe the whole Covenant*: whereas his *minor* to be proved was this [*the external, Ecclesiastical interest of Infants of inchurched believers is that which believers, as such, have, do and ought to believe as a branch of the Covenant of grace*]. But Mr. *C.* as a man weary of disputing falls to his dictating way again after his confused manner leaving his reader to aim at what he would prove, and how. That which he should prove is, that *the external Ecclesiastical interest of Infants of inchurched believers is that which believers, as such, have, do and ought to believe as a branch of the covenant of grace*: surely if they ought to believe it he should produce some promise or declaration that avowes it as a constant and certain thing. But instead thereof he fals to *Gen.17.7.* and tels us, *God in making a Covenant in a Church reference especially, as was that with Abraham Gen.17.7 he taketh in their seed or children as joint covenanters.* but what he means by *Gods making a covenant in a Church reference*, or in which words he takes believers seed as joint covenanters with their parents, or in which words *the external Ecclesiastical interest of every believers natural child* may be proved, he shews not, nor can shew, there being no mans seed: but *Abrahams* there mentioned. He goes on thus; *Hence the phrase of seed in their generations taking in parents generating and children begotten, as those in and by whom Churches, are like to be continued.* Answ. It is true it is said *Gen.17.9.* to *Abraham* [*thou shalt keep my Covenant; therefore thou and thy seed after thee in their generations*] and this Covenant is *v.10. every man-child among you shal be circumcised.* But that this phrase [*seed after Abraham in their generations*] should infer that God taketh in believeng parents generating and children begotten even of the Gentiles in the Covenant of grace at least in respect of external ecclesiastical interest is yet to me a riddle, I know no more to be inferred thence but this, that not only *Abraham*, but also the Israelites his posterity were bound to circumcise their males in their generations. But we have more of this stuffe.

"Whence (*saith he*) God, when to speak in reference to the Church-seed "as well as to the choise elect-seed of *Isaac's* line in which the visible, and "not meerly the invisible Church was to be continued, he saith, he will "establish his Covenant with *Isaac*, not with *Ishmael*, *Ishmael was A-*"*brahams* seed too, and therefore externally in the Covenant, and therefore "sealed; but God knowing that *Ishmael* would reject this, he warneth *A-*"*braham* of it a little before that it might not trouble him afterwards: It is "not to be with him in his generations for that cause *Gen.17.8.* compared "with *Gen.21.9,10,11,12,13.* but with *Isaac* in his generations, God not "opposing therein *Isaac* to his Church-seed, who by rejecting the Covenant "will and did love, he and his to be cast out.

Answ. Mr. *C.* in this passage speaks so obscurely that it is hard to say what he drives at, and I may take up the saying, seed me a riddle what's this?

He:

He makes a difference between Gods speech of *Ishmael* and *Isaac*, "that "God saith he will establish his Covenant with *Isaac* not with *Ishmael*, "it was not to be with him in his generations, who was to be cast out: all which I grant true, and thence infer, that God never made his Covenant with, to, or for *Ishmael*, and yet he was to be circumcised, and therefore the initial seal (as it is called) was given to him to whom the Covenant belonged not. But Mr. *C.* using this blind *index* [whence] leaves us to ghess, what he drives at. [whence] importes it is from somewhat before that God said this of *Ishmael*, but that before was that *God takes in parents generating and children begotten.* But me thinks it is from the contrary (as the Apostle conceived *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8, 9.) that God speaks this of *Ishmael*, who was *Abrahams* seed, and yet not taken into the Covenant, who yet should be taken in, if yet Mr. *C's.* principles were good, that "the Covenant was made to "*Abraham* and his seed in their generations. And how Mr. *C.* reckons *Ish-* "*macls* as not *Abrahams* Church-seed I know not, nor do I understand how *Ishmaels* posterity should be cut off from external right to the Covenant: he belog a Church member according to Mr. *C's* dictates.

Mr. *C.* then tels us, that *God saith in reference to our times he will be a God to the families throughout the earth*, and pag. 83. he cites for this purpose the prophecy *Ierem* 31. 1. but there it is, the families of *Israel*: But were it, the families throughout the Earth, this proves not that it is Gospel, *that Infants of inchurched believers have external Ecclesiastical covenant-interest.* If it did, it may as well infer infants of inchurched believers, yea servants (who are part of the families of the earth) to have the same interest, yea all in the world, if we must understand it without limitation, and if with limitation then it is most rightly expounded as the Apostle doth *Gal.* 3. 8. the promise *of blessing all nations, of believers* v. 9. and so *all the families of the earth; to whom God will be God* shall be only believers of all the families of the earth *Gentile believers* as Mr. *C.* truly saith, without Infants. As for what Mr. *C.* observes, *that God said to Abraham to be a God to him and his seed in their generations not in their regeneration*, it is frivolous. For none of the Gentiles seed are *Abrahams seed* but by regeneration, and so to be *Abrahams seed in their generations* applied to Abrahams spiritual or Church-seed among the Gentiles is all one as to be *Abrahams seed by regeneration.* And for the prophecy of being a God to all the families of the earth, it is meant not of every member of the family, but the meaning is that God would not restrain his Gospel and Church to the Jews, but take in any of the families of the earth, who would embrace it, as when it is said *Mark.* 16. 15. *preach the Gospel to every creature*, (that is) to any Gentile as wel as Jews, yet infants not meant. This is proved from the event because parents did believe when children did hate them for it *Mat.* 10. 35, 36. and the husband was often a believer the wife an infidel. But saith Mr *C.* "it was usually otherwise, and "God speaks of things as they usually prove: extraordinary occurrences cross not such a rule. To which *I* say, if the prophecy were as Mr. *C.* would, that it should be Gospel that God will be a God of children with parents, because he will be god of all the families of the earth, then it must be true of the children of all and every of the families of the earth which recieve the Gospel. Nor are prophecies to be expounded at, if they foretold onely contingents what may be, and what may not be, but what shall certainly be.

nor

nor can ther be a rule, much lefs Gospel, made of that which is uncertain, somtimes it is somtimes it is not, a rule being, as they say in *logick, a determinate & known thing*. nor is it true that *the occurrent of the families being divided in* religion *was extraordinary*. For our Lord Christ speaks of it rather as ordinary & commonly to be expected *Matth.* 10. 34. 35, 36. But Mr. *C.* would have a *rule from Acts.* 11. 14. *Acts.* 16. 31. *Luke.* 19. 9. To this may be answered 1 that three instances mak not up an induction of particulars whence a rule may be made. 2. The first instance is not meant *of* infants, for none are there said *to be saved but those that heard the words which Peter spake.* The next includes not Infants. For the very next v. 32. shews that *by the house* were meant *those to whom the word of the Lord was spoken.* Nor is there any intimation of an infant meant *Luke.* 19. 9. And it is certain that none of the texts speaks of that which they are produced for, a bare external interest: for they expressly speak of salvation, and therefore if they prove it to be a rule that *parents and children are joint Covenanters, or are taken in together* they will prove they are saved together, which Mr. *C.* I suppose will not assert. But some other answers are in my *Examen* which I must vindicate with these. I had said *Examen part.* 78 there is a necessity to make τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ a restrictive particle and to expound *this house Luke* 19. 9. of *Zacheus* his family only in reference to his person. Against this Mr. *C.* speaks thus.

"Nor by salvation come to his house, is meant the comming of salvation "to himselfe: as if he and his house were all one: nor do I know any pa- "rallel Scripture speaking in such language, that when the scope and intent "is to mention the comming of such or such a mercy to such a person, that "phrase is used to denote the same; that such or such a mercy is come to his "house. what need such a circumlocution? if so intended, the word might more "plainly have been set down, this day is salvation come to this publican, "this person, this man or the like, in as much as he also is become a son of "*Abraham.* And what though the Greek word be used in *Acts* 2. 45. and "4. 35. for secundum according as, yet not for quatenus, or in quantum e- "forasmuch as the text and sense thereof are cleare, that it noteth proportion "of such administration, not meerly the cause or reason thereof. Or if it "be supposed to imply the cause or reason thereof its evident it noteth the "proportion also, they gave to every one as, or according as they needed scil: "proportionably to their need: it being regular as to give to the needy, so "to give them according to the measure of their present necessity. But "how that sense will here be fitly applicable I see not, to say that salvation "is come to his house or to him according as he is a Believer, but ra- "ther as our translators render it, it's to be taken as a reason of the "former, salvation is come to this house, forasmuch as he is a son of "*Abraham.*

Answ. By restraining *the salvation come to* Zacheus *his house* to his person, I do not make *Zacheus* and his house all one, but *salvation is come to his house* that is, to this place, *inasmuch*, or *in that Zacheus is also become a Son of* Abraham. But whereas Mr. *C. thinks no Scripture using such language*, I will use *Grotius* his words shewing the contrary even in *Luke*, because they are full to answer this passage of Mr. *C. Annot. in Luc.* 19. 9. τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ, *Synecdoche, Domus enim pro Patre familias dicitur: ita supra.* 10. 5. εἰς ἣν

δ' ἂν.

εἰς ἀν οἰκίαν εἰσέρχεσθε, πρῶτον λέγετε, εἰρήνη τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ· καὶ ἐὰν μὲν ᾖ ἐκεῖ ὁ υἱὸς εἰρήνης, ἀναπαήσεται ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν. *Domum autem ideo nominásse videtur Christus, ut ostendat rebatam hospitii gratiam. Dixerat enim Zachæo Christus,* ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σῷ δεῖ με μεῖναι. *Quare quæ ad hunc locum afferri solent de beneficiis Dei in familiam pii Patris familias, quanquam vera sunt rectè accepta, tamen huc pertinere non arbitror.* As for what he saith that καθότι doth not signifie *quatenus*, he may know that *Scapula* puts *quatenus* for the first signification of it. What I said, that καθότι was not only a causal particle, but also a restrictive is not denied by Mr. *C.* But *he thinks it is not good sense to say, according as he is a believer, but rather it is to be taken as a reason of the former.* I confess it would not be good sense to say [*according*, that is after the proportion that he is a believer] but thus it is good sense to make it to note the reason with restriction, and so our Translators do when they render it [*for so much.*] And this is confirmed in that, if it be expounded that *salvation did come to his house*, that is his wife, children, servants for this only reason, or cause, because *he was a Son of Abraham*, in that he was a believer, it may be gathered thence that a mans whole house, or posterity, may be saved barely by his believing: To this Mr. *C.* saith, *Na: but as Acts* 16. 31. *upon his believing they shall come in the Gospel-way, in the Covenant-road, and ordinary means of salvation.* But that this is a false Exposition both places shew. That *Luke* 19. 9. must needs be meant otherwise than of the means of salvation with which *Zachæus* might not have been saved: For besides that to his *being a Son of Abraham* (not a *Son of* Abrahams *Covenant* as Mr. *C.* speaks (though that be true also) but a follower of *Abrahams* Faith) *salvation* is certainly annexed; nor had it been so joyous if he had not meant salvation it self: it is put out of all doubt that he means salvation it self by *verse* 10. where he gives this reason why he said *salvation was come to him*, though some murmured at his going in to him; *for* (saith he) *the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost*; therefore he had both sought, and did save *Zachæus* who was lost. And for the other place it is as frivolous to expound *Acts* 16. 31. of the means of salvation. For, 1. *Pauls* Answer is of that of which the Jaylour asked him, else he had deluded him by his Answer; but the Question was not, What may I do to be put in the road, ordinary means of salvation, the Gospel way? But, What may I do to escape the wrath due to me? 2. That salvation is meant which was consequent on his believing, but the ordinary means of salvation was not consequent, but antecedent; that which followed on his believing in Christ was the certainty of salvation. Yea to interpret thus, *Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved*, that is thou shalt hear the Word, be Baptized, &c. is so frigid and sapless and interpretation as no considerate man, sure no Interpreter besides Mr. *C.* that I know, did ever give a sense of it. But Mr. *C.* tells me:

"Nor is it is sense of salvation for covenant means of salvation, or the "covenant and promise it self unusuall in Scripture. The salvation "which Christ and his Apostles preached, and those *Heb.* 2. 3. neglected, "was not barely salvation it self, but the promises holding the same "forth, this was that mercy, and riches, and salvation also which came to "the Gentiles, as rejected by the Jewes, *Rom.* 11. 11, 12, 17, 19, 30 verses "compared. So *Esay* 51, 6, 8, Gods salvation is his promise or covenant

on

"on which their salvation did depend, *Calvin in locum.* 2 *Sam.* 23. 5. *David* "speaking of his house or posterity, which albeit it were not so orient "then, yet God had made a covenant with him, *scil.* in reference to his "house, ordered in all things and sure; And this, *scil.* this covenant with "me and my house, is all my salvation and all my desire, albeit he maketh "my house not to grow or flourish in such a sort: this covenant then was his "salvation *objectivè, causaliter,* or *instrumentaliter.*

Answ. If this sense of salvation for covenant means of salvation, or the covenant and promise it self were usuall in Scripture, yet it could not be the sense, *Luke* 19. 9. or *Acts* 16. 31. whether we understand it of the outward means of salvation, the Word and Sacraments, or of the promise of salvation; but must be understood of saving by justification, as *Tit.* 3. 5, 6, 7. For neither is the outward means of salvation, nor the promise of salvation consequent upon being a son of *Abraham,* and believing as salvation is in those places. 2. Yet in none of the places alleged by Mr *C.* is salvation put for being in the Gospel way the ordinary means of salvation competent to infants. And for the covenant or promise of salvation it self, he dares not avouch it to be Gospel, that all the infants of inchurched believers have interest in it, and therefore if salvation *Luke* 19. 9. were put for the covenant or promise of salvation, yet it would not prove that it belongs to every son of *Abrahams* whole house, but Mr *C.* must limit it to the elect, as I do. Yet let us consider his Texts, that it may appear with how little heed he brings Texts, as if he never examined their pertinency, but heaped them together whether to the purpose or not. *They are said to neglect salvation, Heb.* 2. 3. *Ergo, salvation is taken for the outward means of salvation competent to infants or the covenant of salvation.* Nay rather salvation is taken for salvation as it was preached and offered, not for the means of salvation competent to infants, nor for the promise of salvation, but for salvation it self neglected in that they did not take hold of it by believing and obeying the doctrine of the Gospel. *Acts* 28. 28, salvation is said to be sent to the Gentiles, and that they would not hear it. But salvation there is the doctrine of salvation, not competent to infants who could not hear it. *Rom.* 11. 11, 12, 17, 19, 30, is not meant either of the bare outward means of salvation, or the covenant of salvation only, much less the outward means competent to infants, *Esay* 51. 6, 8, the term *Salvation* is not taken for the bare outward means of salvation competent to infants of inchurched believers. If *Salvation* 2 *Sam.* 23. 5, did note outward means of salvation, because it is said, *This covenant is all my salvation,* desire should note outward means of desire, because it is said, *This covenant is all my desire.* I grant the convenant is termed his salvation *Causaliter,* or *Instrumentaliter,* and his desire *objectivè.* The covenant everlasting in all things ordered and sure, was made with *David* in reference to his house, not in respect of outward covenant interest to the infants of his house (it's a wonder to me that such a man as Mr *C.* should so dote, especially after the publishing of Mr *Cottons* book of the Covenant on that Text) but in respect of the great promise of raising Christ out of his loins, *Acts* 2. 30. or as it is *Luke* 1. 69. *Raising up a Horn of salvation for his people in the house of his servant David,* and *this* (that is the accomplishment of this promise) *was all his salvation and all his desire, although he did not make his house to grow* in secular greatness. I deny not but parents

faith may be an occasionall means to stave off destruction from, and to further the salvation of their children, as *Heb.* 11. 7. 23, 25, 27, 28, *Jonah* 3, & 4. But this I deny, that barely in this respect, in that the parent is such, the infant of an inchurched believer, whether professing or reall, is a visible member of the Christian Gentile Church, and capable thereby of Baptism, or that this is any part of the Gospel. But Mr C. tells us,

Shall it then be yielded that such benefit should come as was before spoken of to adult servants of the house, &c. And is here no reference to the poore Babes by reason of their tender age? Hath the mercifull God revealed no ordinary help for them?

Answer. It is yeilded that benefit came to the servant of the Jaylors house, *Acts* 16. 31. but not the benefit there mentioned barely by the Jaylors faith without their own. Though we conceive infants not meant *Acts* 16. 31. because the Texts, *v.* 32, 34, lead us to understand by [*the House*] the persons who *heard the word, believed and rejoyced*, yet we exclude not infants from salvation, nor do we deny to the elect the ordinary help of the Spirit regenerating them, and Christs mediation for them, if they die in infancy, although they have not the ordinary outward means of the Word and Sacraments. And therefore he might have spared his pathetick interrogation fitter for an Orator than a Disputant, and for a Papist than a Protestant. Nor need we *exclude them from salvation for want of actuall faith because of the words Mark* 16. 16. *Heb.* 11. 6. For either those places may be understood of the act of faith in those to whom the word is preached, or else if it be understood of all infants, they may have faith in seed and act by Immediate operation of the Spirit, and yet they not to be baptized, because it is undiscerned by the Minister of Baptism. *The Jaylor might have encouragement to hope for his Infants salvation*, though they were not meant in those words, *Acts* 16. 31. If the election of God be not any thing visibly to comfort him concerning his Children, no more is the covenant of salvation, which is comensurtae with election, *Rom* 9. 8. nor is discernable any more than election, both are alike discerned by the fruits of repenting and believing.

As for Baptism, it could not assure salvation, nor the want of it debar from it. If it be not said, *That the Jaylors house believed before they were baptized*, yet it is said in the next verse, and in the verse before, that *Paul spake the word to all that were in his house.*

&c. As for that he saith, " It follows not that what is applicable to the adult " persons in the house, *scil.* that joy of faith must exclude children from " baptism whereof they were capable, no more than when it is said, *Deut.* 12. " 7. that they and their households were to eat before the Lord, and to re- " joyce in all they put their hands to, &c. Because therefore their little chil- " dren could not so actually express joy in what they put their hands unto, " therefore they were none of the household which did eat before the Lord. " Anabaptists would not like this arguing, which urge the joynt communi- " on of the Jewish Children in all sorts of Church-ordinances.

I answer, If by little children be meant infants of a day or two, or some months old (at which age they baptize infants) I affirm that they are not meant by the *Household*, *Deut.* 12. 7. and that for the reason given, because *they could not eat before the Lord, and rejoyce in all that they put their hands unto,*

mo. Nor do I know any whom he calls Anabaptists, but would like of this arguing: *The Jewish Households were to eat before the Lord, and rejoyce in all that they put their hand to*; therefore little children of a day or two, or some months old, are not any part of the households to whom that precept is given, or of whom that which is there said, is there meant. For though we all grant that infants were circumcised, and in my *Examen, page* 169. I say the males that could eat, though not come to years of discretion fit to receive the Lords Supper, were to eat the Passover, yet I know none of the so called Anabaptists which urge the joynt communion of the Jewish children (infants of a few dayes or months old) in all sorts of Church-ordinances.

What Mr *C.* saith further, *Suppose a mans household, Men, Women and Children, all diseased and cured at the Bath, and afterwards the household expresseth their joy for it by leaping & dancing for joy; and it be said such a man, he and all his were washed at such a Bath, and he & his whole household afterwards even danced for joy: none will say, that because little ones could not so leap for joy, and are excluded from the notion of the* [*whole household*] *in this later, therefore they were not in the account of* [*all his*] *in the former*, if it were granted him, yet the arguing from *Acts* 16 32. where it is said, That *Paul spake the word of the Lord to all that were of the Jaylors house*: and v. 34, *He rejoyced believing in God with all his house*, with the constant narration of the Evangelist in the Acts of the Apostles, mentioning baptizing of none but believers, do evidently shew, that by [*all his*, v. 33] were meant onely those that heard the word and believed. It is true more or fewer of this or that sort of persons or things born or unborn are meant by the terms [House or Household] as the matters and circumstances of the speech lead to, nor need I say that *Gen.* 34. 50. under the term *House* are not meant little children, because of the words *Gen.* 35. 1, 2, 3, 4. Nor need I deny that *Infants are often intended by the term House and Household*, as *Gen.* 30, 30, *&c.* or that *they are chiefly meant thereby*, as 1 *Sam.* 20. 15, *&c.* or that *they are intended when some parts of the family are expresly instanced in, and children not withall mentioned*, as *Gen.* 14. 16. or that *children are ordinary instruments to build or hold up a house in naturall, civill, religious and Church-respects too*, as *Exod.* 1. 21. or that *the Covenant-expressions of Seed and Seed in their generations, do more directly reach them as such, than either Wives or Servants, as such*, as *Gen.* 17. 7, *&c.* Yet all this doth neither take away the force of the reasons before given why under [*all his*, *Acts* 16. 33.] Infants are not meant, much less prove that which Mr *C.* should prove (which he must do if he will prove his covenant-interest Ecclesiastical of believers seed thence) that in the Jaylors house were infants, and they baptized.

Ezek. 16. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. hath been often shewed to be impertinently alledged being meant of the Israelites when brought out of *Egypt* and then God said [*live*] to them when they had been ready to perish in Canaan first, and then in *Egypt* by oppression and after brought them to mount *Sinai* and entered into the covenant of the Law, which Mr. *C.* indeavoring to apply to an Ecclesiastical external priviledge of Gentile believers infants in the time of the Gospel doth *toto Cœlo errare*. It is neither said there to *Jerusalem* then *live*, nor *Micah.* 7. 20. "that the same mercy and truth engaged to *Abra-*
"*ham* and *Jacob* God did both swear to other Jew fathers of families, or that
"there is mention of pardon of sins externally made over to them or plea-

"here for that end v. 18, 19. *And though I deny not that* in respect of the cove-
"nant made with *Iacob* at Bethel *Gen.* 35. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. God is said
"there to speake with Israel in *Hoseah* his dayes *Hos.* 12. 2. yet I deny there
is a word that saith that external Church interest of inchurched Gentile be-
lievers infants is Gospel. Nor is there any thing 2 *Sam.* 23. 4, 5. about
external covenant-Church-interest, but of the peculiar promise made to *David*
of the continuing the kingdome to his posterity, which having its full accom-
plishment in Christ *Acts.* 2. 30. was indeed in that respect the covenant of
grace, and was so believed both by *David* and all believers before Christ,
that it should be done, and now by all believers that it is done. But this
promise was made of *Davids* house only not of every particular believers,
and therefore it is impertinently brought to prove that *it is Gospel that to every*
believers house God hath made such a Covenant, or that the children of every be-
liever have an external covenant interest with the parent. As for the instances of
Eve and *Lamech* concerning *Seth* and *Noah* *Gen.* 4. 25. and 5. 29. ther's no
mention of any *Covenant*, nor that these were *Covenant babes*, much less of a
Covenant belonging to all believing parents with their children, but an ac-
knowledgment in the former that *God had appointed Eve another seed instead of*
Abel whom Cain slew in respect of the preisthood say some, others in respect
of propogating mankind, others because of Christ to come from him: in
the other a propheſy of *Noah* that *he should comfort them concerning their worke*
and toil of their hands, because of the ground which the Lord had cursed, which
is concieved by some as meant of the invention of plowing. *vide Christoph.*
Cartwright in locum: the *new Annot.* follow that sense. But were it true *Eve*
had respect in that speech *Gen.* 4. 25. to *the promise* *Gen.* 3. 15. and that *she*
believed God would continue the Church in Seth's posterity, and that thence came
the distinctions of the sons of God and daughters of men *Gen.* 6. 1, 2. and *La-*
mech believed that Noah should be a rest, as it were to the Church albeit that
corrupt world should be destroyed: yet all this is noteeing to the point Mr. *C.*
should prove, that *it is Gospel that the children of every inchurched Gentile-*
believer have an externall covenant church-interest, there being in those Texts
not a word of such an externall covenant Church-interest, nor of any
generall promise to them, but onely a mention of speeches which had their
rise from particular Revelations about those persons which are there men-
tioned.

Psalm. 102. 25, 26, 27, there's not a word of the externall Federall
Church state of inchurched Gentile Church-believers. But if the Psalm
were made towards the later end of the captivity of *Babylon*, and were the
prayer of the Iews, as v. 13, 14, makes it probable, then it seems to be meant,
as the new Annotations on Psa. 102. 28, thus, *The children of thy servants shall*
continue] *This is the literal* (*as I may call it*) *immortality proposed in the Law to*
them that fear of God, their surviving in their posterity: If of the Saints prophecy-
ing of the calling of the Gentiles, or, as some would, of the reingrafting of the
Iewes, that Paraphrase of *Junius* may be right: 1. *Vera & germana Ecclesiæ*
tuæ membra conservabuntur in æternum virtute tua & tibi cura futura sunt. Take
it of whomsoever the words may be verified, it mentions no such thing as ex-
ternall federall Church-interest, but continuance and establishment before
God, that is, as *Ainsworth* notes, *as much as so long as God doth dure, meaning*

for ever. For assurance whereof they had a word of faith, to wit, some revelation of God, though no such covenant as Mr *C.* imagines, intituling children of inchurched Gentile-believers to externall Church-interest.

Mr *C.* urgeth a second Argument to prove the federall interest of believers infants to be Gospel because from the beginning, and he begins with *Gen.* 3. 15. to prove that it was held as Gospel, that the *Species* of the infants of believers in Church-estate were taken into the Verge of the Covenant of Grace; as if infants of believers were a *Species*, and not Individuals, or that it were denied that some infants were taken into the verge of the covenant of grace. And then he dictates without proof, that *Adam* and *Eve* were eyed by God as a seminall visible Church; whereas in that promise they were eyed either as the root of mankind, or it as a Church, more likely as the seminall invisible, than as the visible Church. He interprets *The Seed of the Woman*, not onely of the principall Seed *Christ*, in, and by whom it was ratified and fulfilled, but her Church-seed also whom the same promise did comprehend. But I would know of Mr *C.* whether *Cain* were not her Church-seed, who by Mr *C.* his Dictates was the infant of inchurched believers. For *Adam* and *Eve were eyed*, saith Mr *C.* as a seminall visible Church? If so, then it is true of *Cain*, that he should bruize the Serpens head as *Eves* church-seed; which how he did, unless being of the wicked one, and slaying his brother, as is said of him, 1 *John* 3. 12. be bruising the Serpents head, I understand not. Many Interpreters comprehend *Cain* under the Serpents seed; but none I have met with, comprehend him, or any reprobate, under the *Womans Seed* mystically understood. There are Interpreters that understand the promise, *Gen.* 3. 15. as made to mankind in respect of the naturall Serpent, and the best of *Christs destroying the works of the Divel*, as *John* speaks, 1 *Epist.* 3. 8. and others of the elect overcoming Satan, and *treading him under their feet*, *Rom.* 16. 20. But none do I find who understand it of infants of believers externall Covenant Church-interest. Believers, it is true, are called *Abrahams seed*, but no where true believers, as such, are called *Eves* Church-seed, nor doth *Eve by faith from thence thus interpret the scope of the promise*, *Gen.* 4. 25, 26. And if infants be meant by the womans seed, *Gen.* 3. 15. in a spirituall sense of overcoming the Divel, yet no infants but elect can be meant thereby, sith no other overcome the Divell. So that it is so far from being true, that *this Gospel of Infants of believers externall Covenant Church-interest, was held in the beginning of the world*, *Gen.* 3. 15. that I rather conceive that it is no elder than Mr *C.* and am sure is a meer figment. But there is more of this Rubbish to be removed. He tells us,

" The same Doctrine is implicitly held forth, *Gen.* 9 in the opposition of the " servile condition of *Canaan*, v. 25, 26. to the future Churchstate of *Japhet*, v. " 27. the one accursed parent and child to servitude, so that *Chams* Babes as " soon as born, were to be slaves: but *Japhet* parent & child, are prophetically " voted to Church-estate in *Sems* tents, so that inchurched *Japhets* babes " are actually within *Sems* Tents so soon as born. As God would accurse " collective *Canaan*, *Noah* propheseth that God would enlarge, because collective *Japhet* to turn into the tents of *Sem*; which Interpreters expound " of the joyning of the Gentiles unto the visible Church. Now visible " Church-estate supposeth visible Covenant-estate, as is evident.

Answer

Answ. If Mr. *C.* may be allowed to make Gospel of Doctrine so implicitely held forth as his new Gospel is here; I see not why we should so much blame, as we do, Popes for making new Articles of Faith out of places clearer for their purpose, than this is for Mr. *C*'s. The servil condition of *Canaan* is referred generally by Interpreters to the bondage they were in when *Joshua* subdued them, and the *Gibeonites* were made slaves: which though it did extend to their Children, yet was not such, but that even they were Proselytes many of them to *Israel*, as *Araunah* the *Jebusite*, and after the woman of *Canaan* is commended for her Faith, *Matth.* 15. 28. and therefore not excluded from the visible Church. And for the blessing of *Japhet*, whether we read it, *God shall enlarge Japhet*, as some, or *perswade Japhet*, as others, I see not how it is well cleared, that the accomplishment of it is in the Calling of the Gentiles descended from *Japhet*, as the Greeks, and others into the visible Church, because it is said that *Canaan should be servant to* Japhet, whereas the *Tyrians*, and *Sidonians*, and *Carthaginians*, and others descended of *Canaan* were in the visible Church as well, if not as soon, as many of the Posterity of *Japhet*, as is apparent by the Histories of the Church mentioning Bishops and Synods held among them, and famous Writers. And therefore for my part I encline to think it a Prophecy of the Civil condition rather than Ecclesiastical, whether it were fulfilled in *Alexander the great*, and the *Greek* Kings of *Asia* after him subduing *Tyre* and *Sidon*, and possessing *Palestina*, of which *Judea* was a part, or of the *Romans* subduing *Carthage* and possessing *Judea*: But be it taken as a Prophecy of the Ecclesiastick state of these people, with what Argument will Mr. *C.* prove, That *the dwelling in the Tents of Sem*, is refered rather to the visible, than the invisible Church? They who will have it accomplished when the Gentiles were *fellow-heirs of the same body, and partakers of Gods promise in Christ by the Gospel*, *Ephes.* 3. 6. or when *the Gentiles were grafted in the stead of the Jewes*, *Rom.* 11. 17. have more reason to understand it only of true believers converted by the Gospel, and so of the Invisible Church, than to understand it of the visible Church as visible, as I have shewed in the first part of this *Review*: yet were it meant of the visible Church, there is no Argument to prove it meant *of the Babes of* Japhet *as soon as they are born*. For what though it be that *Canaan*, and *Sem*, and *Japhet* be *all collectively taken*, yet Mr. *C.* himself, *pag.* 161. hath taught us, *That Speeches of the whole Body of the Jewes, collectively taken, are true, in respect of the choice or refuse part*; and so may, or rather must be the speeches here necessarily understood, *Canaan* collective neither comprehending every *Canaanite* in their greatest servitude, nor collective *Sem*, or *Japhet*, comprehending every *Israelite* or descendent from *Japhet*, but a notable part. And if those of *Japhet that dwelt in the Tents of Sem*, that is according to the Exposition of Mr. *C.* were *of the visible Church*, were brought in by perswasion, and this perswasion was by the Preaching of the Gospel according to the opinion of many Interpreters, the Argument is forcible to the contrary, that Babes are not hereby meant among the Inhabitants in the Tents of *Sem* Ecclesiastically expounded, but only such as could hear and understand, and were perswaded by the Gospel to joyn themselves to the visible Church of Christ.

After this Mr. *C.* dictates out of *Gal.* 4. 23, 24. *Gen.* 21. 10. *That even as Ishmael and his were exiled out of Abrahams family, and the legal* Jerusalem

and

and her Children even the body of the Jewes adult and infant were dis-churched, so Ecclesiastical Isaac, Abrahams Church-seed with their Children should be instated in the visible political Gospel-Church. But the Apostle doth not speak of casting out of the visible Church as such, but out of the Inheritance of Sons, that is justification and salvation, and *Jerusalem that now is and her Children is not Jews as Jewes or the body of Iewes or adult and infants* as Mr. *C.* speaks: for then many Myriads of Jewes believing should be cast out: But *Ierusalem that now is*, notes the legal Covenant, and her children not Infants born at the City *Ierusalem*, but so many whether of Jews or Gentiles, as sought righteousness by the Law, and not by Christ, as *Hagar* signifies the legal Covenant, & her Son *Ishmael* such as *were born of the flesh*, that is, *trusted in the flesh*, as the Apostle speaks, *Phil.* 3. 3. that is, in their legal righteousness, and carnal privileges. And on the other side, *Sarah* and *Ierusalem above*, signifie the Gospel-Covenant, *vers.* 24, 25. which *begets Children by Promise*, that is, according to the Doctrine of Faith in Christ typified by *Isaac*, and these that believe are *born after the Spirit*, and do inherit life, righteousness, salvation. There's not a word of *Abrahams Church-seed* there, or any where else in Mr. *C.* his sense; and [*Ecclesiastick* Isaac] is a new Notion, and a meer figment of Mr. *C.* in his sense; and [*the casting out*] is meant of the invisible Church of the saved, such as do reject Christ, and adhere to the Law; and *the taking in* is meant of the taking into the invisible Church of the justified and saved, them that believe in Christ, or are united to him, and not of an in-Churching of meer visible Professors, Parents, and Children into the visible Church by an outward rite.

The three Texts next alleged by Mr. *C.* are all mis-alleged to prove *an external Covenant Church Interest of the Infants of in-Churched-believers*, to wit, *Esay* 65. 20. the impertinency of which to this end, is shewed in the Second Part of this *Review* Sect. 11. the impertinency of *Isa.* 61. 9 and *Ezek* 37. 27. in this Part of the *Review* before Mr. *C.* proceeds to a Third Argument.

In answer to which I deny, 1. the Major, or sequele, that [*if Infants and little ones of visibly believing parents in their Church estate, before they can make any personall confession or profession of faith in the covenant, yet then are Abrahams Church-seed, then is it Gospel that the promises belong to them.*] Nor is it in substance or circumstance the Apostles, *Gal.* 3. 16. *To Abraham and his seed are the promises made.* For though it is granted, that it is Gospel that to *Abraham* and his seed the promises are made, yet it is utterly false that there is meant a seed of *Abraham*, who are neither elect nor true believers, but onely the naturall children of Gentile inchurched believers, yea of Gentile visible inchurched professors of Faith, whom Mr *C.* in a new language of his own without Scripture, calls *Abrahams Church-seed*; yea, the Text is so manifestly against it, that I wonder Mr *C.* could imagine any Reader would receive his Dictates about this Text. For the Apostle expresly links *the promises to Christ as the seed of Abraham*, and whether *Christ* be understood personally or mystically, as *Beza* and others, yet by *the seed* are not meant the fictitious Church-seed of *Abraham*, to wit, the naturall children even of infants of visible inchurched Gentile-believers, or visible professors of Faith, but true believers, or elect persons, who alone are members of Christ mystical.

still. And the promises are *of the Spirit through faith*, v. 14. *the inheritance*, v. 18. *life and righteousness*, v. 21, 22, which are made to none but true believers, or elect persons. To which I add that external covenant-interest (if there were such) is never in Scripture termed the Gospel, no not in those who rightly have it, as true believers, but Christs dying for our sins, and justification by faith in him.

2. I also deny the *minor* " [that the Infants and little ones of visibly believing parents in Church-estate before they can make any personal confession or profession of faith in the Covenant, yet then are *Abrahams* Church-seed] Mr. *C.* *takes upon him to prove the* minor; 1. in those of *Abrahams* loins in the elect seed. I should think (saith he) it should not be questioned, but yet it hath by some; that Infants while Infants and till believers are not in the covenant &c. And by such other speeches of our Adversaries in this point, the covenant-right not only of the individual Infants of believers, but the Covenant estates of that *species* and sort of persons is wholly denyed, and so since it's evident and acknowledged that some are elected of that sort, yet it's denied that they have part in the word of Gods covenants, so that if they die in Infancy, as many of the choise seed of *Abraham* and *Isaac* and *Jacob* did &c. Yet that ordinary means of saving efficacy in all the saved elect is denied, contrary to that principle *Rom.* 9. 6. But more hereof anon: but *Rom.* 9 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. is so clear for it I wonder any deny it. *Isaac* and *Jacob* are made precedential instances of interest not only of election, but of Gods calling unto the fellowship of his free covenant without respect either to their desire or indeavour of it personally v. 16.

" Answ. There are sundry reasons which make me conceive that in this and many other passages in this argument Mr. *C.* aimed at my self. Mr. *Robert Baillee minister of* Glasgow *in* Scotland had in the 2. part of his *Dissuasive* intituled *Anabaptism ch.* 4. pag. 92. charged me *with spoiling all Infants of all interest in the Covenant of grace, and denying all right to the new Covenant to Iewish Infants till in their ripe years they became actuall believers.* From which false criminations I have vindicated my self in the *Addition to my Apology* printed at *London* 1652. Mr. *C.* here tels of some " who speak as if they " held that Infants while Infants, and till believers are not in the covenant, " that wholly deny the covenant estate of that sort of persons, though they " acknowledg some of them are elected of that sort, yet it's denied they have " part in the word of Gods covenant, and if they die in Infancy that ordinary " means of saving efficacy in all the saved elect is denied them. I have reason to conceive that these are calumnies of others, sure I am if they rae meant of my self they are calumnies, and so shewed in my Books before cited and in other of my writings. From which that I may stand free I further express my self distinctly thus. 1. That by [*in the Covenant of grace*] I mean the promise of righteousness and external life by Christ Jesus. 2. That I mean by [*being in the Covenant of grace or belonging to it*] the having this promise made to them by God whether *Gen.* 17. 7. or *Gen.* 3. 15. according to the speech of the Apostle *Tit.* 1. 2. that *God promiseth eternal life προ χρονων αιωνιων before the times of the ages*, that is afore any age of man was past. 3. that all the elect of God whether children of believers or

unbe-

unbelievers dying in Infancy, or at the riper age are in this covenant of grace, that is, God hath promised eternal life to them by Christ, they are given to Christ to save, are *children of the promise Rom.* 9. 8. 4. That all these are *Abrahams* seed meant in the promise *Gen.* 17. 7. though not actual believers. 5. That all these have Christs merits and the spirits inbeing in them afore they dye as ordinary means of salvation. 6. That none but these elect persons have the said covenant of grace or promise of righteousnes and life by Christ made to them. 7. That no where visible professers of faith is in the Covenant of grace. 8. That the natural child of a believer, no not the naturall child of *Abraham* the Father of believers was or is in the covenant of grace, as their child, or barely by vertue of their faith, but onely the elect of them by vertue of their election by God. 9. That these elect persons, though elected, and having the promise made to them, yet have not the things promised (if of years of understanding) till they do believe, they are not justified till then, and so are not actuall partakers of the covenant of grace, or not actually therein. 10. That no where in Scripture is the naturall child of a Gentile-believer, or a visible professor of Christian faith, termed *Abrahams Seed*, and the term of *Abrahams Church-seed*, applied to such is a novel expression, not grounded on Scripture. 11. That the formall, proper, and adequate reason why any was to be circumcised, was, not his being in the covenant made with *Abraham*, nor is the reason why any should be baptized, barely his interest in the covenant of grace, but the command of God, in the one, appointing males of eight dayes old of *Abrahams* house, and Proselytes thereto to be circumcised; in the other, disciples by their own profession of faith in Christ to be baptized. 12. That the use of the terms, *Being in the outward Covenant, externall covenant-interest of Infants*, and such like are mistakes upon the imagined connexion between the covenant of grace and the initiall seal, as they call it. Now to Mr *C.* his proof.

His proof is from *Rom.* 9. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 16. *That elect infants were Abrahams seed in covenant*, which I deny not, but say, that *Rom.* 9. 8. proves not only, that all the elect seed be included in the promise, *Gen.* 17. 7. but also that the Apostle expresly affirms, that onely the elect are the children of the promise understood spiritually, and they only *Abrahams seed. Acta Synod. Dordrac Judic. profess. Belgic. de* 20. *Art. pag.* 113. *Hæc propositio* [*solis electis hæ promissiones sunt factæ*] *ex professo probatur à Paulo, Rom.* 9. 7. 8. *Amesius Coron. Art.* 5. *c.* 2. *Seminis in ulcatio solos electos & efficaciter vocatos notari docet Apostolo sic hunc locum interpretante, Rom.* 9. 8 *Gal.* 3. 16. *&* 4. 28., Mr. *Rutherford Exercit. Apolog.* 2 *c.* 2. *num.* 7. *Soli electi dicuntur in Scripturis fœderati, filii & hæredes promissionis, Rom.* 9 8. Mr *Norton*, Mr *C.* his Colleague, commended by Mr. *Cotton* with him, *Respons. ad Apollon. c.* 2. *pag.* 30. *Objectum fœderis gratiæ sunt soli electi.* Dr. *Twiss Animadv. in Corvin. pag.* 235. *Negamus Deum pacisci fœdus gratiæ cum omnibus & singulis: dicimus hoc fieri solum cum electis.* More may be seen to this purpose in my *Examen, part.* 3 *Sect.* 4. in this part of the *Review*, *Sect.* 33. and almost in every Protestant Writer of note who opposeth the *Remonstrants* of *Belgia*, and other patrons of Universall grace, freewill, and falling away from grace. But what Mr *C.* saith and I grant, proves not that *Infants and little ones of visibly believing parents in Church estate, before the Infants can make any personal confession or profession of*

faith in the covenant, are Abrahams Church seed to whom the promise, Gen. 17. 7. *belongs*, but the contrary: Nor is it hereby proved, that *such Infants are covenanters ingaged*, or *as Ifants of Abraham and Isaac, children of the promise*, as if the *formalis ratio* of their childrens being children of the promise, were *Abrahams* and *Isaacs* believing and inchurching, as Mr. *C.* seems to conceive, it being contrary to the expres determination of the Apostle, *Rom* 9. 8. which excludes *Ishmael* and *Esau* from being *children of the promise*. Nor is it true, that *the change of Abrahams name, Gen.* 17. 4, 5, 6, 7, *&c. compared, proves that the children of believers inchurched are Abrahams seed*, but onely that believers of all nations are such, *Rom.* 4. 17.

Mr *C.* glanceth at a passage in my *Examen*, page 96. wherein I say, that the Apostle, *Rom.* 4. 12. makes Circumcision, a *Seal of the righteousnes of faith*, but not to all, or only circumcised persons, but to all believers whether Jews or Gentiles; so that according to the Apstles doctrine, Circumcision in as much as it sealed to *Abraham* the righteousnes of faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised, so that it is so far from being true that persons have the promise, therefore they must have the seal in their persons; that it follows, persons have the promise, therfore they have the seal in *Abraham*, hough they never are nor may be sealed in their own persons.

" To this Mr. *C.* saith, " The Apostles discourse cleareth it to be other-
" wise, his scope being not to infringe any Gospel-right to the Gospel-seal,
" but to take off any reasoning in point of justification from any work of
" the Law considered apart from Christ: As for the sealing of *Abrahams* be-
" lieving children the Gentiles in *Abraham* sealing, if that were intended, as
" much might have been affirmed of the believing children of *Abraham*, as they
" such, and so the circumcising of such Iewes at least had been more than
" were needed to far forth.

I reply, I grant the scope to be to prove Iustification by faith; but I say, in respect of the present point the words prove no more, but that *Abrahams* personall circumcision was to him and all that belive as he did, whether Jewes or Gentiles, the seal of the righteousnes of Faith. And I do acknowledge, that if that were all the use of circumcision, there was no simple necessity of any Iew believer to be circumcised in their own persons, yet God might think good *ex abundanti, more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his Councell*, as the words are, *Heb.* 6. 17. and therefore would have them also circumcised in their own persons to that end. But however there were other ends of circumcision, as the prefiguring of Christ to come, the distinguishing the Israelites from other people, &c. And therefore notwithstanding *Abrahams* circumcision sealed to Jew-believers the righteousnes of faith, yet it was not needless that they should themselves be circumcised in their own persons for the ends to which God appointed it. And the command being expres for their circumcision, they could plead no exemption from their personall circumcision upon that pretence that *quatenus* believers they were circumcised in the circumcision of their father *Abraham* while the command stood in force, no not though all the ends had ceased, as that Christ were come, all other nations were circumcised as well as they, &c. I say, had these ends and all other ceased, yet without Gods releasing of the command, they were to be circumcised.

How

How little that Act of Christ, *Luke* 18. 15, 16, 17. with *Mark* 10. 16. makes for Mr *C.* his purpose, is shewed in the second part of the *Review* before, and so likewise how impertinently *Esay* 61. 9. & 65, 22. are alleged, is shewed before in this part of the *Review*. I neither grant that *incburched Gentile visible believers are any other where called Abrahams spirituall seed*: Nor do I think Anabaptists wil grant, that if they were, then are their children also.

But, saith he, " The parents being not meerly abstractively considered " the Covenant-seed, *Gen.* 17. 7. but as in reference to their childen with " them. For the seed of *Abraham* to whom the Covenant *Gen.* 17.7 is made, " is the seed in their generations, which necessarily imply and suppose as the " parents generating, so the children begotten of them, the parents make not " the generation alone, nor the children alone, but joyntly considered toge- " ther.

Answer. No person is the Covenant-seed, *Gen.* 17. 7. but *Abrahams* seed, which being meant of his naturall seed, so it includes all descended from him by *Isaac* and *Jacob* in their future generations; if meant of his spirituall seed [*their generations*] notes either the ages in which they were born by natural generation, or by spiritual regeneration by Fathers in Christ, who beget them by the Gospel 1 *Cor.* 4 15.

" But, saith Mr. *C.* " Here Anabaptists sever the subject parties taken into " the covenant-consideration, they agree it's *Abraham* & his spiritual seed, " but leave out the notation of the seed, *scil.* seed in their generations the " proselyte Gentiles in *Abrahams* house, they were not his carnall seed; " why are they then sealed, but as they were *Abrahams* spiritual and Church- " seed.

Answer. We sever not the subject parties taken into Covenant consideration, as Mr. *C.* speaks, but distinguish them: Nor do we leave out that Notation of Seed, *scil.* in their generations; but take it in, as I have said. the Proselytes, if believers, as *Abraham*, they are his seed by Faith, if no, they are not his seed according to Scripture. *Abrahams Church-Seed* is a new-devised term without Scripture: Yet the proselytes and their children were to be circumcised by vertue of the command, whether they had any part in the covenant or not, as being in his house, though not of his seed. And if by *Gods solemnly enjoyning a Seal to a Blank, or a seal to no Covenant of his*, be meant, that circumcision of the Proselytes was a token of that Covenant which was no covenant of Gods, I deny it; it was a Covenant of Gods, in which he made many promises, it was not a token of a Covenant that assured nothing, as a paper in which nothing is written (which we call a Blank) there were promises and persons specified in the covenant. But if the meaning be this, That God solemnly enjoyned that such should be circumcised to whom no promise was made in that Covenant, I grant it true *Ishmael*, &c. and count it no absurdity to say, God in that sense did solemnly enjoyn the Seal to be put to a Blank.

Circumcision, in the Institution of it, was a token or signe of the Covenant made with *Abraham*, *Rom.* 4. 11. *to be a Seal of the righteousness of Faith*, is said of no ones circumcision but *Abrahams*. What [Mr *C.* means, That it was a seal of the righteousness of Faith,

not so much *Subjectivè* as *Objectivè*, *Rom.* 4. I understand not, except this be his meaning, that it did seal not so much the righteousnes of faith to the persons circumcised, as this truth, That righthecusnes is by faith. Being understood of *Abrahams* personall circumcision, I conceive it sealed both wayes, of any other mans circumcision; I find not the Apostle calling it the Seal of the righteousnes of Faith. But of Seals and sealing I have spoken sufficiently in sundry Sections before. I shall not contend about that passage, That *the Baptism of* Simon Magus *was in the nature of it, and Gods institution, a visible Seal of the most spirituall part of the covenant, and yet did not* Iscariot *and* Magus *partake of the spirituall part of the Covenant, my former explication being remembred. And I take it as true which next followes, It is peculiar to the elect to be in the covenant in respect of the participation of the saving efficacy of it, Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. And hence observe. that none but the elect are rightly said to be in the covenant of grace: For none are in the covenant of grace but they to whom it is made (for what is it to be in the covenant, but to have it made to him? So the *Directory*, so *Rom.* 9. 8.) But they to whom the covenant of grace is made, are the elect onely. The covenant of grace is the covenant of Saving grace, *Heb.* 8. 10, 11, & 10. 16. *Rom.* 11. 26. 1 *Cor.* 11. 25. *Heb.* 13. 20. of Regeneration, Iustification, &c. But that is made onely to the Elect: *Ergo.* The *Minor* is proved thus, They to whom it is made, they have the saving efficacy, otherwise God should make it and not perform it, and so his Word fall, which is not to be granted: But the elect onely have the saving efficacie, as Mr. *C.* confesseth. *Ergo.* I deny not, Reprobates may in respect of their own profession, be said to be externally in the covenant of grace, in appearance to men, in the face of the visible Church, but not in respect of Gods promise and before him, which they say is sealed in the Sacrament. Nor do I deny the appointment of God to be to circumcise or baptize Reprobates as well as elect, and that the nature of these ordinances is the same on both sorts, though the use and efficacy in part be various. Nor do I deny the covenant with *Abraham* one, yet hold it is mixt, which is proved from the words of Mr *C.* here in that it holds forth variety of covenant-blessings; some more common to all, and some more peculiar to a few. But I deny the Goipel doth hold forth blessing, common to any other than the godly. It is true, there are promises of this life, 1 *Tim.* 4. 8. 1 *Cor.* 3. 22. *Mark* 10. 30. and Reprobates have some such outward things as the elect, as cloaths, aire, life, but not as blessings from the Gospel, neither sanctified in the same manner, nor upon the same tenure. As for circumcision, it was the covenant metonymically onely, and did confirm the whole covenant sacramentally to elect and reprobate.

Mr. *C.* yet adds, " That if that sort of persons, to wit, Infants, or *Abrahams* spirituall seed without personall actuall faith by which it's said onely persons come to be *Abrahams* seed, it's enough to prove, that Gentile inchurched believers infants are the the seed of *Abraham*. But that is fully proved from *Gal.* 3. 7. 6. 9. 16. 27, 28, 29. where, by Christ, is meant Christ mysticall, that is, Christ with his Body the Church, as 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. If then Infants be not *Abrahams* seed, then are they not members of Christ, nor of the invisible Church, and so are without salvation.

To

To which I answer, That I never denied that elect infants were *Abrahams* spiritual seed, nor said onely by actuall faith persons are *Abrahams* spiritual seed, but grant that some Infants are *Abrahams* spirituall seed, whether by election onely, or by seed of faith, or by such a special secret work as is unknown to us, like *Jacobs* struggling in the womb, and taking hold on his brothers heel, or *John Baptists* leaping in the womb of his mother for joy, and so are of the body of Christ, and members of the invisible Church, and thereby saved. But I deny that infants of Gentile believers, whether elect or not, are *Abrahams* spiritual seed, and in that respect in the covenant of grace or promise of God being their God, and thereby admitted to baptism.

" But Mr. *C.* adds. " I say to exclude that sort of persons *scil.* believers " Infants from being a part of the visible-church in genera is to exclude " them from any ordinary state and way of salvation. Nay I will go further " and say, that for any to suppose all the individual Infants and each of them " which came of such inchurched parents, not to be also parts of this body of " Christ the visible Church, and consequently not to be Abrahams spiritual " seed, is to exclude them from a state and way of salvation. In respect to " the ordinary course thereof, and so to leave them all under the consideration of such a way to be saved in as is only extraordinary: ordinarily they " are not to be supposed to be saved, or at least it is not to be supposed, that " ordinarily, or that in an ordinary way any Pagans, or Turkes out of the " visible Church, or any in and of Rome as Tridentine and Antichristian " should be saved: yet God may and somtimes doth, and will have some " souls brought on to him thence, and even from amongst Mahometans " &c. But all will yeild I suppose that this is an extraordinary case: and so " crosseth not that rule, that without even the visible Church there is no salvation; *scil.* Taking the maxime in reference to ordinary times, and " with all to the ordinary course and way of attaining unto salvation.

Ans. Mr. *C.* his drift I conceive is to prove, that *if Infants of believers be not visible Church-members they have no ordinary state and way of salvation*, and that the maxime is true, *that out of the visible Church in reference to ordinary times and withal to the ordinary course and way of attainining unto salvation there is no salvation.* Against which I oppose that if the maxim *out of the Church there is no salvation*, be understood of the visible Church, & the ordinary state & way of salvation, it will as well concern Mr. *C.* to shew how children of believers endued with a reasonable soul and humane body, yet still-born or dying in their mothers womb with her and never borne are provided for an ordinary way of salvation as wel as for us concerning Infants born alive. I suppose they will not say Infants dying in their mothers womb and there buried, and never brought to light, are visible members of the Church, who were never visible men, nor that they are to be baptized. What ordinary way & state of salvation external have they more than Mahometanes? If it be said they have election, the vertue of Christs death the promise of God according to election, the secret work of the spirit I grant it, and the same may be said of Infants living, nor can it be certainly and without doubt denied of Papists and Mahometans infants. Though I confess it is far more probable that oridnarily God gives these means to Infants of believers whether Churched or unchurched than to the Infants of others, and rather to the Infants of true believers, than meer

professors.

professors of faith. Yet I dare not determine certainly thereof because of the expres resolution of the Apostle *Rom.*9. concerning *Ishmael and Esau*, and his reference thence *v.* 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22. And if he count it certain *there is no salvation out of the visible Church in an ordinary way* there being no ordinary way to estate Infants in the visible church (which I grant not as well as he) but baptism, then he doth as good as affirm, that ordinarily no infant is saved without baptism, which is either the Popish tenent or not much short of it. This will the more urge M. *C.* because he limits the promise to *Abrahams* visible Church-seed in reference to Church-covenant, and I suppose they of *N. E.* baptize not infants of parents not inchurched; what ordinary way of salvation have children of believers not inchurched, who are not accounted visible Church members when their parents were not? And the like must be said of the children of excommunicate persons, of uncertain originall Apostates, who are with them, or some of them no visible Church-members: how are they in the visible Church, and what provision is for them? For my part I conceive that if the matter be impartially considered, I think their doctrine is pressed with the like difficulty that mine is. I affirm that believers infants, and infants of unbelievers, if elect, are certainly saved ordinarily, that is, according to the constant course of Gods purpose by vertue of Gods promise, Christs death, and the Spirits secret working, though they be neither baptized, nor are visible Church-members: and I think they can say no more concerning infants of believers dying with the mother in the womb, and never brought to light, which is no unusuall thing. I say that it is very probable because of generall indefinite promises and frequent experience that the infants of believing parents are elect, when the infants of Infidels are not. Yet I cannot affirm they are elect, because the promises are not universall to every believers infants; yea, if they were, as Pedobaptists would have them, universall in respect of externall privileges (which is not true) yet there could be no certainty of election and salvation inferred thence. And therefore though there be a better ground of hope of the salvation of a believers infant than others; yet in a question concerning the certainty of the event whether they are saved or no, I must suspend my judgement, and leave it to Gods secret will, having no rule revealed whereby to determine it. If Mr. *C.* assure any more, I conceive he will deceive himself and others. Dr. *Twiss. Animadvers. in Corvin.* pag. 35. saith thus: *Ad hæc fortè in ea sententia sunt nostri Theologi ut propositum Dei de salvandis fidelium liberis in infantili ætate morientibus haud liquidò satis demonstrari in sacris literis. Et sanè non diffiteor exitia hujus rei suppeditari nobis ex sacris literis inducta, quibus tamen acquiescimus.* But Mr *C.* adds,

" Such then as exclude all Infants of believers one or other from the notion " of *Abrahams* spirituall seed, from covenant and Church-estate, they put them " in the Pagans, Gentiles estate, of which *Paul* speakes, who being they " and others strangers from the promise and covenants, and from the visible Church: they place them in that respect in an estate of persons that are " without God in the world, and so under the Divel the God of the world; " and in an hopeless estate, neither they nor any for them can have any ground- " ded hope of them, they are without hope, in regard at least of any ordinary " way or mean of salvation *Eph.* 2. 11, 12.

Answ. I exclude not all infants of believers one or other from the notion

of *Abrahams* ſpirituall ſeed, from Covenant and Church-eſtate, meaning this of being *Abrahams* ſpirituall ſeed, and included in the covenant of grace and inviſible Church, which alone can make God to be their God, eſtate them in Chriſt, be the ground of a certain hope of their ſalvation, and that according to an ordinary way. They that teach them to be viſible Church-members, and baptize them, cannot give parents a grounded certain infallible hope of ſalvation without this ordinary way; I aſſen, nor can they give more aſſurance of that way of Baptiſm, than may be given without it, baptiſm not ſaving *without the anſwer of a good conſcience towards God*, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. Neither that nor their imaginary viſible Church-membership aſſuring that they are not under the Divel, nor without God in the world. And if they do, they do it without Scripture, and experience doth too often refute them. Mr *C* goes on.

Nor let it ſeem grievous that our friends and brethren in the Lord of name and worth in the Church, have, as it ſeemeth, urged that in caſe of ſuch an excluſion of believers children, they are made as Turks or Indians, ſo far forth in regard that not being in covenant nor Church-eſtate, the Apoſtle truly ſtates ſuch perſons caſes, they are without hope, and without God in the world: He maketh no diſtinction of potentia remota *and* propinqua *in that caſe.*

Anſw. It is a grievance to us their brethren in the faith, that Mr *M.* and ſuch men of name and worth in the Church, ſhould ſo miſrepreſent our Tenet as they do, with whom Mr *C.* ſeems to concur. Mr. *M.* his calumny in miſrepreſenting my words in his *Defence, part* 2. *ſect.* 10. as if I had ſaid, *That I know no warrant to think election to reach believers children more than unbelievers children, that I know no more promiſe for them than for the children of unbelievers*, is anſwered in my *Apologie, ſect.* 14. I have ſhewed here and in my *Examen, Part.* 2 *Sect.* 10. and in my *Apologie Sect.* 14. that I put the elect of them into the covenant of grace, and in the Inviſible Church, and this onely is the ground of a ſure hope of their intereſt in God, and Chriſt, and ſalvation. And that they are elect I give 4 probable reaſons which are not competent to the infants of Turks and Pagans, 1. generall indefinite promiſes not made to Turkes and Pagans, 2. The payers of parents and godly for them, 3. Their education and breeding among the godly, whereby they are in a neerer poſſibility to be godly, than others. 4. The frequent experience that the children of the godly prove ſuch; which yet becauſe thoſe promiſes are not particular and definite, that is, determining this particular good of ſalvation to each particular perſon, & prayers are made and heard with limitation of Gods will & the education may fail in its effect, and experience is not ſo conſtant, but that it falls out otherwiſe in many, therfore there's no ſufficient ground for certain hope but only probabie. Mr *M.* Mr *C.* and others, aſſign 2 more, to wit being in Covenant & Church-eſtate. But Mr *C.* pag. 93. confeſſeth, *It is peculiar to the elect to be in covenant in reſpect of the ſaving efficacy of it, Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. And that being in covenant and Church-eſtate, which he makes common to all, elect and reprobate, cannot aſſure them certainly of ſalvation; therefore were it granted that there were ſuch a covenant of Church-privileges and that they were viſible Church-members and to be baptized (which I conceive to be fictitious) yet this could not make the hope of their ſalvation more than probable, no nor ſo probable as the reaſons I give, where I infer that they do us wrong to inſtil into peoples minds that which tends to make us odious, that our doctrin takes away all grou dof

Love

hope of infants salvation, dying in infancy, whē in truth the promise of salvation as we assign it is the same wth the promise as they assign it, & the grounds we give of the hope of the infants interest, are as sufficient to make it probable as theirs, if they were supposed true, which yet notwithstanding all they say, we know are fictitious. Now hereby is a plain answer to Mr. *C.* If Infants of Turks be any of them elected, which Mr. *C.* seems to grant when he saith, *God may and sometimes doth and will have some souls brought on to him from* Rome, *and even amongst the Mahometans, &c.* We do grant they are really and before God in as good a condition as believers children, though not in appearance to us and in respect of their present estate, nor can they be said to be without Christ, without God in the world in all respects. But in respect of present state and appearance to us, neither Infidels nor their children are in any condition so hopefull as believers and their children, because of the generall indefinite promises they have, the benefit of prayers, which are not with a like ardency: for Infidels though we pray for them also in a more generall manner, the benefit of their education, which if it be to Indians children, yet not with a like care. And if it be, we should not think it absurd to say, that if they be brought into godly families, their salvation is hopefull as well as believers children. Else why doth Mr *Cotton conceive in the way of the Churches of New England, in the latter end they may be baptized.* And the experience is very frequent concerning godly mens children proving godly, but very rare that an Infidels child living among Infidels, is converted. And for a *word of promise for faith and hope to rest upon*, as I said, it hath been shewed, that neither Mr *M.* nor Mr *C.* nor any other can produce any promise in Scripture that assures the salvation of an Infant of a reall believer, much lesse of a meer professor dying in infancy; yea, to retort Mr *C.* his Argument, *we are not to sorrow without hope, concerning our brethren that dye at age:* yet we have no certain word of faith to relye on, but that God will be the God of elect and true believers, *Luke* 20. 36 37, 38. But that this promise reacheth to our brother deceased at age, we know onely probably, though the probability is greater by reason of his profession and conversation, yet at most but probable, notwithstanding those signes, we are not certain he is elect, he may live and dye an hypocrite. Many are canonized for Saints in Heaven who perhaps are among unclean spirits in hell. We therefore in this case are fain to suspend our judgment about the certainty, and to content our selves with a likely hope upon probable grounds. And so we may do concerning our children according to my doctrine, though I confesse the hope is more probable of such a one than of an Infant; yet sometimes also there appears as much cause of fear. However this I say, that were it not to make our doctrine of Antipædobaptism odious to parents, who being indulgent to their children, are easily moved to passion towards them, that say any thing of them that seems harsh, and are very much inclined to them and their words that tend to feed them with such conceits as occasion their hopes, though but fond, of good to them, our doctrine would be free from this exception. But such courses should be far from men of worth, who should present truth nakedly, without respect to mens affections. As Mr *C.* tells us, *he hath been the longer in proof of this seventh Conclusion, in that it is the very Hinge of the Controversie*: So I have answered it more fully, though it have been very tedious to me by reason of Mr. *C.* his confused and impertinent Dictates. And I

do

do declare that I do not see reason from that which Mr. *C.* hath said to unsay what I said, that the children of believers covenant-estate, at least Ecclesiastical, as asserted by Pædobaptists, is a new Gospel, not elder than *Zuinglius*, and therefore rejecting it, I shall hold that to be Gospel which I find so called, 1 *Cor* 15.1,2,3,4,&c. *Rom.* 1.16,17. *Gal.*3.8. 2 *Tim*, 2.8. *Rom.*2.16. and such like places and wish Mr. *C* & others of his mind, who upon such uncertain and impertinent allegations, impose their Gospel upon mens consciences, to ponder with more seriousness the Apostles words', *Gal.* 1. 9. *If any man preach any other Gospel than that ye have received, let him be accursed.*

SECT. XLV.

Mr C. his Answers to objections against his seventh Conclusion, part. 1. c. 3. Sect. 9. *of his* Just Vindie. *are considered, and Mr.* Bl. *his Tenents concerning the geneall term of a Covenant, that it is a mutuall agreement.*

I Wave the first Objection here, and for my speeches about *Pharez*, *Zara*, and others, and that of the Jewes being branches of the Olive by their birth, that I forget not my self, and how far I own them, and wherein I correct them, or explain them, may be seen in the first part of the *Review*, *Sect.*6. 19, 21.

The second objection is thus, If Infants be in the Covenant of grace, and born so, then such Infants were born in the Covenant, and never out. And besides, Gods Covenant of saving grace being absolute, and undertaking to give saving grace to such as are in covenant with him, all such must be saved, unless God fail of his truth.

To this Mr. *C.* answers, 1. *That Covenant of grace, as* I. S. *acknowledgeth it to be mentioned*, Deu. 29. *it was made with little ones then unborn intentionally*, v. 14, 15. *as well as with those then present actually: So that when they were born, they were born in the covenant and never out. As much may be said of the Infant Elect seed, or children of the promise dying infants, they were born so, and never out of that estate after they were actually existent: yea they were all girded in the covenant*, Jer. 13.

Answ. The passage *Deut.* 29. 15. is not meant of Gods covenant or promise to them, but their promise or covenant to God, as appears in that *v.* 14. *Moses* is said *to make the covenant with them*, that is, to engage them in their own persons for themselves and little ones to own God and his lawes, and *v.* 15. it is said, *before the Lord our God*, which shewes that the person making that covenant, *v.* 14. was distinct from the Lord, and this *Covenant be made with him that was not there with them that day*, to wit, the unborn posterity, as rightly M. *C.* and others conceive, and this Covenant *Moses* made with them by engaging them by an oath of their Princes and progenitors, in the same sense as *Saul* and the Israelites were bound to the Oath made by *Joshuah* and the Princes of Israelites to the Gibeonites. So that those unborn are not said to be in Gods Covenant of grace as made by him, and so intentionally onely because not existent; but they were in covenant with God virtually, because of the Obligation which lay on them by their progenitors and Princes engagement for them *to take the Lord for their God*, and upon their

obedience God engaged himself to *establish them to be a people unto himself*. And this, I confess, did ever oblige them; but it is nothing to the objection which speaks of Gods Covenant as made to infants, not of infants Covenant as made to God. Nevertheless I confess what ever were the Authors meaning in that Objection, it is no absurdity to grant, that elect infants dying so, were born in the Covenant and never out, that is, they had the promise of God made to them at, yea and before their birth, and in respect of the actuall possession of the benefits of the covenant, they were in the covenant before their death and never out. But so are not elect infants dying in respect of outward Church-privileges, they are not born visible Church-members, nor subject to be baptized.

2. Saith Mr C. *Gods Covenant did not barely offer, or promise to covenant; but made a Covenant, a Covenant and an Oath with them that day*, Deut. 29. 12, 13, 14, 15. *and amongst other promises engaged himself to circumcise their hearts* chap. 30. 6. *yet were not all in heart circumcised, and yet the promise of God failed not, being in the generall propounded to them conditionally, and not as it is said here absolutely, at least it had reference to them all in common. The word of the promise took not effect in as many of the Jewes to whom the covenant promises externally belonged, yet it followed not, that therefore it took no effect at all, and that God was unfaithfull, for it took effect in others*, Rom. 3. 3. and 9. 6, 7, 8. *And so here.*

Answ. What this is to the objection which is here answered, I do not well understand. Gods covenant of saving grace, whether expressed *Gen.* 17. 7. to *Abraham and his* spirituall *seed*, or *Heb.* 8. 10 or elsewhere, is absolute in respect of the persons to whom, God takes into covenant persons of his own good pleasure without any previous disposition moving him to promise to this rather than that, though some benefits of that covenant are promised upon condition, and all those to whom it is made, must be saved, unless God fail of his truth. But for the Covenant, *Deut* 29. 12, 13, 14, 15. it was their covenant to God, as well as Gods covenant to them, nor was it the covenant of grace according to the Gospell made to Gentile-believers, but a nationall engagement of the Israelites to observe the lawes of God which *Moses made with them at Gods command in the Land of Moab, besides the Covenant which he made with them in Horeb*, and Gods engagement thereupon to take them for a people while they observed his Laws In which covenant first *Moses* tells them what God hath done for them, notwithstanding their dulness to perceive it; and then ejoyns them, *v. 9 to keep the words of the Covenant and do them, that they might prosper in all that they did*: and then tells them, that *they all stood there* in a full Assembly, that they might be engaged *for themselves, their little ones, strangers within their Camp, and posterity to observe Gods Commands*, and then tells them that *God would establish them for a people unto himself*, that is, that he would continue them to be a distinct people to him from other nations, and *be a God to them according to his oath to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*, that is, to drive out the Canaanites, to give them their Land, to make them great and prosperous, which is manifestly a covenant proper to *Israel*, and it is not denied to be propounded to them conditionally, and to have reference to them all in common, and was of the same sort with the covenant at mount *Sinai*, not the covenant of regenerating and saving grace made to the Gentiles,

tiles, called the new Covenant confirmed by Christs blood, *Deut.* 30. 6. God promised to *circumcise their heart and the heart of their seed*: which promise I do not now conceive to be conditionall: For though *v.* 2. there be a condition expressed, yet I think it is not a condition of the promise *v.* 6. but of the promise v. 3. to wit, of restoring from captivity upon their seeking of God. But if it be made a condition of the promise *v.* 6. yet it is not a condition competent to Infants, nor is it there made to any but the Israelites, and to them onely at the time of their return from captivity in reference to their re-establishing in the land of Canaan, and so was not common to them all, much less to all believing Gentiles at all times. It is untrue that *the promise of saving grace is made to any onely externally*, or that *it takes not effect in all to whom it is made*, or that any such thing is meant *Rom.* 3. 3. & 9. 6, 7, 8. though I deny not that there were many promises to Israel after the flesh, which being indefinite in respect of persons, and conditionall upon obedience to the lawes given by *Moses*, took not effect in all the Israelites, though in generall propounded, and therefore notwithstanding some attained them not, yet the faith of God was not without effect. But all this is nothing to the objection concerning Gods covenant of saving grace in Christ, which is not shewed to be made to any but the saved, nor shewed to be in respect of the persons taken into covenant conditional.

3. Saith Mr. *C. This Argument supposeth that one cannot be within the Covenant of saving grace externally, but they must be in a saving estate, the contrary whereunto appeareth*, Concl. 3. *And it is said of sundry illegitimate Jewish Children, that they were within the covenant of saving grace, namely externally: for the Author cannot mean other. And yet of all such who will say, they were all in a saving estate? Even* Esau's *Birthright was more than right to* Isaac's *temporall estate as born of* Isaac, *it was a Church blessing as well as a Naturall and Civill.*

Ans. That any one is in the covenant of saving grace onely externally, is not proved before. My words *Examen* pag. 73. which Mr. *C.* seems to mean, [but *Pharez* and *Zarah* of *Judah* and *Tamar*, *Jephte* of *Gilead*, and many others were within the covenant of saving graces and Church-privileges] are not meant of the covenant of saving grace externally onely, but also internally. *Esau's* birth-right was more than right to *Isaac's* temporall estate as born of *Isaac*, it is that which *Jacob* was not born to, for it was πρωτοτόκια, *the right of the first born*, which *Jacob* had not but by purchase and blessing, nor is it denied to be a Church-blessing, but that it was the spirituall blessing promised to *Abrahams* seed, to wit justification and salvation from the covenant of saving grace I do not conceive: for that was not limited to the first born as the birth-right was, and therefore it seems to have been either the superiority, or the inheritance of *Canaan*, or the descent of *Christ* and the Church of God from him (to which I most incline) the least of which being a great losse, and having with it the privation of interest in the covenant of saving grace, he being hated of God, made *Isaac* tremble and *Esau* cry, and were a fit instance to set before the Christian Hebrews, lest they through prophane undervaluing Christ, *fail of the grace of God.*

Mr. *C.* adds 3. Object. *But saith he, the Covenant of grace being a Co-*

venant, there must be a mutuall agreement betwixt the Covenanters, and so knowledge and consideration of the terms thereof, and restipulation as in mens covenants. Henry Den a little differently maketh a necessity of the persons entering into covenant with God, scil. by faith unto covenant-right, and not meerly Gods entering into Covenant with the creature, for so he entered into covenant with the Beasts, &c. Gen. 9 10. *Answer. To which I answer, the covenant of grace is as well a Testament,* 1 Cor. 11. Heb 9. *Now a Testament may be, and useth to be made in reference to little ones without their knowledge, nor do any use to deny a Childs right in the Testators will because it was taken in amongst other Legacies in the bequeathed Legacies before it understood the same. Nor will it be denied in the case of the elect seed, the choice parties in Gods Covenant, Gen. 17. That they, many of them, dying Infants, without actuall knowledge, were not therefore children of the promise, or that that solemn Covenant Deut. 29. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, & 30. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, &c. with that people, wherein conditions also were propounded on their parts, that therefore the Covenant was not made betwixt the little ones there present because they neither understood, nor could actually subscribe to the conditions, the contrary being there expressed: No, rather it sufficed, that the childrens covenant-estate being the parents privilege, whence the encouragements to Abraham to walk with God, Gen. 17. 1, &c. from that amongst other encouragements, that God would become his Seeds God also, &c. v. 7. and so Deut. 29 and 30. amongst other encouragements to the parents that is one, v. 6. that God will do so for their seed also: yea the children being reckoned as in their parents, as Levi paid Tythes in Abraham. &c. Yea, the externall avouching a Covenant may be of God, being owned as the childrens, Deut. 26. 16, 17. yea the childrens circumcision being as well the parents covenant duty: whence called the Covenant, or the covenant parties covenant part or duty as well as the token of Gods Covenant, Gen. 9. 7, 9, 10, 11. they restipulate in their parents knowing acceptance of the Covenant and professed owning of it upon the Covenant terms, as well upon their childrens part as their own. & they restipulate in a passive reception of the Covenant-condition and Bond too after imitation of their Father* Abrahams *faith and obedience: To which purpose I. S. confessed circumcision was annexed to the covenant: yea, the bastard children of* Judah *and* Gilead, *and others, are acknowledged to be in the Covenant of saving grace, which yet could not personally restipulate in a way of actuall knowledge, or faith, or the like.*

Answ. The Objection, as it is not mine, so I might let it and the answer passe, but that there are some things in the answer to it, that do require consideration. In the first part of this *Review, Sect.* 5. answering Mr. *Stephens* his arguments for *the Convertibility*, as he calls it, *of a word of promise and a word of command, from the general nature of Covenants between men and men*, I had said, the words כרת and διαθήκη do not always note a mutuall covenant, and mutuall performances, and instanced in *Gen.* 9. 10 and said, there is a single covenant as well as mutuall, and further added, that if it be true, that such a convertibility must needs be between those persons that do contract according to the generall nature of Covenants, then there can be no Covenant between God and Infant, which an Infant cannot contract. If any say the Parents do contract for them, to I say, Be it so; then according to this arguing, they should also sear or be sealed for them. Hereupon Mr *Bl. Vindic Fid.*

Append.

Append. pag. 470. taks occasion to answer part of this, maintaining pag. 479. *that there is a mutuall contract, and mutual performances, to which persons are engaged, not onely usually in covenants, but in all covenants, and that it is of the general nature of Covenants, that there should be such a convertibility as that both must, if not seal, yet contract or perform, and where a Seal is vouchsafed, must accept of it.* And to the allegation of *Gen.* 9. 9, 10. answers ברות, *is taken improperly, as Job* 5. 23.

Whereto I reply, That it must needs be confessed, that *Covenant, Job* 5. 23. must needs be understood improperly, for the stones of the field cannot properly covenant, that is, promise any thing, who are there said *to be in covenant* with Man, But *Gen.* 9. 9, 10. where *God* is said *to establish his covenant with all living.* I see not why it should be taken improperly, sith covenanting doth properly agree to God, who doth in proper sense promise, and in improper sense it would not be rightly said of God, that he did not make a Covenant, but as it were make a covenant, or do some other thing which is resembled by making a Covenant, which must be the explication of that phrase if God be conceived to speak improperly. If Mr *Bl.* do conceive any Tropicall impropriety of speech in that expression, I suppose he cannot reduce it to any Trope in Rhetorick, but that he will mar the sense of the words. And if *Gods Covenant with* Noah *and his Sons,* be properly understood *v.* 9. I see not any reason why the same term without repetition applied to beasts, as the object of the Covenant, can be taken any otherwise than properly. Besides, this Covenant *Gen.* 9. 15 seems to be called *Gods Oath, Isa.* 54. 9. and therefore is properly taken. Nor do I know any Interpreter who understands it improperly. *Paræus* hence gathers, *Fœdus hoc est universale Dei cum omnibus creaturis terrestribus. & est absolutum non conditionatum.* And the *New Annotations* of Mr. *Ley* on *Gen.* 9 10 have it thus: *Some allege this place against the Anabaptists, and thus it may serve to refute this fancy,* viz. *that the Covenant of God may be made with, and the seal of the Covenant applied to creatures that have not the use of reason, which they deny, in denying the administration of Baptism to them.* Which passage although it have this falshood, that we deny that the *Covenant of God may be made with* or to *Infants*: yet it appears that they who speak thus, understand Gods covenant *Gen.* 9. 10. properly. The promise *Heb.* 8. 10. of *writing Gods Lawes in their hearts,* is called *the Covenant,* unto which no covenant is prerequired, and to take away the evasion, *as if it were not a covenant properly so called, but a prophecy, or but a part of the covenant, there being other promises which prerequire conditions,* it is to be observed, that it is not onely called *the better Covenant,* v. 6. as being *made a Law upon better promises,* and having *a better Priesthood* to execute it, but also it is opposed to the *Old Covenant,* and as coming in its stead, and therefore if in the one it be properly meant, it is so in the other: and *Jerem.* 32. 40. the promise, that *He will not turn away from them to do them good, but will put his fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from him,* is *his Covenant.* The Covenant to *Abraham* and his seed is called *Promises, Gal* 3. 26. which shews that promises on one part may be called a Covenant. And though in Deeds indented there are mutuall promises, yet in Deeds Poll as the Lawyers call them, I think a person is said to covenant to another, though there be no condition

or promise required of him to whom the Deed is made. As for that which Mr. *Bl.* saith, *Where there is a Seal vouchsafed, the party to whom the promise is, must accept of it*: it is true if it be required, but it is expected that it should be shewed, that God ever required the Infants of believers to be baptized in their own persons.

To return to Mr. *C.* Most of the things he answers are granted, or else examined before, but the chiefest thing in the answer is denied, to wit, that *Parents knowing acceptance of the Covenant, and their passive reception of the Covenant-condition and Bond to after imitation of their Father Abrahams faith and obedience, is or may be termed the Infants restipulation intituling to Baptism.*

In the answer to the next Objection, Mr. *C* seems to charge us rather than himself, *to block up the ordinary way to regeneration, and to debar believers children from the ordinary means of their chief good, by denying them interest in the Word of Promise, the which is such a means, &c.*

But therein Mr *C.* his charge is but vain: For the word of Promise, which is the means of regeneration, is not the covenant of externall privileges, but the promise of saving grace in Christ, which we debar them of no more than Mr. *C.* doth. And when he denies that *he makes every believer to be Abraham*, sure he must do so if he expound *Gen.* 17. 7. *I will be a God to thee Abraham*, that is, to every believer, and *to thy seed*, that is, every believers seed. And when he grants that God doth *not promise such a particular Land now as to Abraham*, and that *the multiplying of Abrahams, &c. was of peculiar consideration*, he must grant that the Covenant made with *Abraham* had peculiar domestick promises not common to all believers, which is all one as to say, it was a mixt covenant, and that circumcision had some reason from the promises in the covenant, which were peculiar to *Abrams* naturall posterity, which is sufficient to prove there is not *par ratio*, or the same reason of baptizing infants, as for circumcising them. I find no where any but *Abraham a Covenant-Father*, as Mr. *C.* would have it, no where doth God say *he would be a God to Isaac, and Jacob, and to their seed*: Nor is it said, *Rom.* 11. 16. 28, that *they were covenant Fathers to their posterity*, nor Jesse *a Covenant-root to* David, *Isai.* 11. 1. And by Mr *C* his Doctrine, inchurched believers are made *Abrahams*, sith it makes the promises to be to them and their seed, which is ascribed to *Abraham* onely, *Gal* 3. 16. *Luke* 1. 55.

But Mr. *C* objects, That *the Apostle calls all those inchurched Jewes of old, our Fathers, Fathers to him and to the Gentiles, Corinthian members*, 1 Corinth: 10. 1, &c.

To which I answer, They could not be called the Corinthians naturall parents, being no descended from them; nor their Covenant-fathers, for they were many of them such, *as God was not well pleased with*, v. 6. and the Corinthians descended not from them, and therefore derived no externall Church-privilege from them: therefore either it must be understood that they were called Ancestors of the Corinthian Christians, who are called Idolaters, chap. 12. 2. either in the sense we call any in foregoing generations our Fathers, though we are not descended from them by naturall generation, or else by the Figure of communication, wherein that is spoken as common to others with the persons mentioned, which is not common indeed, but either out of

famili-

familiarity, indulgence, desire to ingratiate, or such like reason we attribute it to them to whom it is not to be attributed, as *Paul*, *Ephes.* 2. 2, 3. *Peter* 1 *Pet.* 4. 3. which was not true of them. *Philip.* 3. 6. *Acts* 23. 1. but meant of the Gentiles to whom they wrot, *Col.* 2. 13. *Gal.* 2. 15. and so *Our Fathers* is not of you Corinthians, but of me and *Sosthenes*, 1 *Cor.* 1. 1, or by an enallage of persons, as when *Paul* saith, 1 *Thess.* 4. 17. *we which are alive*, it is not to be conceived to be true of himself, or of any of the Thessalonians to whom he then wrot, but it is [*We*] for [*They*] the first for the third person.

" But saith Mr. *C.* " If *Isaac* and *Jacob* were not such Fathers to their seed " also, as was *Abraham* in Covenant and Church-respects, how then are the " Jewes said to be beloved for their [Fathers] sakes? Surely it was not for " their sakes as men, and naturall Fathers, but as spirituall and Covenant-" fathers, *Rom.* 11. 26, 28. compared; yea the Covenant is expresly made in " those terms to *Isaac* & to his seed, to *Jacob* and to his seed, *Gen.* 26. 3, 4, 5, " & 28 13, 14. And so though they were *Abrahams* Church and Covenant " seed, yet Covenant Fathers to others, and so Gentile inchurched believers are *Abrahams* Church-seed, yet Covenant-fathers to their Children.

The term *Root*, and *first Fruits*, and the term *Fathers*, *Rom.* 11. 16. 28. are not proved to be the same. *The Fathers*, it's not denied to comprehend *Isaac* and *Jacob*, as well as *Abraham*: But they are called *Fathers* there in respect of the naturall generation of the Israelites to be re-ingrafted, not as *Covenant-Fathers* propagating externall Church privileges even to Gentile inchurched believers: For they are there reckoned as the Israelites progenitors, not the Gentile inchurched believers progenitors. Yet I deny not that God hath reference in that passage to his covenant made with them, and his love to them, and so the Jewes now broken off, yet are beloved by God, with an intention to restore their posterity out of remembrance of his ancient amity and covenant with their forefathers, which cannot be verified of the Gentile inchurched believers in respect of their children. Neither *Gen.* 26. 3, 4, 5, nor *Gen.* 28. 13, 14, is either of the Evangelicall promises made to *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 5, *A Father of many Nations have I made thee*, or that *v.* 7. *to be a God to him and his seed*, made either to *Isaac*, *Gen.* 26. 3, 4, 5, or *Jacob*, *Gen.* 28. 13, 14. though the promises of *multiplying their Seed, blessing them, giving them the land of Canaan in their Seed, blessing all the Nations or Families of the earth*, be there mentioned, which, with sundry passages of the Apostle *Rom.* 4. 11, 12, 16, 17. *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. *Gal.* 3, 16, 29, and other places assure me those Evangelicall promises, *Gen.* 17. 5. 7. were made to *Abraham* peculiarly, neither as a Patriarch out of a reason common to him with other Patriarks, nor as a believer out of a reason common to him with other believers, but out of a peculiar consideration of him, either as Father of believers by his exemplary faith, or as a person elected by God to have the covenant instated in him and his seed.

As for Mr. *C.* his answer to the objection from *Rom* 4. 16. if that Text prove not that all that are *Abrahams* seed are actuall believers, yet it proves that *the promise is sure to all that are* Abrahams *seed by actuall believing as he did*, and consequently are saved.

To

To his quſtion, *If all members of the viſible Church be not* Abrahams *ſeed, what right have they to the ſeal of the covenant made to* Abrahams *ſeed?* I anſwer, Right to Circumciſion and Baptiſm is not from the Covenant, but according to Gods appointment to ſome, whether they be in covenant or not, *Abrahams* ſeed or not.

Gal. 4. 26, 28, 31. *Gal.* 3. 29. I have formerly ſhewed that by [*Us all*] are not meant every Galatian Chriſtian Profeſſor, but true believers, as *Rom.* 8 32. 1 Cor. 12, 13. 2 *Cor.* 3. 18. & therefore thence it cannot be gathered, that any meer profeſſor of faith is *Abrahams* ſeed, much leſs his infants. None but true believers are ſaid *Gal.* 3. 27, to *be baptized into Chriſt*, and *to put on Chriſt*, though others were baptized into his Name: which appears *verſe* 26. where they are ſaid *to be the Sons of God through faith in Chriſt Jeſus*, and yet there were other than elect perſons in that Church, and they baptized. Mr. *C.* methinks ſhould not be ignorant that what is ſaid of perſons in the Churches indefinitely, is ſometimes verified onely of the choyce party, 1 *Cor.* 1. 1. 1 *Theſſ.* 1. 4. 1 *Pet.* 1. 5. & 2. 9. by a Synecdoche of the whole for a part Nor doth Mr *C.* his diſtinction of *baptizing into Chriſt*, *putting on Chriſt*, *being Children of the promiſe*, *being by one ſpirit baptized into one body*, attributing theſe to all *Sacramentally*, and *in facie Eccleſiæ*, ſuit well to theſe places, in which the predicate cannot be attributed in truth to thoſe that are meerly ſuch.

As for the laſt Objection, Mr. *C.* muſt needs be guilty of making three parties in the Covenant, *Abraham*, *his ſeed Believers*, and *their Infants*. For Believers are not comprehended under *Abraham*, but under *his ſeed*, nor believers naturall infants comprehended under *Abrahams ſeed*, except they be true believers, or elect perſons, nor in the covenant made *to Abraham and his Seed* doth *Abraham* ſuſtain the perſon of all believers, Jewes and Gentiles, but of *the Father of them*, and therefore as yet Mr. *C.* his Concluſion remains unproved, that *the Covenant intereſt at leaſt Externall and Eccleſiaſticall of Infants of inchurched Believers, is Goſpel*, but a Figment of Mr. *C.* not found in Scripture.

SECT.

SECT. XLVI.

The 27, 28, 29 Chapters of Mr. Blakes Vindic. Fœderis *are examined, and it is shewed, That he hath not proved the Covenant of Grace in Gospel times to admit or to be made to any but the Elect regenerate.*

SIth Mr. *Bl.* is accounted one of the chief Patrons of Infant Baptism, my purpose is to examine the remainder of that which he hath written in his *Vindic. Fœd.* against me for Infant Baptism, and may be conceiv d to be yet unanswered. Ch. 27 pag. 189, 190. he heaps up many texts to prove that *in old Testament times the Covenant was made with Israel in the uttermost latitude and extent with all that bore the name of Israel*, which I grant, understanding it of the National Covenant, *Deut.* 29. and of the Covenant of the Law, *Exod* 20. &c. but deny it being meant of the Covenant of Evangelical grace, which is the onely Covenant the people of God are now under, and which alone is the question now, Who are in this Covenant? or to whom is this Covenant or the promises of it made by God? I assert as before, *Sect.* 33. That it is made onely to the Elect. And Mr. *Bl.* pag. 191. yeelds that *many Orthodox writers seemingly restrain the Covenant onely to the Elect and regenerate.* But he addes some distinctions, whereby he thinks what they say may be salved from self contradictions. 1. *Of a two fold Covenant, 1 a single, 2. a double to perform both parts, to save upon repentance, and to give a new heart*: But he doth not shew that there is any Evangelical Covenant now which is not double, nor that either the double or single is made with any but the elect. 2. *Of an inward Covenant*, which he grants to be made onely to the elect; and *an outward, which*, he saith, *is a Covenant properly so called, and which Scripture holds out for the Covenant of God with his people, in which all professed Christians so called are, which puts them into a capacity of Sacraments, and their children of the initial Sacrament*: But what this outward Covenant is, or where it is to be found I know not; what I find about it is shewed to be vain, Sect. 25. and Mr. *Bs.* refutation of it in his *Apology against Mr. Bl.* pag. 66, 67, 10. saves me any further labour to shew it to be a figment. 3. *Of being in Covenant according to title to the Covenant, or to the benefits of the Covenant*; and saith, *the right of Covenant belongs to all that externally make profession, the benefit onely to the elect.* But I know no right of Covenant, but what is by Gods promise, and surely all to whom God promiseth have the benefit of the Covenant; and to imagine, that *the Covenant of grace is to any to whom the grace following the Covenant is not*, is to make Gods Covenant and word to fail, which the Apostle abhorred, *Rom.* 9. 6. and to make the Covenant of grace as liable to complaint as the first Covenant, contrary to *Heb.* 8. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. 4. *Of entring into Covenant, which all visible professors do, and stedfastness in it, which do onely the elect and faithfull*, *Psal.* 78. 34. But this text speaks

not of the Covenant of Evangelical grace as if any were entred into it who were not ſtedfaſt in it: but of the Covenant of the Law with the Jewiſh people, which is not the Covenant in which the Gentiles are under the Goſpel. And to Mr. *Bls.* confuſed talk I again ſay, 1. That the Covenant of Evangelical grace is made by God onely to the Elect, and that in reſpect of Gods promiſe none but they are in the Covenant, nor is there to any right to Sacraments or capacity of an initial Seal barely by that being in Covenant. 2. That profeſſion of Faith may cauſe a man to be taken to be in the Covenant by the guides and brethren of the viſible Church, in the face of which he may have title to Sacraments, but his infant children have no title thereby to Baptiſm. 3. That from the beginning none but the elect had the Covenant of grace made to them. 4. That from the beginning it is not proved the children with their parents to have been no not in the imaginary outward Covenant. But let's view what Mr. *Bl.* ſaith.

1. He alledgeth *Matth.* 28.19. "and takes it as freely confeſt, that "a Diſciple of Chriſt is in Covenant with God, and tels us that the "Covenant *Matth.* 28.19. is committed to man to work, and to judge of "it being wrought, to put a ſeal for ratification and confirmation of it; "which cannot be reſtrained to the elect, for they onely are known to "God; an elect perſon and a Church member ſhould be *termini convertibiles*, the ſeal of the Spirit, and the ſeal of the Sacrament are in "equal latitude; to baptize an unregenerate perſon is to put a ſeal to a "blank, as high an abuſe of that ſacred Ordinance as the circumciſion "of the Sichemites, *Gen.* 34.24.

Anſw. It is not confeſt by me that *a Diſciple of Chriſt*, that is every Diſciple of Chriſt *is in Covenant with God*, meaning it in reſpect of Gods Covenant or promiſe of Evangelical grace made to him, nor do I know of *any Covenant*, *Matth.* 28.19. *committed to man to work, and to judge of it being wrought, and to put a ſeal for ratification and confirmation*, though I grant every Diſciple profeſſing Chriſt is in ſome ſenſe in Covenant with God, that is, by his act of profeſſion doth engage himſelf to follow Chriſt, and ſo in that reſpect is in Covenant with God, and that *Matth.* 28.19. the Apoſtles are injoyned to make Diſciples by preaching the Goſpel, and baptize them, which may be done without *working a Covenant between God and man*, (which phraſe doth imply that a Miniſter can work God into Covenant, which is in my apprehenſion an abſurd conceit) or *judging of a Covenant being wrought*, or *putting to a ſeal for confirmation of it*. And for the abſurdities Mr. *Bl.* infers from the denial of reſtraining the Covenant to the elect, I count the firſt not to follow upon my tenet, ſith I conceive a man may be a Church-member who is not in the Covenant of grace; and for the ſecond, I count it no abſurdity according to my explication before given, Sect. 34. 35. though I do withal declare, that *the ſeal of the Sacrament* is a term I reject for the reaſons given before, Sect. 31. And for the third, I count it no abuſe to put a ſeal to a blank, that is, to baptize a perſon who is not in the Covenant of Evangelical grace. As for the 3d. argument Mr. *Bl.* would draw from *Matth.* 28.19. to prove *that the*

Covenant

Covenant of God is onely a Covenant professed, because Matth. 28. 19. *& whole Nation is in Gods ordinary way of administration in a capacity to attain and enter into it*, it is answered in the 2d. Part of this *Review, sect.* 9. where it is shewed that *Matth.* 28. 19. there is no such command as to make Disciples, and baptize the whole of a Nation, even the infants.

Mr. *Bl.* adds a 2d. text, *Matth.* 20. 16. & 22. 14. whence he argues thus; "If there be a call from God in the times of the N. T. in a far greater latitude then the grace of election, that of many called few onely are elected, then the Covenant in the N. T. times is not to be restrained to the elect and regenerate, but contains all that professedly accept the terms of the Covenant, and visibly appear a people of God. This is evident, seeing the call is into Covenant; all at the feast were called ones, all the hired Labourers were Covenant-servants. To conceive men to be called of God, and not to be in Covenant with God, is a full contradiction. The call hath its *terminus a quo* and its *terminus ad quem*; a state which upon call they leave, and a new state on which they enter. They are upon this call in a neater relation to God then the rest of the world, otherwise they were the same as ever, and not called at all. But there is a call in N. T. times, &c. Ergo.

Answ. The consequence of the *major* is denied, and to the proof of it I say, 1. *The call is not into Covenant with God* in the sense which is now in question: For now the question is, Whether there be a Covenant in the N. T. wherein God engageth himself to be God, and to account for his people any besides the elect? Now no man is called into Covenant in this sense: for no man is called to engage God to be God, &c. it were an arrogant & to call or invite men to engage God, it is God onely who is to do this, and therefore if any were to be called to this, it were God himself. 2. It is not true, that *to conceive men to be called of God, and not to be in Covenant with him is a full contradiction.* For though the calling mentioned *Rom.* 8. 30. do always bring men into an estate of being in Covenant with God, yet not the calling *Matth.* 20. 16. & 22. 14. For though *the calling there have a Terminus a quo & ad quem*, in the one resembled by calling to work in the Vineyard, in the other by calling to a Wedding feast; yet that every one that was called had *a new state on which he did enter*, is not true: For even those who refused to come were *called*, *Matth.* 22. 3, 4. and the man who came in without a Wedding garment, though he sate down, yet was not in a state of Covenant, or acceptance, but was thrust out. Nor is Mr. *Bls* arguing of any force. *Men are called into Covenant with God, therefore they are in Covenant with God*: For by the same reason it might be inferred, the same men are called *into the fellowship of Christ*, 1 *Cor.* 1. 9. *into the Kingdome and glory of God*, 1 *Thes.* 2. 12. therefore some non elect persons are in the fellowship of Christ, in the Kingdom and glory of God, which is false.

Mr. *Bl.* adds *Mat.* 13. 24, 25, 47. & 3. 12. & 2 *Tim.* 2. 20. whence he argues thus. "A man in the Kingdome of Heaven is a man that is in Covenant with God, unless he stood in a Covenant relation he could have

" no ſtanding there; and the compariſon were very ſtrangely drawn,
" if this Kingdome thus ſet out had all that were good, none bad in it.

Anſw. It is granted that good and bad, elect and non-elect are in the viſible Church, and ſo in the Kingdome of Heaven, if by it be meant the viſible Church: but that a man in the Kingdome of Heaven is a man that is in Covenant with God, that is a man in the viſible Church is a man that is in Covenant with God, ſo as that God hath made a Covenant or promiſe of Evangelical grace to or with him, is denied, nor is, or ever will be proved by Mr. *Bl.*

A 4th. text is *Heb.* 10. 29. whence he ſaith, " Theſe muſt needs be
" granted to be wicked, yet cannot be denied to be in Covenant, being
" ſanctified with the bloud of the Covenant. And then ſets down three
" interpretations; one of the Arminians, that ſay they were ſanctified
" internally and in Covenant, but fall from both, which he lets paſs.
" Another, that Chriſt is ſaid to be ſanctified, which ſeems to him to be
" very much ſtrained. A third, by external ſeparation for God, and de-
" dication to him, which he embraceth.

Anſw. Neither do I conceive that it is Chriſt who is ſaid *to be ſanctified by the bloud of the Covenant*: For though I grant he is ſaid *to be ſanctified*, *Joh.* 10. 36. and *to ſanctifie himſelf*, *Joh.* 17. 19. and τελειῶσαι *to conſecrate or make perfect*, *Heb.* 2. 10. & 5. 9. & 7. 28. Yet I do not find the phraſe applied to Chriſt any where, that he is ſaid *to be ſanctified by the bloud of the Covenant*; but ſtill applied to thoſe that are bought by Chriſt, *Heb.* 10. 10, 14. & 13. 12. Nor doth it ſo well ſuit with the Apoſtles aim of aggravating the ſin of Apoſtacy from Chriſtianity, to mean it of Chriſts being ſanctified, as of the Apoſtates being ſanctified heretofore by that bloud of the Covenant which he now counted common, or unclean: Nor do I conceive it can be meant of ſuch a meer external ſanctification, whether by Baptiſm, or external profeſſion, as Mr. *Bl.* and others conceive. For 1. the ſanctification here is the ſame with the ſanctification meant, *ver.* 10, 14. & 13. 12. But that ſanctification is more then ſuch an external ſanctification, even ſuch *as perfects for ever them that are ſanctified*, v. 14. and hath with it *the writing and remiſſion of ſins* according to the Covenant which is ſet down *v.* 15 16, 17. 2. Nowhere is ſuch an external ſanctification aſcribed to the bloud of the Covenant; but to aſcribe to it ſuch a meer external ſanctification in any ſanctified by it, is to diminiſh the vertue of it, as if it did no more then the legal ſacrifices contrary to the Apoſtles arguing, *Heb.* 9. 12, 13, 14. 3. Nor thirdly, had it aggravated the Apoſtates ſin to ſay *that he had counted the bloud of the Covenant wherewith he was ſanctified onely externally, a common thing*: For this had ſhewed no more evil in the diſeſteem of Chriſts death, then if the bloud of the legal ſacrifices which did ſanctifie externally, *Heb.* 9. 12. had been counted unclean. Therefore I conceive the ſanctifying *Heb.* 10. 29. meant of the effectual ſanctifying before God, meant *Heb.* 2. 11. & 10. 10 14. & 13. 12. but yet underſtand the ſanctifying, *Heb* 10. 29. not of what was ſo really, but of what was according to their own opinion, and profeſſion embracing the Chriſtian Doctrine. Even as *Gal.* 5. 4. *whoſoever are juſtified by the Law*, that is,

Whoſoever

Whosoever of you do avouch that you are justified by the Law. *Luke* 15.7. some are said to be *just persons needing no repentance*; that is, in their own opinion and profession, as those *Luke* 18.9. And thus I conceive is that speech also to be understood, 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. and hereby the *Arminian* argument from both places for Universal Redemption, and Apostacy of Saints is avoided. Now these may be denied to have been in Covenant, that is, to have been of those to whom God promised Gospel grace, sith they were onely sanctified according to their own opinion and profession; yea though the sanctification were meant of being sanctified externally, and this were from the bloud of the Covenant, yet it follows not that those who are sanctified thus are in Covenant with God, as the meaning of those is who say the elect onely are in Covenant, that is, the Covenant of Evangelical grace is made by God onely to the elect.

Mr. *Bl.* adds "Neither can all the noise which Mr. *T.* hath made "about 1 *Pet.* 2.9. take off that text, but that it speaks fully to hold up "a Covenant in this latitude; and from thence I thus argue. If those "phrases, *a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy Nation, a peculiar people*, be applied to Christians as to Jews in an equal latitude to "one as to other; then it must needs follow that there is a Covenant "in Gospel times in like latitude as in the time of the Law, including "all that accept the terms of the Covenant, and visibly appear as the "people of God, and is not restrained onely to the elect regenerate. "The consequence is evident, seeing the terms plainly imply a Covenant. Here is a Covenant people or no where: But these terms, *a* "*chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people*, "are applied to Christians as well as to Jews, to one in as great a latitude as to the other. That which God speaks to Israel in the Wilderness, that *Peter* speaketh to the Church to which he writes; All Israelites in *Moses* days, all Christians professing, in *Peters* time, had "those titles, when onely those that kept Covenant were at any time "worthy of them, and had the comforts of them.

Answ. The noise I make is not a meer sound without reason, nor is any one of my reasons made void by Mr. *Bls.* answers. To him I reply, 1. That his speech is inconsiderate when he saith *the text speaks fully to hold up a Covenant in this latitude, which comprehends non-elect persons*, when there is not a word of any Covenant, and the terms he onely saith *plainly imply a Covenant*. And though I deny not that the people there mentioned were a Covenant people, yet I deny any one of the terms doth imply a Covenant; for *a chosen generation* doth not imply a Covenant, sith both election and generation may be without a Covenant; and the like may be said of the other terms, *a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar, or purchased people*: So that in this respect the consequence may be denied. Nor is the consequence good for another reason. For it is not true that *all Israelites in Moses days had those titles*, which I find *Exod.* 19.5,6. yet there onely three of them, and those not said of all the Israelites in *Moses* days, but a promise of being to God such as these titles import, upon condition they did hearken to his

voice, and kept his Covenant, which was neither verified of all Israelites in *Moses* days, nor in after times. And therefore though those terms were applied to Christians as to Jews, yet it doth not necessarily follow that there is a Covenant in Gospel times in like latitude as under the Law, sith those titles were not verified of all the Jews at any time, but of them and then onely when they were obedient. But I deny the *minor* also of Mr. *Bls.* argument, that *the terms are applied by Peter in an equal latitude to Christians as by Moses to Jews*, and assert as in my *Possessor*, *sect.* 10. *pag.* 128. that they are applied onely to those who are members of the invisible Church. Whereupon Mr. *Bl.* speaks thus to me.

"But I would wish Mr. *T.* to take into more serious consideration.
"First, whether the first verse of this second chapter be meant onely of
"invisible members? Whether the Apostle perswades regenerate men,
"and onely regenerate men, *to lay aside all malice, and all guile, and hy-*
"*pocrisies, and evil speakings*?

Answ. To the first question I say affirmatively, that by *new born babes*, v. 2. are meant onely members of the invisible Church; for they are said, *ch.* 1. 23. *to be born again, not of corruptible seed, but incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth for ever.* Ver. 2. *to be elect according to the fore-knowledge of God the Father, begotten again unto a lively hope*, ver. 3. And to the 2d. that he mentions onely regenerate persons, whom he perswades, though the duty is incumbent on others.

"2*ly.* Whether the 3d. v. be to be thus limited; Whether the Apo-
"stle makes doubt in that manner, whether they had tasted that the
"Lord is gracious? And yet those words in both those verses must
"needs be understood of the same men, and under the same notion as
"these, ver. 9. The Apostle brings his speech to no full period till
"v. 11. Those that must lay aside all malice, guile, *&c.* of whom he
"makes question, whether they had tasted that the Lord were gracious;
"they are this chosen generation, this royal priesthood.

Answ. 1. εἴπερ 1 *Pet.* 2. 3. is translated [*if*] and may seem to import doubt or uncertainty, but it may be as well translated [*seeing*] as it is 2 *Thes.* 1. 6. and so it imports certainty that they *had tasted how gracious the Lord is*, without making question of it. And this reading is more apposite to their condtiion, and more suitable to the exhortation; For it is more agreable to the nature of a motive to the duty, ver. 2. to conceive it thus, *Desire the word to grow by it, sith or seeing you have tasted how gracious the Lord is.* 2. But if it were read [*if*] yet in such passages as these [*if*] doth not import doubt, but onely is as a rational particle, noting the connexion between the terms, as *Joh.* 15. 18. *Ephes.* 4. 20, 21. And so the sense is here, *If you have tasted* (which he supposeth, not questioneth) *then you ought to desire the milk of the word, that you may grow by it.* 3. Were it the Apostle had doubt whether *they had tasted how good the Lord is* (which is not to be conceived, considering what he saith of them, *c.* 1. *v.* 3, 23. *c.* 2. 2, 5. *&c.*) yet this doubt might be of a more full taste, which every regenerate elect person might

not

not have. 4. The exhortation *to lay aside malice*, &c. doth not intimate they were any of them whom he calls *new born babes*, v.2. *a chosen generation, an holy nation*, v.9. unregenerate or non-elect; for such exhortations are necessary for the most holy Saints, in whom are reliques of corruption, and liableness to temptation.

3*ly*. Saith Mr. *Bl*. "Let him seriously consider the Apostles further "enlargement of this honour of these Christians, *which in times past* "*were not a people of God*; words borrowed from *Hos*. 1. 10. *Hos*. 2. 23. "and spoken of the call of the ten revolted Tribes: And in *Deut*. 32. "21. of the call of the Gentiles into a visible Church state and profession, and so applied by the Apostle, *Rom*. 9. 24, 25, 26. Whence I argue. "The call of the ten revolted Tribes, and of the Gentiles into a visible "Church way, is not to be meant of the Church as it is invisible onely. "This Mr. *T*. hath taken into consideration, and answered. However it "be in the places to which the allusion is, yet it is certain that here it "is meant of such a calling as is from darkness to marvellous light; ta"king it, it seems, for granted, that there is no marvellous light in "visible Churches; that in the land of *Zebulon* and *Nephthali* where "they saw a great light, there were onely invisible members. *Matth*. 4. "15, 16.

Answ. My answer to this objection was in two things. 1. That terms applied to Christians in the New Testament with allusion to passages in the Old, yet are not always to be applied to Christians in the same latitude they were to Jews. 2. That in that place such a *calling* is meant as is *from darkness to his marvellous light by his vertues or powers*; which therefore deserve *to be shewed forth*, and which *they do shew forth that* are thus called. And both these I confirmed from *Rom*. 9. 24, 25, 26. which is manifestly said of them who were called *v*. 23. *vessels of mercy*; Nor is this a denomination *a parte præstantiori*, for it is expresly said ὃς καὶ *were the same whom he called vessels of mercy*. And the same place of *Hos*. 1. 23. is alluded to in *Rom*. 9. 25. and 1 *Pet*. 2. 10. and can be understood of no other then the elect. And therefore if the places *Hos*. 1. 10. *Hos*. 2. 23. *Deut*. 32. 21. should be understood (which I grant not) of any other then the elect or members of the invisible Church; yet 1 *Pet*. 2. 10. can be understood of no other, sith no other have such *a calling* as is there meant, *v*. 9. nor any other *obtain mercy* as there is meant. That which Mr. *Bl*. replies after his flirting fashion, goes on this false insinuation, that I *took it for granted, that there is no marvellous light in visible Churches*, which he would refute from *Matth*. 4. 15, 16. and that this was the force of my reason; whereas my reason did not suppose that at all, but that none are so called from darkness to light in that manner the Apostle there describes the calling, but onely the elect, which is true; though there be marvellous light in visible Churches, yea, and in meer visible professors, yet none so called as *Peter* describes 1 *Pet*. 2. 9. but onely members of the invisible Church.

4*ly*. Saith Mr. *Bl*. "As honourable titles as these are frequently gi"ven in Scripture, as shall be shewn, to visible professors, why should "then these be limited to invisible members?

Answ.

Answ. 1. No titles so expresly noting elect persons as those 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. are given any where to meer visible professors. 2. If they should be in any place given to the visible Church, yet they are to be restrained to the elect onely; as when a heap of corn is so called, which hath much chaff; or a field of corn, which hath much tares; the denomination is from the better part, and is to be applied as verified onely of it.

Sly. Saith Mr. *Bl.* "Mr. *T.* in his Letter made this Text to be paral-"lel with those Texts, *Gal.* 6. 10. 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. 1 *Pet.* 2. 10. And those "Texts I have demonstrated to be meant of visible Churches, to which "Mr. *T.* replies nothing.

Answ. I do not find that in *my Letter I made* 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. *parallel with those Texts, Gal.* 6. 10. 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. 1 *Pet.* 2. 10. But in my *Exercit.* § 12. I do alledge to prove that onely believers may be meant by *a holy Nation*, as they are by a *family* or *kindred*, *Ephes.* 3. 15. *the household of faith*, *Gal.* 6. 10. *the house of God*, 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. *a people*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 10. Now saith Mr. *Bl. these texts I have demonstrated to be meant of visible Churches.* But he hath not demonstrated them to be meant of meer visible Churches, or meer visible Professors in them, who are not also of the invisible Church; and therefore I thought in my *Postscript*, and think still I need make no further reply. Mr. *Bl.* considers my arguments to prove 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. meant of the invisible Church.

"1. I argue (saith Mr. *T.*) from the terms, *chosen generation, royal* "*priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people*, that is by Christs death, *Tit.* "2. 14. which cannot be affirmed of any other then elect and true be-"lievers. *Ergo.* *Answ.* 1. Such a way of arguing would not pass with "Mr. *T.* in his adversary; as *peculiar people* is taken in one place of "Scripture, so it must be taken in all places; but in one place it is ta-"ken for the elect regenerate. If this would hold, much labour might "be spared in finding out the various acceptation of words in Scrip-"ture.

Reply. M. *Bl.* it seems hath such a spirit of Divination, as to foresee what I would do in a contingent thing. But this folly of his I impute to his Satyrical vein, which makes him that he can neither relate nor answer any thing of mine candidly. My argument was not drawn onely from the term [*peculiar people*] but also from the terms [*chosen generation, royal priesthood, an holy nation*] which with the other term [*a peculiar people*] or as in the Margin of our last Translation [*a purchased people*] have been applied to the elect onely by these interpreters, whose words I here set down. *Beza analys. Loci oppositum membrum, electorum videlicet summam excellentiam describit, &c. Piscat analys. Hortatur commemoratione duorum maximorum beneficiorum Dei, electionis ad vitam aternam, & vocationis efficacis. Electionem indicat his verbis: vos autem estis genus electum, vocationem vero illis regale sacerdotium gens sancta, &c. Dicson. Vocantur autem regale sacerdotium quia sunt & regni Christi & sacerdotii participes, imo per Christum sacerdotes & reges constituti vocantur. genus electum, quia Deus eos præ aliis populis sibi adoptaverat. Gens sancta, quia eos sibi dicaverat Deus in vitæ puritatem. Populus in acquisitionem, quia Deus eos redemerat, & sibi in thesaurum & hæreditatem asciverat.*

Diodati.

Diodati. v. 9. *A royal*] *that is to say, a company of Priests who are likewise Kings, Exod.* 19. 6. *Priests to Godward, to whom believers do yield spiritual worship.* v. 5. *and Kings over the creatures, over which Christ their head hath given them the dominion, which they had lost in Adam, and hath made them fellows in the glory of his Kingdome, Matth.* 19. 28. 1 *Cor.* 6. 2, 3. *Revel.* 1. 6. & 2. 26, 27. & 3. 21. & 5. 10. & 20. 6. *A peculiar*] *which he hath purchased with a price and made his, by a sovereign title to hold them for his own people. New Annot.* v. 9. *A chosen*] *that is, whom God hath effectually called out of the world, see Chap.* 1. 2. *Deut.* 7. 7. *Royal*] *that is Kings and priests, See Exod.* 19. 6. *Revel.* 1. 6. & 5. 10. *Kings, because of that power which they have, through Christ, over their lust, see* Phil. 4. 13. *Priests, because separated to the service of God, see* v. 5. *Holy nation*] *see Exod.* 19. 6. & *Deut.* 7. 6, &c. *A peculiar people*] *or a purchased people peculiar*] *or a people for possession: that is, a people whom God hath purchased to be his own. See Exod.* 19. 5. *Deut.* 4. 2. & 7. 6. & 26. 18. Psal. 135. 4. *Tit.* 2. 14. *Act.* 20. 28. *Ephes.* 1. 14. 1 *Thes.* 5. 9. Dr. *John Rainold Apolog. thes.* §. 21. *Nam primum nomen populi sanctorum* Dan. 7. 27. *ex Daniele satis clarè indicat significari electos,* 1 Pet. 2. 9. *Gentem sanctam & populum Dei peculiarem,* Exo. 19. 5. Mal. 3. 17. Tit. 2. 14. *Eximiè nuncupatos quandoquidem hic est populus cui soli regnum amplissimum in Christo, & cum Christo, ut ibidem* Dan. 7. 27 *promissum est, ita da um iri testantur sacræ literæ* Apoc. 5. 10. & 20. 6. & 22. 5. §. 20. *ad designandum populum electum,* 1 Pet 2. 9. *qui Deo cedit εἰς περιποίησιν in possessionem seu peculium.* By which allegations it may be perceived, 1. that the interpretation I give is the common interpretation of most learned Protestants: 2. that it is proved no by one title onely but by four titles, whereof not one of them can be applied in the sense Peter useth them to any but the elect: 3. that this interpretation and application is confirmed not by one only place of Scripture, but by many: 4. that though I alledged but one place, to wit *Tit.* 2. 14. yet being so manifestly paralel, and so clearly pregnant for my purpose it was enough, and such as I would allow the like in any adversary for good proof, though I do not take it that in all places the sense is proved by the alledging one scripture in the sense conceived. nor do I think it unnecessary to finde out the various acceptation of words in scripture.

2. Saith Mr. *El* "These termes and others equivolent to these are "given to the Israelites *Deut.* 14. 1, 2. *Deut.* 7. 6. *Deut.* 32. 9. not "as a church invisible, but as visible members. Their qualifications "are often as low, as their appellations by reason of their relation to "God raise them high. And setting apart Christs death, I would know "how they came to this honour.

Answ. These termes *are given* in the places cited *to Israelites*, yet that *they are given to them as visible members, and not as a church invisible*, or as I would say to the church visible of Israel, in respect of and with limitation to the elect or members of the invisible church, as a field of corn in respect of the good grain, is not proved. Yet if it were the titles 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. spoken of christians, cannot be verified of them but

in a ſenſe appropriate to the elect. They are no way *a royal prieſthood*, but as *prieſts that offer ſpiritual ſacrifices to God, acceptable to God through Jeſus Chriſt*, v. 5. which none but the elect and true beleevers can do; no other way *royal* but in that they are *Kings to God*, reign over ſin, Satan, &c. through Chriſt, which none but the elect do; *a choſen generation*, but by Gods election to life eternal; *a holy nation*, but by regeneration of the ſpirit; *a peculiar people*, but by Chriſts purchaſe; which can be verified of none but true believers, and elect perſons. And to Mr. *Bls.* demand I anſwer, *ſetting apart Chriſts death*, I know not how Chriſtians ſhould come to this honour which is expreſſed 1 *Pet.* 2. 9.

3. Saith Mr. *Bl.* "The gift of Apoſtles, Prophets, Evangeliſts, "Paſtours, and Teachers, were the gift of Chriſt, and purchaſe of his "death. Theſe are for conſtitution of viſible Churches, viſible mem-"bers enjoy theſe priviledges in common with regenerate perſons, to "which more is already ſpoken.

Anſw. Though I finde Apoſtles, Prophets, Evangeliſts, Paſtours, and Teachers, termed *Epheſ.* 4. 11. *the gift of Chriſt*, yet I do not finde them ſaid to be *the purchaſe of Chriſts death* as ſuch: nor do I know how they can be truely ſaid *to be the purchaſe Chriſts death*, as is meant, 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. *Tit.* 2. 14. ſo as that every Apoſtle, &c. ſhould *be redeemed from iniquity, be of the people of Gods poſſeſſion, to ſhew forth the vertues of God, &c.* nor do I conceive to what purpoſe this is brought in here by Mr. *Bl.* except he mean that the titles 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. are given to the viſible Church in reſpect of the Miniſters, which is ſo frivolous that I am unwilling to imagine it of him.

2. Saith Mr. *Bl.* "Mr. *T.* objects from that which is ſaid of them, "they are called by God, by his power and vertue into his marvellous "light, and v. 10. that now had obtained mercy which they had not "before; which cannot be affirmed of any but true believers and elect "perſons.

Anſw. Men brought into a viſible Church-ſtate, are brought into a marvellous light. The ſeven golden candleſticks Rev. 1. 20. *had a marvellous light in their lamps, and yet in ſome of thoſe there were onely a few names, that had not defiled their garments; And this light is a mercy, the fruition of it a great mercy*, Pſal. 147. 19, 20. *Yea, it is applied by the prophet*, Hoſ. 2. 23. (*whence the Apoſtle gathers it*) *unto the mercy enjoyed in a viſible Church communion, as is not denied by Mr.* T. *himſelf.*

Reply. Where it is that I deny not that *Hoſ.* 2. 23. *is applied unto the mercy enjoyed in a viſible Church communion*, I remember not, yet if I did grant it any where, I might underſtand it of ſaving mercy, proper to the elect, for that is mercy enjoyed in a viſible Church communion.

But Mr. *Bls.* anſwer is not to the argument as by me urged; For I did not form it thus, they who have marvellous light, who have obtained a great mercy are elect: But thus, *they who are called by Gods power or vertue, which therefore they are to ſhew forth, out of darkneſs, into his marvellous light, which in time paſt were not a people, but are now*

the

the people of God: which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy, are the elect, which I confirmed from *Rom.*9.23,24,25. where the same place of *Hos.*2.23. is alledged and applied onely to the elect. But these things are said of those 1 *Pet.*2.9. *Ergo.* Which argument is confirmed by the words of *Piscator* above cited, and of *Beza* in the place cited, where he saith, *Simulque ne quis ambigat sit electus necne revocat nos Apostolus ad vocationem efficacem, ex qua æternum illud alioqui occultissimum electionis nostræ decretum certò intelligamus, idque ex una Dei gratuitò eligentis & vocantis misericordia.* The *new Annot.* praises] *or vertues. That is, that we might glorifie God in our conversations, thereby shewing forth the abundant mercy and great power of God in calling us. Isa.* 8.13. *Darkness*] *that is ignorance,* ch.1.14. *whereby is meant our sinfull and miserable estate by nature, under which men are kept, through ignorance of the Gospel, Eph.*4.18. *&* 5.8. *Col.*1.13. *His marvellous*] *hereby is meant our estate of grace, through the effectual calling of God by the knowledge of the truth.* See 2 *Cor.*4.6. *Acts* 13 47. *&* 26.18. *called marvellous, because of the great mystery of godliness, which is revealed in the Gospel; and called his, because God revealeth it.* Dr. *John Rainold Apol. thes.* § 15. *Neque soluni è tenebris in admirabilem Dei lucem vocati,* 1 *Pet.*2.9. *sed & electi,* 1 *Pet.*1.2. *nuncupantur, atque genus electum,* 1 *Pet.*2.9. Now though meer visible Church-members may have marvellous light, and obtain great mercy, yet they cannot be said to be thus called, to be a people of God, and to obtain mercy, as *Peter* there describes.

3. Saith Mr. *Bl.* "It is said that those persons did beleeve contradistinguished to them that were disobedient and stumbled at the word; "but such are onely the Elect, Ergo. *Answ.* So did all they that made "shipwrack of the faith, 1 *Tim.* 1.19. So did *Simon Magus, Act.* 8.13. "So did the hearers compared to the rocky ground, *Luk.* 8.13. And "whereas it is said, these believers are contradistinguished to them that "were disobedient and stumbled at the word, it fully makes against "him; Those disobedient ones, are those that disallow *Christ*, as we "see *v.* 7. that reject *Christ* upon tender, that persist in Judaism or "Gentilism. All others not professed Jews nor Gentiles, are in that "place beleevers (and in all other Scriptures respective to visible pre-"rogatives) which are all visible church-members.

Reply. It is true sometimes they are termed believers, who are meer visible professors, but here the believers are such as to *whom Christ is pretious*, and are contradistinguished to them that *were disobedient and stumbled at the word, unto which also they were appointed* (which Mr. *Bl.* did ill to leave out) which shews they were reprobates appointed to perish, and consequently the contradistinguished believers are such as are saved, which cannot be said of them that *made shipwrack of the faith*, or *Simon Magus*. Which is confirmed from *v.* 9, 10. which Mr. *Bl.* confesseth *is understood of the same men*, v. 3. *and under the same notion as these*, v. 9. *the Apostle brings his speech to no full period till* v. 11. which reasons are confirmed by the note of *Diodati* on 1 *Pet.*2.7. *It is that pretious thing, namely, that precious foundation whereof* Isaiah *speaks,*

which the text leads to, and is verified onely of the elect, to whom alone Christ is the precious foundation. And the other by the note of *Beza* on *v.8. Preterea particula καὶ ad uncta & quod mox subjicit, vos autem genus electum nonne manifestam antitheſin ostendit rerum ad decus & ad dedecus conditorum, sicut credentes & immorigeros ante opposuerat?* Nor is what is said, that *they disallowed Christ, v.7.* any thing against this, that they that beleeved, *v 7.* were true beleevers and elect, any more then it follows all that are meer visible professors are termed *beleevers ordained to eternal life, Acts* 13.48. because they are contradistinguished to those *who rejected the word of God, and judged themselves unworthy of eternal life, v.46.*

4. Saith Mr. *Bl.* "They are said to be *built as living stones, &c* which "can agree to none, but elect persons and true beleevers. *Answ.* That "is left out in the quotation of this text, which would wholly spoil the "argument, and carry it on the other hand; namely those words, *to* "*whom comming as unto a living stone.* The Apostle shews them the "way, and points out the condition called for; which being done, they "are then built as living stones: And this implies that it was so with "some, but not with others. Here is that which is done by some and "and neglected by others, and their happiness upon discharge of their "duty; so that if Mr. *T.* his confidences were not far higher then his "arguments, he might well sit down, and fairly acknowledge that these "titles are given to visible Church-members.

Repl. Mr. *T.* his confidences are strengthened by Mr. *Bls.* slight answers to his arguments. His argument was, They who are said *to be built as living stones on Christ the living stone, a spiritual house, a holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ,* they are true beleevers and elect persons. But such are those *v.5.* who are termed *a holy nation, v.9. Ergo.* The *major* is proved from this, that these things can agree to no other; the *minor* from Mr. *Bls.* own words cited before, that they *are the same, v.3. & 9. the Apostle not bringing his speech to a full period till v.11.* Thus Dr. *John Rainold, thes.* 4. § 24. applies this passage onely *to the elect.* And Mr. *John Goree, Vindic. Vind.* calls it *a misapplication of* 1 *Pet* 2.5. *to the visible Kingdome, which expresly note the spiritual house, ch.* 5. *pag.* 20. *New Annot. on v.* 5. *lively stones*] *that is, as having life from him. See v.4 Diodati annot. on* 1 *Pet.* 2. 5. *Lively stones*] *namely participating of that foresaid life of Christ; and therefore opposite to the dead stones of the material temple. Are built up*] *or be ye built up. An holy priesthood*] *that is to say, a multitude and company of priests. By Jesus*] *whose perfect righteousnes and intercession gaineth all Gods grace to beleevers and to their works.* Now what saith Mr. *Bl* to this? He neither denies *major* nor *minor*; But tels us, that *those words, to whom comming as unto a living-stone, if they had been cited would wholly spoil the argument, and carry it on the other hand*; which is very strange to me, who find those words thus intepreted by the *new Annot. v.4. Comming*] *that is by faith. See Joh.* 6.35. & 5.43,44,45. *Heb.* 10. 22. By *Diodati, v.* 4. *To whom*] *that is to say, being united to the Lord Jesus, and made his members by a lively faith,* that they should prove

that

that *the titles* 1 *Pet* 2.5. *are given to meer visible Church-members*, as if any meer visible Church-member did come to Christ as a living stone by a lively faith, and were a living stone, built up a spiritual house, &c. But let's view Mr. *Ills* reasons. 1. *The Apostle shews them the way, and points out the condition called for, which being done, they are then built as living stones.* But 1. it is plain that the Apostle speaks of them as built up already, οἰκοδομεῖσθε, *ye are built up*, as our translation best reads it, not as of a thing to be done: and this is confirmed in that v 2. they are said to *be new born babes*, ver. 3. *to have tasted how gracious the Lord is*, ch. 1. 22. *to have purified their souls*, v. 23. *to be born again*. And for πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμενοι, it may be as well read *unto whom being comen*, as *unto whom comming*. And so *Piscat. in anal. loci. Argumentorum unum est a pari, videl a vocationis initio, quod significat quum ait, eos jam ad Dominum accessisse, id est fide eum recepisse, atque ita super eum adificari cæpisse*, and therefore notes more then the way and condition called for, even the thing already begun. 2. But had the Apostle shewed onely the way and condition called for, what had this been to prove that the titles, v. 5. are given to meer visible Church members? Sure nothing at all; for were they comen, or comming, or to come, their comming must have been by faith, and they had not been *living stones, built up a spiritual house, nor a holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ*, without a lively faith and election: And therefore neither Mr. *Ills* conceit being granted, is it proved that any other then elect and true beleevers are meant 1 *Pet.* 2.5. 2. Saith Mr. *Bl. And this implies that it was so with some, who did their duty and were happy, but not with others who neglected.* But 1. how those words, *unto whom comming as unto a living stone*, implies the neglect of duty, I am yet to learn: If they did note a condition, yet they could imply onely a possibility of neglect, not that some did neglect. 2. If some did neglect, yet this is nothing to prove that ver. 5. which is said onely of those that did come and so were happy, *the titles are given to meer visible professors*. The rest of the Chapter is to vindicate himself from what I said, that I hardly beleeve any approved Writer joyns with him in his interpretation. To which he saith, 1. *It is not like my confidence, who dare affront the body of protestant Divines in Tenents that* ex professo *they have handled against the Papists. Answ.* That I do so, is not shewed; that I dare do so when I have truth on my side, is no vice. If Mr. *Bls* reasons had been good, his singularity had not been culpable. 2. He would insinuate that in my interpretation I follow *Estius* and *Gerhard*, whom I neither have, nor ever made use of about this text. 3. That he hath Mr. *Ball*, whose book I now have not, and his words cited by Mr. *Bl.* seem not to speak any thing of 1 *Pet.* 2.9.10. 4. That *A Lapide, is wholly for him, to whom* he saith *I use to be beholding*. But I think the words of *A Lapide* cited by him, are not clear for him; nor do I use to be beholding to *A Lapide*, he being an Author I have not, nor do I remember that I have made use of him but in the first part of the *Review*, § 22. onely about 1 *Cor.* 7.14. 5. That *Gerhard* mentions others that *understand* 1 *Pet.* 2.9. *of common and general election*. But whether approved Writers

ters or not, he doth not say, so that my words stand good, notwithstanding Mr. *Bls.* vindication of himself, his injurious insinuations of me, and his futile arguments and answers about 1 *Pet.*2.9.

Mr. *Bl. ch.*28. proceeds in proving "That the Covenant of grace in "Gospel times admits Christians in profession, in a state of unregene-"ration, and is not limited in the bounds of it to the elect regenerate. "And 1. he argues from four terms, *beleevers, saints, disciples, christians*, "which he proves out of Scripture to be given to persons not elect "(which is not denied) and they imply a Covenant undeniably: and "this he proves from my confession, that the titles men ioned by *Peter* "1 *Pet.*2.9. from *Moses*, argue a people in Covenant, and therefore "I am so shie to confess them to belong to visible professors: But "those titles are as high as these, and as undeniaoly implying a "Covenant are given to visible professors; those then even according "to me are on this account in Covenant with God.

Answ. Mr. *Bl.* doth but mock the Reader, and abuse me, by speaking of a confession which he doth not shew, and by assigning a reason of my not confessing the titles, 1 *Pet.*2.9. not to belong to visible professors, which is never given by me, but imagined by himself. As I said before, so I say again, though I hold those who are (as 1 *Pet.*2.9. the the terms are used) *a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people*, are in Covenant with God, as having Gods Covenant of Evangelical grace made with them; yet I deny that the terms imply a Covenant. And as for the other four terms Mr. *Bl.* alledgeth to prove meer visible professors being in Covenant, he doth in like manner mock his Reader, 1. not telling what Covenant those terms imply, 2. nor how they imply it, 3. nor on whose part they imply it, whether on the persons part thus intituled, or on Gods, which is the onely thing in question, Whether God have made his Covynant of grace in Gospel times with any non-elect? which sure those terms imply not, sith they imply either the act, as Beleevers and Disciples; or the state, as Saints and Christians, of the persons intitled; not any act of God, covenanting or promising to them Gospel grace. 4. The proof likewise from my confession (if it were so) is as vain: For the terms Christ, holy Angels, onely begotten Son of God *&c.* are as high as those 1 *Pet.* 2.9. yet they do not imply a Covenant by my confession; and therefore I may well deny his inference to be my confession, though I should have yeelded that which he saith I confess to be mine.

2. Mr. *Bl.* argues from some absurdities. "1. This restriction of the "Covenant makes an utter confusion between the Covenant it self "and the conditions of it; or the Covenant it self, and the duties re-"quired in it; between our entrance into Covenant, and our observa-"tion of it, or walking up in faithfulness to it: For there are that en-"ter and keep Covenant with God, *Psal.* 44.17,18. *Psal.* 103.17,18. "And there are those that break Covenant, *Psal.* 78.10, 37. *Jer.* 34. "18,19,20. *Levit.*26.25. *Isa.*24.5. Now according to this opinion, "regeneration is our entrance into Covenant, and regeneration is our "keeping of Covenant; before regeneration we make no Covenant,

"after

"after regeneration we break no Covenant, there is no such thing as "Covenant breaking: All this makes an utter confusion in the Cove-"nant.

Answ. They that hold, that the Covenant of grace in Gospel times is limited to the elect regenerate, do not think either regeneration our entrance into Covenant, or our keeping of Covenant, or that before regeneration we make no Covenant, or after regeneration we break no Covenant, or that there is no such thing as Covenant breaking; all these are Mr. *Bls.* fictions, and so is his imputation of making an utter confusion in the Covenant. But this they hold, that God enters none into his Covenant of Evangelical grace but regenerate persons, and that they do all keep Covenant; and that though many before regeneration make Covenant with God, and break that Covenant they make, and so there is Covenant breaking on their part, yet that God keeps the Covenant of Evangelical grace with those he makes it, and that no regenerate person doth so break it as to be ever cast out of Gods Covenant. And for Mr. *Bls.* texts, they are impertinent to prove that after regeneration any do break the Covenant of Evangelical grace God hath made. For *Psal.* 78. 10, 37. *Levit.* 26. 25. *Isa.* 24. 25. do speak expresly of breaking the Covenant of the Law made with the people of Israel in mount *Sinai*, which is another Covenant then the new or Evangelical Covenant, *Heb.* 8. 9, 10. But our question is of the Covenant of grace in Gospel times. And *Jer.* 34. 18, 19, 20. is ridiculously alledged, sith it speaks not of the Covenant Evangelical, but of the particular Covenant which *Zedekiah* and the Princes of *Judah* made to let their Hebrew servants go free, which they brake contrary to the Law. Yet to shew Mr. *Bls.* futility in arguing there is no consequence in this reasoning. In mens Covenants there are that enter Covenant and keep it, and others that in like manner do enter into Covenant and not keep it, and so men enter into Covenant with God, and some keep it, and some not, therefore they that hold that God makes his Covenant of Evangelical grace onely with the elect regenerate, do confound the Covenant it self and the conditions of it, or the duties required in it, or the entrance into Covenant and our observation of it, or walking up in faithfulness to it. For the distinction remains still between all these, though they be conjoyned in the same persons, as heat and light are distinct though together in flame, and justification and sanctification though conjoyned in the same persons. Yea, sith Mr. *Bl.* holds some that enter into Covenant are stedfast in it, he makes according to his own superficial arguing the same confusion we do, and so falls into the same imagined absurdity.

The 2d. absurdity Mr. *Bl.* would fasten on the tenet that the Covenant of grace in Gospel times is limited to the elect, is; that *then there is no such thing as an hypocrite in the world, as in reference towards God; For an hypocrite is one that personates the man that he is not, an hypocrite respective to religion and in Scripture use of the phrase, is one that pretends for God, and is not Gods; now according to this opinion, that onely regenerate men are in Covenant, there is no such thing as an hypocrite, no such sin as*

hypocrisie,

hypocrisi; ewbere the Gospel is preacked, God makes tender of himself in Covenant, and in case none but regenerate persons enter Covenant, then onely they take upon them the persons of people in relation to him.

Answ. If Mr. *Bl.* and other Pædobaptists had any will to deal honestly, as men that sought to clear truth, and not to pervert readers, they would, being so often particularly in my *Postscript* §. 6. admonished, distinguish of being in Covenant by their own act of covenanting, and Gods act of promising. I never denied, that in respect of their own act of covenanting, mere visible professors may be said to be in Covenant with God, but denied that in respect of Gods act of promising (which alone was in question, sith the question being of infants, they cannot be said to be in Covenant with God by their own act of covenanting, but only by Gods act of promising) any other then elect persons are in Covenant with God. Now I grant it, that of them to whom the Gospel-covenant is made by God, there is none an hypocrite; but there be hypocrites of those that enter into Covenant with God; that is, of those that promise to be Gods and are not; to whom, though God tenders himself in Covenant, yet he makes no Covenant or promise to them of Evangelical grace, and therfore notwithstanding this imagined absurdity, yet the position is true, that the Covenant of grace in Gospel times, as made by God to men, is limited to the elect.

The 3d. absurdity is, *then no Minister in any Church may baptize any person, for none can now discern infallibly whether a person be regenerate, and Mr. Bl. findes Christ giving charge to disciple Nations, and to baptise them, but findes him not giving Commission, that wherein the judgement of charity men have cause to conceive them to be disciples, then to baptize them. The Apostles staid not for observation of those signes, that might in a well-grounded charity perswade that they were regenerate persons. And these that fix it here, too ordinarily make interests the chief ground to carry their charity to a more favourable construction. They that are most like to make a party with them, or drive on interest their way, must be judged persons meet for baptism; of this in a short time we have large experience. Those that gather up Churches, and initiate them by baptism (the way of the Apostles I confess, in case that they would make good that they have to deal with Heathens, and therefore a way of more colour then theirs, that set up new Churches, and retain the old baptism) we see what manner of saints are received among them, such that civil persons (respective to sobriety, chastity, or upright dealing with men) cannot without stain of their reputation, make their companions.*

Answ. Pædobaptists do usually plead, that infants are in the Covenant of grace, therefore they are to be baptized. The antecedent can be meant of being in the Covenant of grace no otherwise then by Gods act of promise, to be the God of a believers seed; therefore they make the being in Covenant by Gods act of promise to be a persons God, the rule of baptizing. Now I assert, that God hath not promised to be a God to any man or his seed in respect of Evangelical grace, but the elect. Therefore this absurdity is justly charged on the Pædobaptists,

that

that according to their *hypotheses*, no Minister can baptize any infant in faith. For he must baptize according to them, onely those infants that are in Covenant, and whom he knowes to be in Covenant; but those infants onely are in Covenant who are elect, and no Minister can know which infant is elect, or in Covenant with God, which not, all infants are not, no not of believers, not all *Abrahams*, or *Isaacs*, *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. Therefore according to this rule no Pædobaptist can baptize any infant in faith, and a judgement of charity Mr. *M.* Mr. *Bl.* and others agree and that according to truth, is not it we are to baptize by. So that this absurdity doth unavoidably follow on Pædobaptists opinion, which Mr. *Bl.* endeavours, but in vain, to fasten on us, who do often disclaim baptizing persons upon their being in Covenant with God by his act of promise to be their God, as our rule; and do continually assert our baptizing persons, because disciples by profession, and by reason of their own covenanting to follow Christ (which Mr. *Bl.* confesseth to be according to Christs Commission, and the Apostles way in dealing with Heathens) and therefore the absurdity follows not our opinion, but the Pædobaptists, who can baptize no infant by their rule, because they cannot know any infant whom they are to baptize to be in the Covenant of grace. As for Mr. *Bls.* confession, that *our practise is the way of the Apostles in case we would make good that we have to deal with Heathens*, I wonder Mr. *Bl.* a learned man, should require us to make good that which of it self is so manifest. For sure we have to deal with Heathens or with Jews, sith all the men in the world are either Heathens, that is ἐθνικοὶ *of the Nations*, or *Jewes*: but me thinks he should not say we have to deal with Jews, therefore we have to deal with Heathens, and consequently our practise is the way of the Apostles, by Mr. *Bls.* own confession. To confine the term [*heathens*] onely to them that are not Christians in name, is indeed according to the vulgar speech, but besides the Scripture use, which Mr. *Bl.* me thinks in his writing should have followed. But if Mr. *Bl.* mean it in the vulgar sense, it is easie to make it good that no Englishman or his child is a Christian, till he be made a disciple by preaching the Gospel, sith to be a disciple of Christ and a Christian are terms of the same sense, *Acts.* 11. 26. Yet in baptizing by Christs commission and the Apostles practise, there is no difference made between Jews and Heathens, both are to be baptized upon their believing, *Mark.* 16. 16. neither the one nor the other were, or were to be baptized by the Apostles, without their own personal profession of faith. Our way then by Mr. *Bls.* own confession is the way of the Apostles. His confession also is true, that *our way is of more colour then theirs that set up new Churches, and retain the old baptism*, for acknowledging them church-members at Baptism, and not admitting them as church-members though without scandal, is after their own principles to contradict themselves; and to set up Churches in a congregational way, disclaiming the National and Parochial, and yet to admit infants to Baptism by vertue of Circumcision, and *Abrahams* covenant and church-gathering, what is it but to dissent that in practise which they plead in dis-

pute, and to make the frame of the national Church Jewish, the rule of the Christian Church catholick. Nor have Presbyterians any colour for their reformation of Baptism or the Lords supper, if they will stick to their allegations of taking a rule for Baptism from Circumcision, or of the Lords Supper from the Passeover; for, to them all sorts whether ignorant or scandalous were admitted; and if we must retain whom the Jewish Church retained as visible church members, there will be no Ecclesiastical juridical excommunication for moral miscarriages, there being no such among them. As for what Mr. *Bl.* chargeth the baptized Churches with, of the unholiness of their members, though I can say little of those near Mr. *Bl.* (if there be any) yet I am able to say of some, and Mr. *Baxter* himself hath in print said somewhat of one of the Churches, which might refute this calumny, and I think there are many able to testifie of the holy conversation of many of the Churches of baptized persons, however Mr. *Baxter* imagines they in the end prove wicked. However, we do neither in practise nor opinion maintain such impure Churches of ignorant and vicious persons as Mr. *Bl. Vindic. Fæd. ch.* 47. doth, and Presbyterians commonly do: Nor is it likely, the worst of the baptized Churches should be worse then the ordinary sort of the Pædobaptists Churches of Mr. *Bls.* way.

Chap. 29. Mr. *Bl.* answers to some objections against his assertion. 1. That regenerate persons onely are in New Testament times honoured with the name of the people of God, they therefore onely are in Covenant. To which he answers, 1. *That there are terms equivalent, Beleevers, Saints, Disciples, and Christians, which are given to the unregenerate.* To which I reply, that though this argument be not mine, yet it may be said, that the term *Gods people* doth rather imply being in Covenant with God then the other terms. But I think the argument not cogent, sith the term [my people] doth not in the force of the word necessarily import a Covenant of God, and men may be conceived his people by election, or purchase, without a Covenant, and therefore own it not.

2*ly.* Saith he, *It is not often that that phrase is found in New Testament Scriptures, with such restriction onely to regenerate persons. He denies not* Tit. 2. 14. *is taken for a people separate by grace out of the state of nature: But he is not resolved whether* Revel. 21. 3. *serve to purpose, it being in dispute whether to be fulfilled on earth or in heaven; if on earth, then it sets out a singular glory in the Church through Ordinances in purity, yet with a mixture of close hypocrites. And for Christs personal reign on earth, that he lets go as the opinion of others, of a considerable part of whom he is not very well conceited it seems.*

Answ. His not denying *Tit.* 2. 14. to be pregnant, and being alledged by me as the parallel place to 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. confirms my restriction of the titles there used to the regenerate. And me thinks the promises, *Revel.* 21. 3, 4. *That God would be their God with them, that he would wipe away all tears from their eys, there should be no more death, nor crying, nor labour,* should be sufficient to prove the people of God there meant to be onely the regenerate. And me thinks *Matth.* 1. 21. & 2. 6. *Luke* 1. 17, 68, 77.

77. & 2.32. & 7.16. Acts 15.14. & 18.10. Rom.9.25. & 11.1. & 15.10, 2 Cor.6.16. Heb.4.9. & 8.10. 1 Pet.2.10. Revel.18.4. the term [*my people or Gods people*] should be restrained to the elect.

3ly. Saith he, *My people, or people of God, is used more frequently in the N. T. without restriction to the elect regenerate. He alledgeth three places, 2 Cor.6.16. which with him is plain quoted from Levit.26.16. where it is a national promise, to be understood of Gods visible abode in ordinances, being tendered to those that were over-busie with Idols, from which he dissuades with this argument, that they were the temple of the Lord, separate of God for his worship and service, and the promise is no more then is made good to visible Churches, Revel.2.1. whereof some members were not regenerate.*

Answ. *To dwell in them to walk in them, to be their God, and they to be his people, the temple of the living God, 2 Cor.6.16. whom he receives, to whom he is a father, and they his sons and daughters,* cannot be meant of any other then the elect: For they onely are the temple of God in which he dwels, who have his Spirit, 1 *Cor.*3.16,17. & 6.19. (a bare separation by outward calling to his worship & service is not enough) which is the most forcible argument to dissuade from medling with Idols. However it be *Levit.*26.16. here is not a national promise, but a promise to particula persons, separate from the rest of the nation, *v.*17. Nor can it be understood of Gods visible abode in ordinances, but in persons who were holy; nor is it made to every visible Church, in respect of every visible member: Nor is the promise of Christs walking, *Revel.* 2.1. so much as this of Gods dwelling in them.

The 2d. he alledgeth is *Rom.9.25. which is to be understood no otherwise, where the call of the ten Tribes, from Hos.*1.10. & 2.23. *is applied to the call of the Gentiles into a Church state and condition. And to the objection from Rom.9.23. he saith, God sets up visible ordinances, and calls to a Church state as is there propheſied, that he may there work to himself a people of invisible relation, that thereby he may make them vessels of mercy, having afore prepared them to glory.*

Answ. The call, *Rom* 9.25. is not as Mr. *Bl* seems to conceive, an outward refusable calling into a visible Church state by visible ordinances; but as *v.* 7. 8, 11, 24, 26. calling is effectual calling, which gives being to the called, and is never refused, but proper to the elect onely: Which is apparent from *v.* 24. where he saith *even us whom also*, which can have reference to none but *vessels of mercy* mentioned *v.*23. who are also *sons of the living God, v.* 26. Which being urged by me in my *Postscript, sect.* 10. and not refelled, stands as a firm proof that the people of God there are onely elect ones, or as Mr. *Bl.* speaks, *a people of invisible relation, vessels of mercy afore prepared to glory.*

The 3d. he alledgeth is *Revel.*18.4. where *all professors of faith are included in that exhortation, and so all Ministers are to preſs it.* But though it were the duty of all, yea of them that were not professors of faith, to quit Babylon; yet the invitation is a fruit of Gods special care by a voice from heaven, and therefore is more then an exhortation to a

commoh duty, to wit, a ſpecial effectual call, whereby Gods people, that is his elect ones; ſhall be brought out of Babylon as *Lot* out of Sodom, and is to be conceived of the elect onely, not of hypocritical profeſſors of faith. So that Mr. *Bl.* hath not brought one Text out of the New Teſtament, in which [*Gods people*] is applied to meer viſible profeſſors; and yet if theſe had ſerved his turn, his aſſertion had been falſe, as is ſhewed by the number of places wherein [Gods people] is limited to the elect.

Another objection is out of *Jer.* 31.31,32,33. which he ſaith " is ſet up " againſt all New Teſtament light, to prove that none muſt be of the " called of God in o Covenant, for fruition of Church priviledges, but " thoſe that are regenerate: Men in Old Teſtament Covenan broke " Covenant, as is there expreſt; men in the new Covenant ſhall keep " Covenanant, and theſe are onely the elect and regenerate.

Anſw. The Text joyned with *Heb* 8. 6,7,8,9,10. proves that God makes his new Covenant with none but thoſe who keep it, who are the elect onely. I produce it not to prove (as Mr. *Bl.* ſuggeſts of ſome) that *none muſt be of the called of God into Covenant, for fruition of Church priviledges, but thoſe that are regenerate*; nor to prove that *none ſhall enter Covenant and tranſgreſs it*. that *the Covenant that now is, is not in any poſſibility to be tranſgreſt*: but to prove, that none to whom God makes his new Covenant do break it; which the Author to the *Hebrews* doth affirm, in that he differences this from the former Covenant, that the former was faulty, or occaſioned God to complain that it was broken; but this is ſuch as that to take away occaſion of complaint for breach of it, God makes proviſion by better promiſes, that it ſhall not be broken by thoſe to whom it is made. Nor doth it hence *follow*, as Mr. *Bl.* ſpeaks (*this being the characteriſtical difference*) *that as none in New Teſtament times enter Covenant, but they keep Covenant; ſo none in Old Teſtament times were in Covenant, but did tranſgreſs it*: For we do not ſay as he perverts the poſition, that *none in New Teſtament times enter Covenant but they keep Covenant*; we know many have by their profeſſion and baptiſm entred into Covenant, and have not kept it: but this we ſay, that God makes with none his new Covenant, whether in New Teſtament times, or in Old Teſtament times, but they do keep it; and that this is the characteriſtical difference between the Old and New Covenant (not Old and New Teſtament times) which are in the Epiſtle to the *Romanes* and *Galatians* called *the Law and the Promiſes*; that the one might be and was broken, yet the other is and ſhall be kept by thoſe to whom it is made, becauſe of Gods undertaking to write his Laws in their hearts. As for *an outward Covenant* made by God diſtinct from theſe and yet in force, it is Mr. *Bls.* figment as Mr. *B.* hath proved in his *Apol.* againſt Mr. *Bl.* pag. 66,67,103, *&c.* As for the anſwers, 1. that *the Covenant, Jer.* 31.31,32,33. *is not a Covenant properly ſo called*, it is refuted before, Sect. 33. as I remember. 2. That *it is not the whole of the Covenant*. But if it be but a part, it is made onely to the elect, the other part whatever it be being made to none other. 3. *If the new Covenant be another Covenant, then there muſt be two diſtinct Goſpel Covenants.*

nants. But this is said upon the mistake refuted Sect. 43. that the Covenant at Mount *Sinai* with the Jews was the Gospel Covenant. I have again viewed pag. 105, 106, 107. of Mr. *Bls. answer to my Letter*, and do not find any explication of the promises *Jer.* 31. 31, 32, 33. which may shew that the promises there are made to any but the elect; nor do I find an explication of them, whereby to know how he would have them understood, but of the term [*new Covenant*] which he would have understood as if it were meant onely *of a clearer explication of the old Covenant not well understood before, as Joh.* 13. 34. *the new commandment is a clearer explication then was formerly.* But neither is true: For the new commandment *Joh.* 13. 34. is not so called from a new explication, but a new motive, his own example, as the very words shew: And the *new Covenant* is so called, *Jer.* 31. 31, 32, 33. not from a clearer explication, bu *better promises, Heb.* 8. 6. And I still profess, that I find not that Mr. *Bls.* answer is quit from enervating the argument for effectual grace and perseverance in it, sith he makes the Covenant to be to the non-elect; nor doth he demonstrate, that I cannot build effectual grace and perseverance on that text, making it a distinct Covenant from the first, without the overthrow of effectual grace and perseverance in Old Testament times. Thus much for answer to those three Chapters of Mr. *Bl.* he that would see more of Mr. *Bls.* mistakes about the Covenant, may read Mr. *Baxters* Book afore quoted.

SECT. XLVII.

Mr. *Bls. Vindic. Fad. Ch.* 34. *Concerning the stating the question of the Birth-priviledge of the issue of Eelievers, is examined; and his Objections against my stating it removed.*

MR. *Bl. ch.* 34. complains, that *my confusion hath mudded the way*, that *my mixture brings a cloud upon all*] he might as well say light is darkness. He saith, *I undertake a full Comment upon these words of the Covenant*, Gen. 17. 7. *Exercit. pag.* 3. in which the Reader will not finde this undertaking. He sets down my distinction of *Abrahams seed Exercit. pag.* 3. and then saith, *here by the way Mr.* T. *mistakes himself.* 1. *In casting* Ishmael *out of Covenant in that manner, that all the time of his Circumcision he had not title to it, to that end that he might make (were it possible) the Covenant and the Seal distinct of themselves, without any relation one to the other, conceiving some to be sealed that were never in Covenant, and some to be in Covenant that were never sealed.* Ishmael *was in Covenant, as was* Esau *at his Circumcision, and his Circumcision doth witness it*, Gen. 17. 11.

Answ. I do assert, that the Covenant *Gen.* 17. was not made with *Ishmael*, for none of the promises there did belong to him, and I have further proved it from *v.* 19. 20, 21. *Heb.* 11. 9, *&c.* though not *to make the Covenant and Seal distinct of themselves, without any relation one*

to

to another; yet conceiving some were to be circumcised that were never in Covenant, and vicevers â. But Mr. Bl. thinks it proved that *Ishmael was in Covenant, because he was circumcised*, for it is said, *Circumcision shall be a token of the Covenant between me and you*, Gen. 17. 11. To which I said, the Covenant was *between God and* Abraham *and his seed in their generations*, v. 7. and *this seed* is declared exclusively of *Ishmael* to be *Isaac*, v. 21. and them that should be of him, *Gen.* 21. 12. *Rom.* 9. 7, 8. Though every persons Circumcision after Gods appointment was a token of the Covenant God made, yet not of the Covenant God made between himself and the circumcised: for the covenant of God with *Abraham* was not to every circumcised stranger, nor to every circumcised child, but between God, and *Abraham* and his seed in their generations which should be called in *Isaac*, and accordingly the covenant to be kept, v. 10. is said to be between God and *Abraham* and *Sarah*, and *Abrahams* seed. *Pareus com. on Gen.* 17. 7. *Two heads there are of the Covenant, God and Abraham; on Abrahams part also his seed or posterity are comprehended. But the seed is understood according to the limitations of Scripture here, and in other places*, Gen. 17. 21. & 21. 12. *Rom.* 9. 7, 8. *what therefore is here added in their generations, extends not the Covenant to Ishmaelites, Idumaans, and Keturaans.* There is no truth in that which Mr. *Bl.* adds, *men in Covenant were the adequate subject of Circumcision, and are of Baptism.* For the females and the males of the seventh day were in Covenant, yet not subjects of Circumcision; many Proselytes and others were the subjects of Circumcision, though not in Covenant. Nor is the reason why either this or that person was to be circumcised, and is now to be baptized his being in Covenant, but the command of God concerning them whether they be in Covenant with *God* or no, in that sense in which Pædobaptists mean when they say infants are in covenant, because of Gods covenant made to them without their own covenant, as hath been often proved. The casting out which I observe *Apol.* 114. of *Ishmael* doth not *sufficiently argue* (as Mr. *Bl.* saith) *that Ishmael was once in Covenant*, but that he was once in *Abrahams* house, from whence he was cast out.

2*ly*. Saith Mr. *Bl.* "Mr. T. does ill in laying upon *Ishmael* the "brand of Bastardy, as though he were a son of whoredomes to faithful *Abraham*; Concubines in Scripture have the name of Wives, and "their seed was ever accounted legitimate; neither will this serve his "purpose at all to argue *Ishmael* out of covenant.

Answ. I termed *Ishmael Abrahams* base natural seed, but not to argue him out of covenant, nor by terming him *base* did I term him the son of whoredomes, but of an unlawful bed. And though *Concubines in Scripture have the name of wives*, and whores are usually called those that are common to more then one, and the *sons of Concubines counted legitimate* in respect of inheritances, yet he that should say that Concubines were lawful Wives, and their children legitimate before God, must maintain the lawfulness of Concubinate and Polygamy in the Patriarchs, which our Lord Christs words gainsay, *Matth.* 19. 4, 5, 6.

M. *Bl.* having recited my words *Exercit. pag.* 3. concerning the different

ferent seed of *Abraham*, and the different manner of Gods promise to be God to them, he thus after his calumniating manner infers: *So that it evidently appears, that he casts out all the natural seed of* Abraham (*legitimate or base, as he calls them, inheriting or not inheriting*) *from any title to that Covenant, save in domestick and political benefits.* Which if true, I should cast out *Isaac*, *Jacob*, *David*, *Christ Jesus* himself from any title to that Covenant *Gen.* 17. 7. save in domestick and political benefits: which is so gross a thing, and so manifest a falshood, that I wonder Mr. *Bl.* hath the face to write such a thing of me, and to pervert my words so palpably; but that I perceive he cares little how he hazards his own credit, so he may impair mine. I say, that God promiseth he will be a God to Christ, imparting in him blessing to all nations of the earth, to the spiritual seed of *Abraham* in Evangelical benefits; to the natural seed inheriting in domestick and political benefits. How doth it sufficiently appear hence, that I cast out all the natural seed of *Abraham* from any title to that Covenant, save in domestick and political benefits? Doth it follow, that because I assigne Evangelical benefits to *Abrahams* spiritual seed, I deny any of his natural seed to be his spiritual?

To this loud calumny, he adjoyns his own gross position in these words. "Here I shall undertake a position in full opposition, I will "establish my Covenant, *&c. Gen.* 17. 7. in their fullest latitude as "they are there spoken, in the largest comprehension (which accord-"ing to Scripture they can be taken) are entred with all the natural "seed of *Abraham*, by *Isaac* and *Jacob*. Which if true, then God breaks his word if he be not a God in spiritual, and all other blessings comprehended under the phrase, *I will be a God to thee and thy seed*; to *Judas*, *Abab*, the Pharises that said Christ cast out devils by the help of devils, and so blasphemed the Holy Ghost, the Jews that rejected Christ, in effectual calling, justifying, raising to eternal life, which the Scripture comprehends under that phrase of being a God to a person, *Rom.* 9. 11. *Gal.* 3. 16. *Luk.* 20. 37, 38. He saith, *the confirmation of this position, is a matter of ease if any.* Which I acknowledge, if by [*confirmation*] be meant such as Mr. *Bl.* in his dictating and flirting fashion useth to confirm things; not distinctly opening terms, nor the meaning of the texts he brings, nor shewing by any Logical deduction the pertinency of them to prove his position. But I shall as soon expect a new world in the Moon proved as that position, by any true Logical deduction out of Scripture. He talks of *my trifling circumstances in my Examen, and foul miscarriage in my stating of the question*, even in that which was most necessary according to the rule of all Logicians, that *in every consideration of things, distinction of ambiguous terms should be used first* afore any definition, proposition, proof, or answer be made, as *Keckerm. syst. Log. l.* 1. *sect. post. c* 1. out of *Cicero*, *Boetius*, *Aristotle*, *Galen*, &c. shews; and for endeavouring to bring Mr. *M.* to state his own proposition without ambiguity, that I might know what to deny or grant, which Mr. *Bl.* terms ineptly *my soul miscarriage in my stating of the question*, when I stated not a question at all, but

only

onely sought to finde out how Mr. *M.* meant his 2d. *concl.* in his *Sermon*. But Mr. *Bl.* will have his position limited. And he speaks thus. "1. We "take not in all the natural seed of *Abraham*, as the position plainly "expresseth, but the seed by promise, which I understand not of the "elect or regenerate seed: but of that seed which G d by miracle (ac- "cording to promise) gave to *Abraham* by *Sarah*, when she was past "years of child bearing.

Answ. 1. If he *take not in all the natural seed of Abraham*, as comprehended in that promise *Gen.* 17.7. *but the seed by promise*, then the Covenant *Gen.* 17.7. was never made to *Ishmael*, which was signified by circumcision, and consequently though *Ishmael* was circumcised, yet he was never in covenant, and Mr. *Bls* position is false, *men in Covenant are the adequate subject of Circumcision.* 2. If *he understand not by* [*the children of the promise* Rom. 9.8.] *the elect or regenerate*, then he doth not understand as the Apostle doth, who declares *v.* 11. that *the seed v.* 7. who are *children of the promise v.* 8. are such as are by *Gods calling according to Gods purpose of election, v.* 11. *whom he loveth, v.* 13, *hath mercy and compassion on, v.* 15. and deserts the contrary demonstrants, as I have often shewed in this and other writings. 3. If he understand *the seed by promise* onely of that *which God by miracle (according to promise) gave to* Abraham *by* Sarah, *when she was past years of child-bearing*, then he asserts the Covenant *Gen.* 17.7. in the fullest latitude to be made wholly to *Isaac*, not to *Jacob*, or any other, for no other but *Isaac* individually taken was that *seed which God by miracle (according to promise) gave to* Abraham *by* Sarah, *when she was past years of child bearing.*

Mr. *Bl.* adds, *The natural posterity (which was the birth by promise) we onely understand; and so the Apostle explains it* Rom. 9.7, 8. *neither*, &c.

Answ. If Mr. *Bl.* understand onely *Gen.* 17.7. by [*the seed of Abraham*] *the natural posterity (which was the birth by promise)* and that according to Mr. *Bls.* description in the words immediately precedent is no other then individual *Isaac*, then he takes in no other then *Isaac* into the Covenant, *Gen.* 17.7. as meant by *Abrahams seed.* Now the Apostle is so far from *explaining it so*, that the contrary is most true. For 1. the Apostle expresly saith, *that is they which are the children of the flesh*, that is begotten by meer natural generation of *Abraham*, which is all one with *the natural posterity of* Ab aham, *these are not the children of God*, that is those to whom the promise is made *Gen.* 17.7. as the contradistinction to *the children of the promise* in the latter part of *v.* 8. shews. And that by [*children of the flesh*] are meant *meer natural posterity* appears in that *v.* 7. which is explained *v.* 8. the term [*the seed of Abraham*] is put as equipolent to [*children of the flesh.*] which understood any otherwise then thus [the seed or children of *Abraham* by meer natural generation] should exclude *Isaac* also, who was the natural posterity of *Abraham*, and so the seed of *Abraham*, but not by meer natural generation. 2. If the Apostle had *explained the seed, Gen.* 17.7. *of the natural posterity onely, which was the birth by promise* (which according to

Mr.

Mr. *Bls.* deſcription can be no more then individual *Iſaac*) then he had ſaid *Rom.* 9. 8. *but the child* of the promiſe is counted for the ſeed, not as he doth in the plural number, *the children of the promiſe*, (by whom are meant all elect perſons, who are by ſupernatural calling counted by God for the ſeed of the Gentiles as well as the Jews, as he affirms *v.* 24.) *are counted for the ſeed* to whom the promiſe *Gen.* 17. 7. is made. But Mr. *Bl.* goes on thus.

" Where children of God is taken in the ſame latitude as adopti-
" on, *v.* 4. comprizing all the viſible body of the Jews, as it is alſo
" taken, *Deut.* 14. 1.

Anſw. The right reading (as I have before proved) of *Rom.* 9 4. ſhould be [*whoſe was the adoption*] and this is meant indeed of the viſible body of Iſraelites in former generations, excluding the preſent; nor do I deny it to be ſo meant, *Deut.* 14. 1. but not ſo as either then or at any time comprizing every particular Jew, but as Mr. *Bl.* himſelf rightly explaineth ſuch paſſages in his *anſwer to my letter* pag. 51. (though ill applied to *Rom.* 9. 25, 26.) *the denomination being a* præſtantiori parte, *as we call it, a heap of corn, where yet there is a mixture of chaff, and a corn field, where there is a mixture of tares and other weeds; and as the Apoſtle* (*writing to the Church of the Theſſalonians*) *ſaith, knowing brethren your election of God, and yet I ſuppoſe you do not believe that each particular man was a veſſel of glory.* But I go after Mr. *Bl.*

" Onely, *ſaith he*, thoſe that are born by promiſe are included, and
" ſo all the ſons of *Iſhmael* and *Keturah*, though their parents were once
" in Covenant, are by Gods ſpecial command ſhut out.

Anſw. 1. There are no more born by promiſe according to Mr. *Bls.* deſcription but *Iſaac*, and ſo no more according to him included; not *Jacob*, much leſs *all the viſible body of the Jews*. 2. If *thoſe that are born by promiſe onely are included*, then *Iſhmael*, and *the ſons of Keturah* who were not born by promiſe, are not included in the Covenant *Gen.* 17. 7. then they were never in Covenant, for none were never in that Covenant, who were not included in the promiſe. 3. The Scripture doth not mention *any ſpecial command to ſhut out* Iſhmael *out of the Covenant he was once in*, but to caſt him out of *Abrahams* houſe. Nor do I ſee in what ſenſe *Abraham* could be ſaid to caſt him out of Covenant. Surely not by revoking Gods promiſe, that were little leſs then blaſphemy, to aſcribe to *Abraham* the evacuating of Gods word; not by uncircumciſing him, for neither was any ſuch thing done, though *Abraham* obeyed God, nor perhaps could be done. What other way he might ſhut him out of Covenant I do not underſtand. 4. If *Iſhmael were once in the Covenant*, as it comprehends the promiſe of Evangelical grace, then God promiſed to be his God in reſpect of regeneration, juſtification, adoption, ſanctification and raiſing up to eternall life, and he was in that eſtate, and if he were ſhut out again, then a man may be in the covenant of Evangelical grace and ſhut out again, which is contrary to the very end of the new Covenant, as it is expreſſed *Heb.* 8. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. and infers falling away from Goſpel grace.

Mr. *Bl.* proceeds thus. "Neither are all these included; for as "God cast off *Ishmael* and his seed, so also *Esau* and his posterity; "therefore the Apostle having brought the former distinction of seeds, "rests not there but adds *v.* 10, 11, 12, 13. And therefore the deno- "mination of the seed is in *Jacob*, surnamed *Israel*; Therefore when "the head, or if you will, root of the Covenant is mentioned; usually "in Scripture it is not barely *Abraham*, but *Abraham* and *Isaac*, to "exclude all *Abrahams* seed of any other line; not barely *Abraham* and "*Isaac*, but *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*. The natural seed of *Jacob* then "(not according to ours, but Gods own limits) is included in that Co- "venant in the full latitude and extent of it.

Answ. 1. The terms *head* or *root of the Covenant*, are not Scripture expressions. I finde *Gal.* 3. 16. that *to Abraham and his seed were the promises made*, and *Rom.* 11. 16. *If the root be holy so are the branches*, *v.* 18. *thou bearest not the root, but the root thee*; but this root is I conceive, no other then *Abraham*, who is not termed either *head* or *root of the Covenant* singly or jointly, but of the olive or branches in respect of their propagation from him partly as a natural father, and a spiritual father in respect of Israelite believers, and partly as a spiritual father onely in respect of Gentile believers. But if any be to be termed the head and root of the Covenant, I think it is most fit to give that title to Christ, the *surety and mediatour*, *Heb.* 7. 22. & 8. 6. *to whom the promises were made*, *Gal.* 3. 16, 17. 2. When God is stiled *the God of Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, that it is *to exclude all Abrahams seed of any other line*, and to say that *God cast off Esau and his posterity from the Covenant*, is more then the Apostle saith, or is according to truth. For the Apostle doth onely say, that therefore the Oracle was delivered concerning *Esau* and *Jacob*, and the words of the Prophet concerning *Jacob* and *Esau* are alledged, that he might shew that God confined not his Covenant to *Abrahams* natural posterity, nor included them all; not to shew that he cast off or *excluded all Abrahams seed of any other line* then *Isaac* and *Jacob* from the Covenant. For then *Job*, *Jethro*, and all other Proselytes of *Abrahams* seed by *Keturah*, of *Esau's* posterity had been excluded from the Covenant of grace in Christ, which is contrary to Scripture; and in like sort, all the Gentiles from *Ishmael*, *Keturah*, *Esau*, had been excluded from being called Christian believers. For none are called by God who are excluded out of the Covenant of grace. 3. That *the natural seed of Jacob is included in that Covenant* Gen. 17. 7. *in the full latitude and extent of it*, as it comprehends a promise of Evangelical grace, is so far from being the Apostles determination, that he resolves in the contrary in those words *Rom.* 9. 6. *All are not Israel, that are of Israel.*

Secondly, saith Mr. *Bl.* "We do not say that this Covenant was en- "tred with *Abraham* as a natural Father, nor his seed comprehended as "natural children; but as a professour of the Faith accepting the Co- "nant, taking God for his God; he accepts it for himself, and for his "seed, his natural posterity. And all that profess the Faith hold in "the like tenure, are in Covenant, and have the Covenant; not re-

"fled

" sted in their own persons, but enlarged to their posterity.

Answ. I do not remember that I did any where say that Pædobaptists said, that covenant *Gen.* 17. 7. was entred with *Abraham as a natural Father*, but the *Author of the little Treatise* intituled *Infants Baptism proved lawful by Scripture, asserted the Covenant was made with Abraham as a believer*; to which I replied, that as it was Evangelical it was not made with *Abraham* simply as a believer, for then it had been made to every believer as to *Abraham*, but with *Abraham* as the Father of believers, and with his seed as believers as he was. But that ever any Pædo baptist did afore Mr. *Bl.* assert that the Covenant Gen. 17. 7. as it was a Covenant of Evangelical grace, was *entred by God with him as a professour of the faith, accepting the Covenant taking God for his God, accepting it for himself and for his seed, his natural posterity*, I do not remember. If they should, yet I take it to be false, and without likelihood of truth. For if the Covenant of Evangelical grace were made with *Abraham* under that formal consideration, then God had promised Evangelical grace, justication, adoption, to him as a professour of faith onely, so that if it were supposed he had been an hopocrite, yet he should have been justified, adopted in that he was a professour of faith, or else it is to be conceived justification and adoption were not to *Abraham* by this Covenant, contrary to *Gal.* 3. 16, 17, 18. nor hath it any likelihood of truth, that God would single out so exemplary a believer as *Abraham* was, *Rom.* 4. 18, 19. and enter so solemn a Covenant with him barely as a professour of faith, which was competent to an hypocrite. Nor do I well know in what sense *God entred the Covenant with him as a professour of the faith accepting the Covenant for himself and his seed.* For Gods entring the Covenant is no other then his making of it: But God did not make it on this condition that *Abraham* should accept it for him and his seed, but as knowing *Abrahams* integrity, by way of testification of his love and grace to him being so eminent and tried a believer afore this Covenant was made with him. Nor is it true *that all that profess the faith hold in the like tenure, are in Covenant, and have the Covenant*; not *vested in their own persons, but enlarged to their posterity*, there being none in the Covenant *Gen.* 17. 7. but *Abraham and his seed*, of whom no meer professour of faith, much less his seed, except elect or true believer is either. Nor was the Covenant ever made to *Abrahams* or *Israels* mere natural posterity as it is Evangelical; much less enlarged to the posterity natural of every professour of faith.

Thirdly, *saith Mr. Bl.* " We entitle the seed of *Abraham*, as before, " to spiritual mercies (and so the seed of all that hold in the tenure of " *Abraham*) to saving grace, and justification to life eternal; not by " an absolute conveyance infallibly to inherit (we know though *Israel* " be as the sand of the sea, yet a remnant onely shall be saved, *Rom.* 9. " 27.) but upon Gods terms, and conditions in the Gospel of God, " held out of God to his people; salvation is made over by vertue of " Covenant, to all thus in Covenant in that sense as Christ speaks " *Joh.* 4. 22. salvation is of the Jews. In that sense as Christ of that

" of *Zacheus* family; this day is salvation come to this house, *Luk.* 19.
" 9. In that sense as the Apostle to the Hebrews speaks of it, where he
" sets out the danger of neglecting so great salvation, *Heb.* 2. 3. In that
" sense (as I conceive) the Apostle speaks of it, where he saith, that up-
" on the call of the Jews all Israel shall be saved, *Rom.* 11. 26.

Answ. That by [*salvation Luk.* 19. 9. *Heb.* 2. 3. *Rom.* 11. 26.] is not meant *outward priviledges, in which salvation upon Gods terms may be obtained*, hath been shewed before Sect. 44 And though I grant that *salvation* is said *to be of the Jews*, in that from them was the doctrine of salvation, yet I see no necessity to expound the term [*salvation*] metonymically, as if by [*salvation*] were meant barely the doctrine of salvation, but the sense may be truely conceived thus, *salvation*, remission of sins, justification, adoption, eternal life, *is of the Jews*, as instruments by preaching the Gospel of converting, and so saving men. But that God when he promised *Gen.* 17. 7. *I will be thy God and the God of thy seed* (as this promise is Evangelical) meant this, *all the professors of faith and their seed shall enjoy those priviledges, in which salvation upon Gods terms may be obtained*, is proved false. 1. In that the writers of the New Testament never so explain it, but where the promise is mentioned as Evangelical, they declare it imports a further thing proper to the elect and true believers. 2 That they never by *Abrahams* seed as Evangelically understood, mean any other then elect persons and true believers: both which are proved largely before Sect. 28. 3. That in this sense the promise were not made good, for God doth not make good to every professour of faith that he shall have those priviledges, as to be baptized, be in Church-communion, have the the Lords supper, have a Pastour to preach the Gospel, much less to every one of his natural seed, as frequent experience shews. 4. By this expositon nothing is assured to the infant of a believer, or to a professour of faith, which is not also to an unbelievers child, yea to an unbeliever, who as well as they *have title to saving grace, and justification to eternal life, upon termes and conditions in the Gospel of God, held out of God to his people.*

Mr. Bl. adds, " And this [that professors of faith or believers up-
" on their call shall enjoy those priviledges, in which salvation upon
" Gods terms may be obtained] is all that can by any means be squee-
" zed out of their words, that say, the Covenant of grace was made
" of God, with *Abraham* and his natural seed, or with believers and
" their seed. It is even irksome to read the large business that Mr. *I.*
" makes of it, to hide out Mr. *Ms.* meaning, about the Covenant of
" God made with *Abraham* and his seed; and both Mr. *M.* and my self
" must per force confess that we mean it of a Covenant, infallibly ab-
" solutely to confer grace, and consequently salvation.

Answ. 1. That more may be squeezed out, is proved in my *Exam. part* 3 *sect.* 3. in this *part* of the *Review sect.* 30, 31, *&c.* And if no more be meant by them, these things will follow. 1. That they mean by the Covenant of grace, a covenant of outward priviledges, of visible Church-membership, Baptism, the Lords Supper, to every believer by profes-

en, though a Gentile, and his natural seed, under the pretence of the Covenant, *Gen.* 17.7. which pretended outward Covenant of outward privileges is a meer counterfeit, neither *Gen.* 17.7. nor any where else to be found in the holy Scripture. 2. They do most grosly abuse the text, *Gen.* 17.7. for proving such a Covenant, quite besides the expositions given of it throughout the New Testament, as is proved in this Part of the *Review*, *sect.* 28. and quite besides the expositions even of the reformed Divines, though Pædobaptists, in their commentaries on the N. T. and writings against Arminians. 3. They do mock Readers most palpably 1. in telling them the *Covenant of grace contains the promise of remission of sins, &c.* is *for substance the same in all ages*, and say *it belongs to all the infants of beleevers*, that *they are in it*, that is the Covenant of grace, *they are confederate with parents*, as the words of the *Directory*, Mr. *M.* and others cited by me, *Exam part.* 3 *sect.* 3 shew; and yet deny this Covenant of saving grace is made to them all, but upon such conditions as upon which it is made to unbeleevers children yea, to every man in the world. 2. In that they when they make *the sacraments to be seals of the Covenant of grace*, and attempt to prove it from *Rom.* 4.11. which mentions onely *a seal of the righteousnes of faith* they make them seals of the righteousnes of faith, and say *infants are in the Covenant*, and *the seal must follow the Covenant*, and yet nevertheless deny all the infants they baptize by vertue of being in the Covenant (of which Baptism is a seal) to be in that Covenant of which Baptism is a seal; but say they are in a meer imaginary Covenant, which they call an outward Covenant, of which Baptism is no seal, but rather according to their conceits, the thing it self covenanted or promised. 3. They mock parents, by telling them in writings and sermons, that they are to be comforted concerning their children, that if they be beleevers their children are saved by vertue of the promise *Gen.* 17.7. that they are bound to beleeve it; and yet when they are pressed with the Apostles determination, *Rom.* 9.6,7,8. and other arguments, *they deny that they understand it of the Covenant of saving grace*, (which alone can infer salvation) *infallibly and absolutely to confer grace*; but either they make it onely conditional if they repent and beleeve, which no man is sure any infant doth; or they say in the judgement of charity (which is fallible, and is no object of faith) we are to take them to be in Covenant and to be saved, or else they say (which is now the common shift) they are in the outward Covenant, which is a figment, and of which they cannot say but that a person may be in it and not saved. 4. That sith it is commonly conceited by readers and hearers that they mean that which Mr *M.* Mr *G.* Mr *Bl. &c.* do disclaim, Pædobaptists are bound to teach the people at their baby-sprinklings, and at other times when they avouch the infants of beleevers and of meer visible professors of faith to be in the Covenant of grace, *Gen.* 17.7. and thereupon derive their title to Baptism that they mean but as Mr. *M.* Mr. *Bl.* say, that they may acquit themselves from deceiving the people, and being judged impostors.

2. It is no marvel that the 3d. Section of the 3d. Part of my *Examen*

is

is irkſome to Mr. *Bl.* to read, ſith it doth ſo fully lay open the fallacy of Pædobapiſts in their ſpeeches concerning the infants of beleevers being in Covenant. Nor did I ſet down the poſition I conceived Mr. *Ms.* 2d. *concl.* any otherwiſe then in a fair candid way, giving my reaſons thereof; and not as Mr. *Bl.* ſaith, *per force* impoſing any thing on him. And for Mr. *M.* it is ſhewed above §. 30. that Mr. *M.* in his *Defence* hath rather hidden then explained the meaning of his 2d. *Concluſion*. As for M. *Bl.* I did acknowledge *Exam.* p. 46. that he ſpake moſt warily, and therefore was far from obtruding upon him. But yet Mr. *Bl.* for want of other exceptions againſt me, chargeth me with wronging him in a paſſage in my *Apology*, pag. 156. where I ſay, How doth this ſtand with that which he aſſerts, *ch.* 3. *ſect.* 2. of his *anſwer to my Letter*, pag. 13. That infants of beleevers have ſalvation, if they die in their infancy, by vertue of the Covenant? *Theſe words*, he ſaith, *were none of his, and that I could not but know it, when I publiſhed them; and that the meaning was not his, I knew alſo, ſeeing he expreſſed it in theſe words, That they are in the ordinary way of Gods diſpenſation ſaveable.* To which I reply, The aſſertion I conceived his, I gathered from thoſe words in the place cited by me, *That Scripture therefore, 1 Cor.* 7. 14. *in this controverſie is ſtill brought in by our Divines, as evidently holding out a Covenant holineſs, and conſequently ſalvation of infants.* And truly I muſt confeſs I thought his words ſo plain, that I never dreamt he would have denied it to be his meaning, conceiving he alledged the Proteſtant Divines as conſonant to his own opinion; and that if ſalvation of Infants be inferred conſequently from covenant holineſs (which Mr. *Bl.* aſſerts from 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.) then it is Mr. *Bls.* meaning, that infants of beleevers have ſalvation in their infancy, if they die in their infancy, by vertue of the Covenant, and that he aſſerts a certainty of ſalvation from the Covenant. That which he ſaith, *I knew that the meaning I impute to him was not his becauſe of the words he ſets down, and therefore a calumny tending to make a brother odious*, is I am ſure falſe, and a calumny which I never expect to have fairly anſwered by him, nor almoſt any thing elſe he is charged with by me to have dealt fouly in his oppoſing me about this point. The words he mentions were in the period before thus. *This Papiſts deny, as not knowing how to avoid the ſalvation of infants, but that they are in the ordinary way of Gods diſpenſation ſaveable, when they are thus admitted within the verge of Gods promiſe.* Which being ſpoken of the Papiſts, I did not conceive ſo likely to explain the ſpeech of the period following, as that other a little before, *Proteſtants affirm that infants without actual admiſſion to Baptiſm are ſaved. The main argument wherewith Proteſtants aſſert it, is the Covenant, in which with the parents, infants are included*: and I conceived [*are ſaved*] is as much as are actually ſaved. Nor am I yet ſo well indoctrinated by Mr. *Bl.* as not to think it had been non-ſenſe (which I would not impute to Mr. *Bl.*) to expound *ſalvation of infants*, by *ſaveableneſs in the ordinary way of Gods diſpenſation*. Nor did I imagine that by Mr. *Bl.* much leſs by Proteſtan Divines, a ſaveableneſs onely in Gods ordinary way of diſpenſation, ſhould be made the conſequent of Covenant holineſs, but a certainty

tainty of salvation. For the Covenant or promise doth not assure onely a possibility, but a certainty; yea, possibilities are not the things which men ever assure, they are antecedent to Covenants and promises, but certain events; and to imagine Gods Covenant to assure onely a possibility, a saveableness, and not a certainty of salvation, is to make God to promise nothing, but what is without such a Covenant, which is to make it a blank. And if the Covenant holiness infer onely a conditional salvation, it infers no more salvation then damnation: yea if infants have no more by their Covenant holiness then a saveableness in Gods ordinary way of dispensation, then they have onely a saveableness if they be baptized, hear the Gospel preached, beleeve it, profess it (which is the ordinary way whereby God dispenseth salvation.) But if this were Mr. *Bls.* meaning, he had made Baptism, &c. a necessary condition of their salvation, and so he had tied their salvation with the Papists to Baptism, or rather been more rigid then they, *durior pater infantum Augustino*, requiring the hearing the word, actual faith, and profession of them to salvation. So that I hope by this time Mr. *Bl.* will forgive me this wrong, in setting down his opinion better then he meant it, and that he will let fall his suit against me for this thing: And if so, I will forgive him for his next insinuation of *my setting up a man of straw* and *then beating it down* (though it be indeed the common saying of Pædobaptists, who usually say, the Covenant of grace sealed by Baptism, (which is that of justification) is made to beleevers and their seed, *the promise is to them and their children, Acts* 2.39. which is meant by them of remission of sins,) and for his frivolous charge of my using the arguments of Jesuits, and making use of Protestants names, when I do bring not onely the names, but the very words and arguments of the most approved Protestant writers in great number, and produce one Papist, *Estius* alone, no Jesuite, but, though a Papist, of the better sort; and do, and may safely protest, that some of those Mr. *Bl.* chargeth me with I did not read; and for one, what I read in him came not into my mind when I wrote that *Examen* of Mr. *Ms. sermon.* So that what Mr. *Bl.* doth so often insinuate, as tending to make me suspected as if my arguments against Infant Baptism were borrowed from Papists, even then when I avouch Protestants, is a most unworthy calumny, though I still say I am glad when I find truth, that I meet with it in any Authors, whether Protestants or Papists, and think it not the worse for their owning it.

Mr. *Bl.* after his false accusations of me, and limitations of his own tenet, speaks thus. "To draw all up towards a conclusion. All that "is necessarily included in Gods entrance of Covenant with a people, "engaging to be their God, and taking them for his people; is here by "this grand Charter of Heaven made over to *Abraham*, and his natural "issue by *Isaac* and *Jacob*. All their posterity are branches of this root "by nature simply considered, and they are holy branches by vertue "of this Covenant, which necessarily implies privileges of Ordinances, the fruition of Gods Oracles, which are his Covenant draughts; "without which no people are in Covenant, but all are strangers:

"And

"And this priviledge of Ordinances implies also all priviledges, lead-
"ing to, and accompanying salvation, and salvation it self upon Gods
"terms in his word revealed. And so before the disputation, the Read-
"er hath my supposition.

Answ. The Reader hath a supposition indeed, but such a one, as if he examine it, he will be more to seek concerning Mr. *Bls.* mind, then if he had omitted it. But I shall as fairly as the ambiguity of his expressions will permit, search out his meaning. There are no fewer then nine Propositions thrust together in these words of his, *That all that is necessarily included in Gods entrance of Covenant with a people, engaging to be their God, and taking them for his people; is here by this grand Charter of Heaven made over to Abraham, and his natural issue by Isaac and Jacob.* In which, 1. he asserts the promise *Gen* 17. 7. to be *the grand Charter of Heaven*: And I grant it to be so in the sense in which the Apostle means it, *Gal.* 3. 16, 17, 18. *Rom* 4. 16. and elsewhere, to wit, as it is a promise of regeneration, justification, eternal life, which I call Evangelical grace. 2. He speaks of *Gods entrance of Covenant with a people, engaging to be their God, and taking them for his people, and of things necessarily excluded in this entrance of Covenant.* But there are many ambiguities in these expressions. The term *entrance into Covenant* is ambiguous: He may be said to enter into Covenant who offers it, or who makes and concludes it. The term *people of God* is ambiguous; it may be meant either of his people by special right, as the ten Tribes were when they fell off to idolatry; or his people by outward profession onely, or his people by effectual saving calling. The terms *engaging to be their God*, and *taking them for his people*, may be understood in respect of temporary protection, advancement, rule, *&c.* or righteousness and eternal life. The word *people* may note either singular persons, or the collective body of a Nation which may not include every singular person. He supposeth *things necessarily included in Gods entrance of Covenant with a people*: But I am not yet convinced that any things are necessarily included in Gods entrance of Covenant with a people, engaging to be their God, and taking them for his people; but that all things therein included are arbitrary, or of his free-will. And if there be any things necessarily included, sure they are not priviledges of Ordinances, I mean initial and after Seals, visible Church membership of Infants; for God entred into Covenant with *Abraham* long before, and never promised those things; so he did with *Noah*, and with *Adam*. And that which agreeably to the Scripture was promised *Gen* 17. 7. was to the natural seed of *Abraham* by *Isaac* and *Jacob*, peculiar protection, provision, rule, 1 *Sam.* 12. 12. by giving Laws to them, appointing them Judges, directing them by Oracles in war and peace, *&c.* To the spiritual seed of *Abraham* the promise was of Christ, righteousness, adoption, and the inheritance of eternal life; not those petty things which Mr. *Bl.* doth frivolously imagine to have been contained in that grand Charter of Heaven, as he calls it, which is the thing that Mr. *Bl.* would fain squeeze out of that text, though there be not the least colour in all the holy Scripture for it. His second Proposition is, that

All

All Isaac's and Jacobs posterity are branches of this root by nature simply considered; which if he understand of *Abraham*, and *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, as a natural root, propagating them by natural generation, I grant it; if he mean it of *a Covenant root*, as he calls it, as deriving from them Evangelical grace by the Covenant *Gen.* 17. 7. I deny it. His 3d. is, *and they are holy branches by vertue of this Covenant*; which if he mean they were holy in respect of Gods special rule, setting up his Tabernacle among them and such like prerogatives as are mentioned *Rom.* 9. 4, 5. I grant it: But if he mean it of holiness according to election of grace, as *Rom.* 11. 16. is meant, it is not true. His 4th. is, that *this Covenant necessarily implies priviledge of Ordinances, the fruition of Gods Oracles*: which if he mean in this sense, that Gods worship should be among them, that the Laws of God, and his Word should be to the collective body of Israel, I grant it; but if he mean it of visible church-membership of infants, initial and after Seals, which is the thing he aims at,) I deny it. The 5th. *that priviledge of Ordinances, and fruition of Gods Oracles, are Gods Covenant draughts*, hath the same answer. The 6th. and 7th. that *without this priviledges of Ordinances and fruition of Gods Oracles, no people are in Covenant, but all are strangers*; if it be meant of the Covenant of Evangelical grace, and of particular persons, the Propositions are manifestly false; for then no infants dying afore they have an initial Seal, hear the Word, *&c.* should be in Covenant: if it be meant of the priviledges of Ordinances, and fruition of Gods Ordinances in any sort, I grant, that if there be no worship of God among them, no fruition of Gods Word written or unwritten, no people of ripe age, whether families, or nations, or single persons, can be said to be in Covenant, but are strangers from it; but if they be understood of such peculiar Ordinances and Oracles as the Jews had, *Rom.* 9. 4, 5. I deny it; for *Adam, Seth, Enoch, Noah, &c.* were in Covenant with God without them. His 8th. *And this priviledge of Ordinances implies also all priviledges leading to, and accompanying salvation*; if meant of in-being in Christ, having his spirit to dwell in them, which are the chief priviledges leading to, and accompanying salvation, and of all that have the priviledge of Ordinances, I deny it; unless he mean it as he doth the 9th. Proposition, that *this priviledge of Ordinances implies salvation it self upon Gods terms in his word revealed*, which are Repentance and Faith in Christ, and then both Propositions are granted, the 8th. and the 9th. that the priviledge of Ordinances doth imply both in-being in Christ, and his spirits in-dwelling, and salvation it self to them that repent and believe in Christ. Which is true also of them that have not this priviledge of Ordinances, as *Cornelius*, and many more. And thus Mr. *Bl.* also hath my exposition and answer concerning his position and supposition: Let's now see what he proves.

SECT. XLVIII.

The 35th. and 37th. Chapters of Mr. Bls. Vind. Fæd. are examined, and his Arguments concluding the natural issue of believers to be taken into Covenant, are answered.

HE intitles thus *ch.* 35. *Arguments concluding the natural issue of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to be taken into Covenant*; which he may prove and not oppose me, who grant, that God promiseth *Gen.* 17. 7 to be a God to the natural seed of *Abraham*, inheriting in domestick and political benefits: From whence he falsly infers, that *I cast out all the natural seed of Abraham from any title to that Covenant, save in domestick and political benefits*; and then *undertakes this Position in full opposition, That Covenant in those words expresst Gen.* 17. 7. *in their fullest latitude, as they are spoken in the largest comprehension (which according to Scripture they can be taken,) are entred with all the natural seed of Abraham by Isaac and Jacob.* So that if *to be a God, Gen.* 17. 7. *to Abraham and his seed*, comprehend Evangelical benefits of regeneration, justification, eternal life, his position is, That the Covenant is entred in respect of these benefits, with all the natural seed of *Abraham* by *Isaac* and *Jacob*: which can be meant no otherwise then thus, God had promised, *Gen.* 17. 7. these benefits to them all: For the Covenant could be no otherwise entred with them, *Isaac* and *Jacob* being not then begotten, nor in being, and therefore the entry into Covenant could not be mutual. Here then the Question between us is not, Whether the natural issue of *Abraham* by *Isaac* and *Jacob* were taken into Covenant? *Gen.* 17. 7. for I grant that God there promised to be a God to them by domestick and political benefits, to wit, by setting up his worship more peculiarly in that nation, by raising up the Messiah out of them, by giving them peculiar Laws himself, raising up Judges and Governours for them, vouchsafing them peculiar protection which he vouchsafed not to other people, directing them by his Oracle when they enquired of him, *&c.* And these benefits he promised to them all conditionally if they adhered to God: But the Question between us is; Whether *Gen.* 17. 7. God have promised to all the natural issue of *Abraham* by *Isaac* and *Jacob*, the Evangelical benefits of regeneration, justification, and eternal life, supposed to be meant in the words, *to be a God to thy seed?* This I deny, and Mr *Bl.* should prove, if he dispute in opposition to me. However let's view what he writes.

"My first argument (saith he) is taken from the addition annexed "to this Covenant in the words immediately following *v.* 8. That seed "of *Abraham* that had possession of the Land of *Canaan* through the "gift and by vertue of the promise of God, is the seed here taken into "Covenant to have the Lord for their God. This is so plain, that no-"thing can be plainer to any that read the words; but the natural seed

"of

" of *Abraham*, all the ſeed of *Jacob* in their ſeveral Tribes (record-
" ing as God ſet them their bounds) inherited the Land of *Cana-*
" *an*, which is called the Land of their inheritance, and not onely the
" ſpiritual ſeed regenerate, they that onely ſojourned in *Canaan*, *Heb.*
" 11.13. and were never poſſeſſed of it, had title to it: It was theirs in
" reverſion, though they never came into actual poſſeſſion.

Anſw. 1. The *major* is not true, if the ſubject of the Propoſition be underſtood exclusively, or univerſally, and the phraſe in the predicate [*to have the Lord for their God*] be meant in reſpect of the Evangelical benefits of regeneration, juſtification, and eternal life. It is not true, that God hath covenanted to be a God in reſpect of theſe benefits to all, or onely to that ſeed of *Abraham* that had poſſeſſion of the Land of *Canaan* through the gift, and by vertue of the promiſe of God: nor doth the Text at all make it plain. For though it prove that the ſeed of *Abraham* meant in the fore part of *Gen.* 17. *v.*8. were alſo meant *v.*7. yet it doth not prove that all, or they onely that had the promiſe of *Canaan*, had the promiſe of being a God to them in Goſpel grace. The *minor* is granted, [*all*] being meant, as they ſpeak in Logick, diſtributively in *genera ſingulorum*, that is, of any ſorts of them, but not in *ſingulos generum*; and with limitation to certain times fore-appointed of God, not in all times. All ſorts inherited, but ſome were not to inherit till a certain time, and for a certain time; *A baſtard*, *Mamzer*, *Deut.*23.2. *was not to enter into the congregation of the Lord*, and ſo not to inherit regularly *till the tenth generation*. But were Mr. *Bls.* concluſion granted, it proves not what I deny, that to all, and every Iſraelite God promiſed Evangelical benefits, *Gen.* 17. 7. or viſible church membership and initial ſeal at all to any in that promiſe, *Gen.* 17.7.

" My next argument, ſaith he, is drawn from the ſeal that is annexed
" in the words immediately following this additional promiſe, *v.* 9.10.
" 11. They that had the ſign and ſeal of the Covenant, that had it by
" Divine appointment they were a people in Covenant. This is ſo
" plain, that nothing can be more plain; God doth not enter Cove-
" nant with one and give the ſign and ſeal to another: But all the na-
" tural ſeed of *Abraham* by *Iſaac* and *Jacob* had the ſeal, *viz.* all the
" males, thoſe that were in a capacity of it; it was not limited to the
" ſpiritual ſeed. There had been no place for that diſtinction, of cir-
" cumciſion in the fleſh, and circumciſion of the heart; if none muſt be
" circumciſed in the fleſh, but thoſe that are circumciſed in heart.

Anſw. 1. Waving my exception againſt the title of *ſeal of the Covenant*, not given to circumciſion, or any other Rite in the Scripture, and inconvenient as is before proved, and putting in [*Circumciſion*] inſtead of it; I deny the *major*, if underſtood univerſally: nor is the *major* plainly true, but plainly falſe, it being manifeſt in that very Covenant, that God entred it not with *Iſhmael* and others whom he appointed to be circumciſed. Nor is any thing more plain then the contrary to what Mr. *Bl.* aſſerts. For God did enter into Covenant with the natural ſeed female inheriting of *Abraham* by *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, according

to Mr. *Bl.* himself; the daughters of *Zelophehad* were in Covenant, and yet he did give the sign of the Covenant to others, and not to them. Nor is the *minor* true; for the males of seven days old were in a capacity of circumcision, yet they had it not. I grant that circumcision was not limited to the spiritual seed, yet conecive Mr. *Bls.* proof of no force: For though it had been so limited, yet there had been place for the distinction of circumcision in the flesh, and of the heart, sith things may be distinguished which are not separate. But were the conclusion granted, it fails as the former in proving what I deny.

"My 3d. argument, saith he, is drawn from the Comment that God "himself makes of this Covenant, holding it every where out in this "way of tenure to *Abraham* and his natural issue, as before, *Exod.* 20.2. "*Deut* 5. 6. All that whole people he owned as his, all of them being "*Abrahams* natural issue; yet all of them were not spiritual. *Exod.* 5. "1. *Deut.* 14.1,2. *Amos* 3.1,2. is very full to our purpose. Every one "that descended from *Jacob*, the whole of the family that came out of "*Ægypt*, were a select people to God in Covenant; he was according "to the terms of that Covenant, their God. There is not a place where "God calls them by the name of his people (which are almost endless) "but there we have this confirmed, that that people were the Lords by "vertue of this grant made to *Abraham* and his seed.

Answ. This last speech might be granted, and what else Mr. *Bl.* inters from the Text; yet he attains not his end, unless he prove that by vertue of that Covenant all the Israelits by natural discent were God's regenerate, justified people; for the thing he should prove against me, is, that *Gen.* 17.7. God promiseth to be a God in respect of Gospel benefits to all *Abrahams* natural issue by *Isaac* and *Jacob*. Yet I conceive there are places wherein the Israelites were termed *Gods* by vertue of the Covenant of the Law *Ezek.* 16 8. & 20.5. &c. without mentioning the Covenant *Gen.* 17.7 which the Apostle conceives differently of, *Gal.* 3.16,17. And the scriptures *Exod.* 20.2. *Deut.* 5 6. *Exod.* 5.1. *Deut.* 14.1,2. though spoken of the body of Israel, yet may and are to be understood, at least in some senses of them, not of every individual: Surely he was not *God* Evangelically to those that believed not, nor were they his people, nor legally, so as to afford them that protection, and temporal blessings which are promised in the Law, *Deut.* 28. &c. to *Abab*, *Achan*, *Korah*, and such like. But in the Evangelical sense the denomination is from the better part, *the people before knew*, as the Apostle himself expounds it, *Rom.* 11. 2, 5. and in respect of political blessings according to the Covenant of the Law, to the obedient to the Law, as of long life to dutifull children, safety while they kept the Solemn Feasts. *Exod.* 20. 12. & 34.24. Nor doth *Amos* 3.1,2. *which*, he saith, *is full to his purpose*, say, that *God* was a *God to that whole family which he brought out of Ægypt* by vertue of the *Covenant*, *Gen.* 17.7. much less to every one of them Evangelically, nor doth he say *he had known them all* Evangelically, but *had known them onely*, that is, had distinguished them from other people by giving them his Laws, &c. which makes nothing

thing to prove according to *Gen.* 17.7. *God* took every descendent from *Jacob* into Covenant in respect of Gospel benefits.

"In the 4th place, *saith he*, I argue from the practise of the people "of God, making this Covenant of God entred with *Abraham* and his "seed, a Plea to obtain mercy from God for all Israel, the worst of Is-"rael, in their lowest state and condition, *Deut.* 9.26,27. If this Divi-"nity had been th n known, *Moses* might have been sent away with this "answer; *That he spake for dogs, and not for children; not for Israel "but for Aliens and strangers to the Common-wealth of Israel.* But as this "and the like requests of the people of God were made in faith, so they "prevailed with God; *Moses* there urgeth, *they are thy people and thine "inheritance*, v.29. as doth the Church, *Isa.* 64. 9. and *Moses* petition "takes, as the History shews, *Exod.* 32. 14. Yea, when God vouch-"safes mercy to his people thus in Covenant, *Levit.* 26. 42. it is upon "this account of the Covenant. And appearing for the deliverance of "Israel out of their hard and pressing bondage, he saith to *Moses*, *Exod.* "3. 6. and that to stay up his faith in confidence of deliverance.

Answ. That which Mr. *Bl.* should prove, is, *That Covenant expressed in those words Gen.* 17. 7. *in their fullest latitude as they are spoken, in the largest comprehension (which according to Scripture they can be taken) are entred with all the natural seed of* Abraham *by* Isaac *and* Jacob. And in his *answer to my Letter*, ch. 10. pag. 55,56. he urgeth *Exod.* 32. 13. *Deut.* 29.27, *Levit* 26.42. *Exod.* 3.6. to prove that *Gen* 17.7. *was a promise of grace and mercy to* Jacobs *posterity, such as of which Circumcision was a seal, Rom.* 4. 11. which he saith *is no other then a Covenant of grace*, and saith *Circumcision did seal that Covenant, to be the God of believers, and their seed, Gen*, 17.7,10. But not one of the petitions or speeches alledged do prove either the former, or this last assertion. The petition of *Moses*, *Exod.* 32.13. was upon occasion of the making of the golden Calf, & Gods speech to *Moses* concerning the consuming of them for it, and making *Moses* a great Nation: *Moses* to divert God from this thing, alledgeth, 1. That *they were his people which he brought out of Ægypt with great power, and a mighty hand*; and if he should consume them, the Ægyptians would reproach him, as intending mischief to them when he brought them out of *Ægypt*. Where it is true, God calls the body of them his people: But this must be understood, if Evangelically; in respect of the better part onely; if Legally, either *de jure* because they ought to have been his people, being delivered from *Ægypt*, and having engaged themselves *Exod.* 19.8. to obey God; or *de facto*, because he had done so great things for them, and thereby owned them in respect of his actings for them above other people. 2. He presseth God with his Oath to *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*. But the Oath he mentions is concerning *the multiplying the seed of* Abraham, Isaac *and* Jacob *as the stars of heaven, and giving the land of Canaan to them*, and that they shall *inherit it for ever*; not a word of being God to all the natural issue of *Abraham* by *Isaac* and *Jacob* in respect of Evangelical blessings, nor a word tending to shew the extent of th promise *Gen.* 17.7. in respect of gospel grace. The same answer I give to his allega-

tion.

tion of *Deut.* 9. 26, 27, 28, 29. And to Mr. *Bl.* first I answer, this Divinity was then known to God, and God might have sent away *Moses* with this answer, That he spake for some who were dogs, or reprobates, and not children of God according to the election of grace, which is the Apostles Divinity, *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. 1 *Cor.* 10. 5. *Heb.* 3. 10, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19. and that they were strangers from the Commonwealth of Israel, that is *of the Israel of God*, *Gal.* 6. 16. And this is also the Apostles Divinity, *Rom.* 9. 6. and therefore I count this no absurdity. But I grant they, even the worst of them were not dogs, but children, and of the Commonwealth of Israel political, in respect of their outward state, and in that respect holy, and different from other people. To the other I answer, it is true, *Moses* prayed in faith, and was heard; but there is no mention in the places alledged of his praying for spiritual Evangelical grace for every particular Israelite, but for the preventing an utter destruction of them: Nor doth he at all express any such faith, whereby he believed God had promised to be a God to all the natural issue of *Abraham* by *Isaac* and *Jacob* in respect of Evangelical benefits, but that *God* would not destroy them, in which respect he was heard. And in like manner the Covenant upon the account of which *God* did vouchsafe mercy, is that of giving them *Canaan*, which Mr. *Bl.* will not have the Covenant it self, but an Appendix to it; and yet *Exod* 32. 13. that is it which is pleaded, and *Levit.* 26. 42, the Covenant it is plain is that he made concerning their seating in *Canaan*, for it expressly saith, *and I will remember the Land, and v.* 44. *I will not utterly destroy them.* The Church it is true, saith, *Isa.* 64. 9. *we are all thy people*; but if this Church be meant of all and every Israelite by natural descent, then all and every of them were a praying people, which is not to be said, and therefore is to be understood of the believing remnant only, or else that they were *Gods* people in the sense before given of *Exod.* 32. 12, 14. *Deut.* 9. 29. *Exod.* 3. 6. It is true, *God* saith to *Moses*, *to stay up his faith in confidence of the deliverance of Israel from Egypt*, that he was *the God of his Father*, *the God of* Abraham, *of* Isaac, *and* Jacob, and it is true, our Lord Christ hence proves the resurrection of the dead, *Luke* 20. 37, 38. and therefore it proves eternal life included in the promise, *Gen.* 17. 7. but this is so far from proving *God* to be a *God* in respect of Evangelical blessings meant *Gen.* 17. 7. to every Israelite, or to be a *God* to believers and their natural seed, that it is a good argument to the contrary; for this absurdity would follow, That every one of them are certainly saved, if he were a *God* to every of them in the sense, *Luke* 20. 37, 38.

Mr. *Bl.* next excepts against me for *censuring of* Chamiers *calling the promise of the Land of Canaan an Apendant to the Covenant*, *Gen.* 17. 7. And saith, *The thing is so clear in the narrative of it*, *Gen.* 17, *that nothing can be more evident*, *The Covenant is full*, *v.* 7. *To be a God to Abraham and his seed*; *and this he might have been, had he pleased, in the Land of* Ur *of the Caldees, or in any Land whatsoever that his seed had been planted in: But when the Covenant is thus made, there is added*; *v.* 8. *And I will give unto thee, &c.*

Answ.

Answ. My censure of *Chamier* was no more then this, *I like not*, and I say the same still, that the promise of the land of *Canaan Gen.* 17. 8. is not a meer appendant, but as truly a part of the Covenant God made with *Abraham Gen.* 17. as *v.* 7. And to Mr. *Bls.* strong conceit I oppose my strong conceit of the evidence to the contrary (being backed by the Scripture) as sufficient of countervail his saying; And for his reasons. 1. *God might have been a God to them in Vr, Ergo,* the promise of *Canaan* is but an appendix, not a part of the Covenant. I answer, 1. by the like reason it might be said, *thou shalt be a Father of many Nations, is but an appendant to the Covenant*, contrary to *Gen.* 17. 4. because God might be a God to him, though father of one Nation onely. 2. By denying the consequence, which is in my slender conceit *a baculo ad angulum*. The other (if it be a reason and not a dictate) is, *the Covenant is full, v.* 7. *but when the Covenant is made there is added, v.* 8. I answer. 1. By like reason it might be said, The Covenant is full, *v.* 4, 5, 6. but when the Covenant is made *v.* 4, 5, 6. there is added *v.* 7. *ergo, v.* 7. is no part of the Covenant, but an appendant to it. 2. It is not proved that at *v.* 7. the Covenant is full, yea *v.* 8. being as Mr. *Bl.* himself stiles it, *an additional promise*, it is proved, that the Covenant is not full without it being added as a promise, and so a part of the Conant.

I said the Holy Ghost me thinks speaks otherwise *Possscript.* §. 12. Mr. *Bl* opposeth. *The force of this argument must needs be this. That which is any where called a Covenant, that is not an appendant to a Covenant. But the giving of the land of Canaan to the seed of* Abraham *is there called by the name of a Covenant. Mr. T. sure will not say that Circumcision is the Covenant between God and his people, he will not deny but it is a signe and seal annext to the Covenant; and yet Gen.* 17. 10. *it is called a Covenant. Mr. T. well enough knowes a Metonymy of the adjunct and the common use of it in Scripture; but that it is his wisedome for his advantage to conceal it.*

Answ. Mr. *T.* well knows, that Mr. *Bl.* useth artifices to elude, when he should answer. The words of the Psalmist were alledged as a plain testimony, which need not be formed into an argument, but if it need forming, I should not form it as Mr. *Bl.* forms it (that he may the easier slight what he cannot answer) but thus. That promise which is called *Gods Covenant for ever, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations, which he made, was his oath, confirmed for a Law and everlasting Covenant*, declared by *saying* in words what God would do, that is a Covenant, at least in part, and not a meer appendant. But such is the promise of the land of *Canaan, Gen.* 17. 8. and elsewhere, *ergo.* The *major* might be proved from the definition of a Covenant, which is either a promise or an aggregate of promises single or mutual. The *minor* is the very text. And to Mr. *Bls.* shift I reply. I knew well enough a metonymy of the adjunct or signe to be used *Gen.* 17. 10. But I withal knew it would have been my folly to have expounded the term [*Covenant*] *Psal.* 105. 8, 9. by a metonymy like that *Gen.* 17. 10. For I should have made the Psalmist speak non-sense,

and

and perverted his plain meaning if I had thus expounded, *he hath remembred his Covenant*, that is not his promise it self, but the signe and seal of it, which he made, sware, said. And I think it had been Mr. *Bls.* wisedome to have concealed this shift, and rather have let it pass without saying any thing to the objection.

Mr. *Bl.* adds his *fifth and last argument, from Texts in the N. T. which interpret this Covenant thus entered with* Abraham *in that latitude as extending to his natural issue, and not with limit to his spiritual seed; and that not barely in domestick civil, but in spiritual promises; so that this one hath many in the bowels of it.*

Answ. *Abrahams* spiritual seed are true believers as he was and elect persons, spiritual promises are so called from the things promised, called *Ephes.* 1. 3. *spiritual blessings in heavenly things in Christ*, such are regeneration or circumcision of the heart, remission of sins, justification, adoption, eternal life. If Mr. *Bl.* holds *the Covenant with* Abraham *extending to his natural issue, and not with limit to his spiritual seed in spiritual promises*, he holds regeneration, remission of sins, justification, adoption, eternal life, to them who are neither true believers nor elect persons. Let's view his proofs.

First, saith he *Rom.* 9. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. *The Apostle aggravating his sorrow for Israel, not respective to civil or domestick but higher concernments for the whole body of Israel, he reckons up their priviledges, the priviledges of all that according to the flesh were Israelites; priviledges formerly enjoyed, but now lost, nine in number. Here sure is enough to conclude them of the seed thus in Covenant to be of Gods adopted seed under the promises.*

Answ. He might more truely have said, here sure is nothing (as it was printed) to conclude all the natural issue of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, to be of Gods adopted seed under the promise of spiritual blessings in the Covenant *Gen.* 17. 7. as it contained Gospel grace. The priviledges could not be of all that according to the flesh were Israelites, for of them all as concerning the flesh Christ could not come, now were all (if any of them) priviledges Evangelical from spiritual promises in the Covenant of grace, but rather all of them Domestick or civil priviledges which believers of the nations had not. Nor were the priviledges to the Israelites at all times, but at some times. And therefore this text is impertinent to Mr. *Bls.* purpose, yea this Scripture and that which followes put together, are an *antithesis* to his *thesis*.

Secondly, saith he, *Rom.* 11. *The Apostle speaks of the casting off of Gods people. Those that are cast off from being a people of God, were once his people; those that are put out of Covenant, were a people in Covenant: but the natural issue of* Abraham (*called natural branches, v.* 21. *being by right of birth of that Olive*) *are there broken off, cast off; therefore the natural issue were the seed in Covenant.*

Answ. The conclusion is granted, the natural issue of *Abraham* who were also the spiritual seed were the seed in Covenant, and such were a great part of the Jews in former ages, but those broken off, were never in the Covenant of grace; Nor is it said they were put out of the Covenant

venant of grace, or broken off from the Olive in which they were in their persons, but in which their progenitors were; nor are they said to be natural branches *v.* 21. because by right of birth of that Olive, but by reason of their descent from *Abraham* they are natural branches of that Olive which at first was by natural as well as spiritual descent from him, but never by right of birth. It is false if meant of casting off from being his people, as it is meant *Rom.* 11. 1, 2. that *those that are cast off from being a people of God were once his people*, understanding it in their own persons. But of this text, and this argument, more hath been said in the first part of this *Review*, and more will be, if the Lord permit, in that which follows.

Thirdly, saith he, *Matth.* 8. 11, 12. whence he thus argues. *Children of the Kingdome that are to be cast out, are in the Kingdome onely upon an interest of Birth, for the fruition of the priviledges of Ordinances, and not upon any spiritual title, infallibly giving interest in salvation: But the children of the Kingdome were upon our Saviours sentence to be cast out, therefore they were in the Kingdome onely on an interest of birth.*

Answ. This argument 1 concludes not Mr. *Bls.* position, that *the Covenant expresst* Gen. 17. 7. *in the fullest latitude of the words as they are there spoken, in the largest comprehension (which according to Scripture they can be taken) are entered with all the natural seed of Abraham, by Isaac and Jacob.* 2. It contradicts his own position, for if it bee as he here saith, that *they were not children of the Kingdome* (though the natural seed of *Abraham* by *Isaac* and *Jacob*) *upon any spiritual title infallibly giving interest in salvation*, and yet the Covenant *Gen.* 17. 7. wherein God saith, *he will be a God to Abrahams seed*, comprehends such saving grace as creates a spiritual title, infallibly giving interest in salvation, as the Apostle *Gal.* 3. 16, 17, 18, *&c.* expounds it, then the Covenant *Gen.* 17. 7. is not entred with all the natural seed of *Abraham* by *Isaac* and *Jacob*, in the fullest latitude of the words as they are there spoken, in the largest comprehension (which according to Scripture they can be taken) therefore this argument overthrowes his own position. 3. If by [*being in the Kingdome*] be meant being visible members of the visible Church Jewish, the conclusion is granted, but withal it is proved from the same text, that they were never in the visible Church Christian, but were opposite to it, in that they embraced not the Christian Faith, but opposed the Lord Jesus Christ, and so had no right to baptism, though they had circumcision, and did eat the passeover. 4. It is manifest from the text, and agreed upon by interpreters, that *the Kingdome of Heaven* in that place notes the Kingdome of glory, or the state of eternal life and blessedness in heaven, and not the visible Church onely, or a being in it for the fruition of the priviledges of ordinances. For 1 *the Kingdome of heaven* is that wherein *Abraham* and *Isaac* and *Jacob* were then sate down, for it is said *v.* 11. *they shall sit down with Abraham Isaac and Jacob, in the Kingdome of heaven.* But they were then sate down not in the visible Church onely, nor had being in it for the fruition of the priviledges of ordinances, but in the state of eternal life and blessedness in heaven, *ergo.* 2. *The Kingdome of heaven* there is di-

rectly opposed to *the outer darkness, where is weeping and gnashing of teeth.* v. 12. But that which is directly opposed to the outer darkness in which is weeping and gnashing of teeth, is the Kingdome of glory, or the state of eternal life and blessednes, in heaven, and not the visible Church onely, or a being in it for the fruition of the priviledges of ordinances, *ergo.* 3. The scope of the speech of our Saviour is conceived by most interpreters, to be to abate the insolency and pride of the Jews, who contemned the Gentiles. Upon occasion of the Centurions faith v. 10. he tels them, though they now despised the Gentiles as not worthy to eat with them, yet they should come from East and West and should sit down with the best of their Ancestors, in the best, highest, and happiest place and condition. 4. Expounding it of the visible Church it were not true which our Saviour speaks; For the Gentiles did never sit down with them in the visible Church for the fruition of the priviledges of ordinances, such as Circumcision, the Passeover, Baptism, the Lords Supper, for some of these *Abraham, Isaac,* and *Jacob,* did never partake of, nor ever shall, nor may the Gentiles with them, partake of circumcision, and the passeover, for that had been to have foretold that the Gentiles should have been circumcised with those Fathers, which had been to establish Judaism, contrary to the Apostles decree *Acts* 15. to *Pauls* determination *Gal.* 2. & 5. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. Yea, if it had been foretold that the Gentiles should come and joyn themselves to the visible Church Jewish, which began in *Abraham, Isaac,* and *Jacob,* our Lord Christ had foretold that conjunction, which was so far from proving true in the event, that they who did come to Christ were persecuted and cast out of that Church *Gal.* 4. 29. 1 *Thes.* 2. 15. 5. Hence it follows, that *the children of the Kingdome* are not so called because they were in that Kingdome of heaven which is there meant, for then they had never been cast out: but they are called children of the Kingdome, because as *Diodati* notes, *by the prerogative of Gods Covenant the Jews seemed to be heirs of this Kingdome,* or as the *new Annot. ad cb.* 9. 15. *who were born of those parents to whom the Kingdome was promised, and by vertue of the Covenant* Rom. 9. 4. *it had still belonged to them, had they not forfeited it by their unbelief and wickedness.* Piscat. sch. *Filios vero regni*] id est, *Judæos qui hactenus per aliquot sæcula ad regnum illud cælorum vocati sunt & vocantur.* Beza Annot. *Filios regni, τὸ υἱὸς τῆς Βασιλείας,* id est, *indigenas, quos vocant vulgò naturale subjectos. Intelligit autem Dei regnum, ad quod pertinebant in genere quicunque erant ex Abrahæ genere, cum longè alia sit ratio coram Deo censendi filios Abrahæ, nimirum ex fide.* So that they were children of the Kingdome not before God in actual title or possession, but onely in appearance to men, and likelihood, considering their descent and the first manifestation of Christ, and the Gospel to that people. 6. Our of this it appears that a man may be said to be cast out of the Kingdome of heaven, who was never in actually, but onely in possibility, according to what was apparent to men, and consequently Mr. *Bls.* propositions are not true in his precedent argument, *Those that are cast off from being a people of God, were once his people; those that are put out of-*

of Covenant, were a people in Covenant; nor the argument good, *Ishmael* was cast out of Covenant, therefore once in. Nor is it seldome, that men are said to *be brought up from the grave*, as *Psal.* 30. 3. and to be redeemed from the grave and hell, who were never in, but onely in danger of it.

But Mr. *Bl.* hath yet a fourth text, which was his text in his *Birthpriviledge*, it is *Gal* 2. 15. From whence after some explication given of the text he thus argues, *That which is a priviledge of nature or birth, belongs to the natural issue, that cannot be denied. But to be in Covenant with God as a people holy and exceeding others that are without as sinners, is a priviledge of nature or birth, therefore this priviledge belongs to the natural issue.*

Ans. To be in covenant with God may be understood either in respect of the Covenant with *Abraham Gen.* 17. or the Covenant at Mount *Sinai Exod.* 19. To be in the Covenant *Gen.* 17. may be in respect of Evangelical benefits, or of domestick and political benefits or priviledges, as, to bee accounted members of the Israelitish nation and so of that church, to have the service of God among them, the law among them, education under it, freedome from idolatry, and other pollutions of the Gentiles. To *be as a people holy*, may be understood either of holiness by inward sanctification, called circumcision of the heart, or of outward holiness ie being distinguished from other people, as set apart visibly for God, whether in reputation or truth, either by Gods distinction or by an outward signe, or by their own profession. I grant the *minor* of being in Covenant either *Exod.* 19. or *Gen.* 17. in respect of the domestick and political benefits, at least some of them, and to be a holy people exceeding others that are without as sinners, if understood of outward holiness in reputation or truth, by Gods distinction, and by the outward signe of Circumcision, was (I do not grant is) a privil dge of nature or birth, and accordingly grant the conclusion, that this priviledge did (I do not say doth) belong to the natural issue (I do not say to all) of *Abraham* by *Isaac* and *Jacob*, and was proper to the Jews, and no more can be gathered from *Gal.* 2. 15. there's not a word of the same priviledge as belonging to the natural posterity of believing Gentiles. But the *minor* is denied, if understood of Evangelical benefits and of holiness inward (of which alone the question should have been formed, his position being in full opposition to my words) nor is it proved out of the text, himself expounding *Jews by nature*, that is *by birth and offspring of a nation that is holy though in themselves sinners, reputed an holy people, a people by covenant holy to the Lord*, which they might be though *to be in Covenant with God* Gen. 17. 7. *and as a people holy and exceeding others that are without as sinners* by inward holiness be not *a priviledge of nature or birth.*

But Mr. *Bl.* thinks *my grant involves me in not a few contradictions.* 1. To what I say *Exercit. pag.* 3. *the natural seed inherit onely domestick and civil benefits.* But Mr. *Bl.* falsly chargeth me, the word [*onely*] is Mr. *Bl.* addition not mine, as the Reader that shall read the words may perceive. 2. *To what I am wont to deny, that birth entitles any to*

such priviledges as interest in Circumcision, and observance of Moses *law.* But this is another of Mr. *Bls.* forged calumnies: let him shew if he can that I say so any where, and he deserves some credit, if not let him suffer as a Calumniator. 3. That *I deny the natural seed any promise of spiritual mercies*, which is another forgery of his like the former. 4. That I say *this was proper to the Jews in that Church state, who had prerogatives peculiar to them.* And then saith thus. *And here we urge it no further, and it fully concludes Mr. T. in a contradiction, that will have the natural seed of* Abraham, *and no other then his spiritual seed to be entituled to such priviledges.* Here's more of his forgery, that I say no other then *Abrahams* spiritual seed are entituled to such priviledges as were proper to the Jews in that Church state, who had prerogatives peculiar to them. Let him shew any such thing in my writing, or let him, as he and his fellow Pædobaptist Mr. *Robert Baillee* (who hath in like sort wronged me) as they ought, testifie their repentance by righting me. Otherwise the Lord will to their shame discover their evil dealing, i their own conscience be so blinde or so hard as to slight such a sin.

He concludes thus, *Any one of these arguments severally, much more all jointly, make good this position, that all the natural seed of* Abraham *by* Isaac *and* Jacob, *are in that great Charter (vouchsafed of God) taken into Covenant so as to be the people of God, and to enjoy all priviledges of his people in order (upon Gods termes) to everlasting salvation.* But 1. not one nor all prove that God did promise to all *Gen.* 17. 7. or any such outward priviledges as he means, to wit, to be circumcised, or right to it and the Passeover, nor that all enjoy them. 2. The promises of justification, adoption, eternal life, upon Gods termes, without the promise of regeneration and effectual calling, make not a person to be in the Covenant, nor a people holy to the Lord Evangelically. Now this promise Mr. *Bl.* hath not proved to be made to all the natural seed of *Abraham*, by *Isaac* and *Jacob*, and till he doth so, he proves nothing against my assertion *Exercit. pag.* 3 which he pretended fully to oppose, but hath failed to do it. His 36. *ch.* is answered before *sect.* 29. I pass on to *ch.* 37. which is thus entituled, *The Covenant in New Testament times takes in parents with their children*; This he sets himself to make good first by interrogatories, and then by *Peters* words *Acts* 2. 38, 39. which is answered before *sect.* 21. A little of his interrogatories.

To his first, if by *the grant* he mean the Covenant of grace Evangelical, I deny it to have been ever made to a believer and all his seed, nor is it proved by Mr. *Bl.* If a Covenant of visible Church-membership and initial seal, I deny any such Covenant ever made by God to a believer and his seed, or the grant thereof to have been held by the Church of God in fee from *Abraham* to this present hour, and therefore need shew no reverse of such a grant.

To his 2d. demand, I grant a whole nation may enter into Covenant as *Deut.* 29. nor do I restrain any from engagement of their infants and posterity unborn by an oath and curse to own God But I finde there no promise or grant of visible Church-membership and initial seal to believers and their seed, by vertue of such a Covenant. His

other

other frivolous queſtions in that demand are anſwered often, that the difference ariſeth from the different inſtitution of Circumciſion which is the rule of adminiſtring them, not intereſt in the Covenant if there were ſuch.

To his 3d. demand, I know no ſcandal ever given or likely to be given to the Jews by not baptizing infants. His random talk *of ſtriking out of the Covenant infants*, is ſhewed often before to be vain, as going on ſuppoſitions not proved. To his allegations of *Gen.* 17. 7. *Ezek.* 16. 20. 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. I have often anſwered before.

To his 4th. that the reaſon why in the Apoſtles dayes and the next age to them no queſtion was moved about the baptizing of infants, though infants were circumciſed by the Jews is manifeſt, to wit, Chriſt had not appointed infants to be baptized, the Apoſtles and primitive Chriſtians did not at all uſe it, it was contrary to the end and uſe of baptiſm as appointed by Chriſt, they knew not of the Pædobaptiſts doctrine, about the title to baptiſm from the Covenant, and its ſucceſſion to circumciſion.

But Mr. *Bl.* further refers me to Mr. *Baxters Treatiſe of Infants Church membership, proving that infants were ſometimes Church members, pag.* 26, 27. *that there is no repeal of this grant vouchſafed of God pag.* 27, 28. *waiting for ſome fair anſwer to the former demands* Whereto I ſhall addreſs my ſelf, as being very deſirous with the aſſiſtance of the Lord to do my endeavour for the freeing of men from the deluſion of that Book, wherewith a great number of Pædobaptiſts have been gulled.

SECT. XLIX.

The 4th. Ch. of Mr. Baxters, *Part* 1. *of* Plain Scripture proof, *&c. is examined, his conceits about Infants viſible Church membership and their admiſſion conſidered; and ſundry Animadverſions made on that Chapter.*

MR. *B. part* 1. *ch.* 4. of his *Plain Scripture-proof*, &c. writes thus. "My 2d. argument, and the chief I ſhall make uſe of, is this. All "that ought to be admitted viſible Church-members, ordinarily ought "to be baptized: But ſome Infants ought to be admitted viſible Church-"members; therefore ſome Infants ordinarily ought to be baptized. "Mr. *T.* hath gone over and over the terms of this Argument; ſo oft, "as if he could not poſſibly find out my meaning in them: when they "are as plain as I well know how to expreſs my ſelf. A great while he "fain would have denied the *major* Propoſition; but at laſt he is con-"tent to deny onely the *minor*: And indeed that is the very heart of the "controverſie. The queſtion between us is not ſo much *whether infants* "*may be baptized*? as *whether they are in the number of Chriſtians, and* "*to be added as members to the viſible Church*? If Mr. *T.* did grant the "*minor*, and not deny our children Chriſtianity, and to be members of

the

" the Church, I ſhould for my part, think his errour (though foul)
" yet of leſs conſequence in denying of Baptiſm. But it is their Church-
" membership that he denieth, and yeeldeth that all that ought to be ad-
" mitted members ſhould be baptized.

Anſw. That I did often in the diſpute at *Bewdly* go over and over the terms of this argument, need not ſeem ſtrange, when Mr. *Thomas Hooker* having the book he was to examine before him in Print, in a like point, ſaith thus, *Survey of the ſumme of Church Diſcipline, Part* 1. *ch.* 12. *when I had read over Mr.* Rutherford *once and again, I was at a ſtand in mine own thoughts, to determine certainly what was his proper intendment by the catholick and viſible Church.* I might well doubt what he meant by the viſible Church, how he defined it, (wherein his notion is different from what others have, as is ſhewed before in the 2d. part of this *Review, ſect.* 17.) whether he meant the viſible Church catholick, or particular; and if particular, whether Jewiſh, or Chriſtian. And for the admiſſion, what he meant by it, how, and by whom it ought to be, was doubtfull. I perceived in the very entrance of the diſpute, by his preface and his propounding the queſtion about our baptizing, repreſenting it as odious, as if it were murder and adultery; and after by his denying liberty of repeating to mee, refuſing to explain his own terms, ſcoffingly putting it off as if it were catechizing of him, when I deſired him to open ſome terms to me which he uſed; and when I told him that it was needfull the people ſhould underſtand us, he replyed, he came to diſpute with me, not to inſtruct them: nor would clear them, except I could by diſtinction force him to it. I deprehended that he was, as I found him, bent to catch advantages to inſult over me, and carry away the fame of a victory, and not in a brotherly candid way to diſcuſs the point, that truth might appear to all the hearers, which I hoped from a man ſo ſeemingly godly. Upon which reaſons I confeſs I was hæſitant, both about the anſwering of this, and other arguments all along the diſpute, finding that Mr. *B.* had ſtudied arguments in unuſual expreſſions, that he might the more eaſily entangle me, having no time to weigh his words, but being required preſently to give anſwer. For which reaſon I was alſo neceſſitated ſometimes to vary my anſwers as I deprehended his meaning to be. Now preſuming I ſhall better underſtand Mr. *B.* then I could do before, I ſhall give a more determinante anſwer to his argument. Which that I may do, I conceive it neceſſary, that in the entrance I do enquire into his opinion concerning the viſible Church, and admiſſion into it, and the meaning of his expreſſion [*ought to be admitted viſible Church-members.*]

1. Mr. *B* ſuppoſeth that *the reaſon of the appellation given to the viſible body, is its ſeeming (to the judgement of man) to be the ſame with the myſtical Præſcitus: Morator ſect.* 11.

2. That " to be a member of the Church viſible, is but to be one that
" in ſeeming, or appearance, or to the judgement of man doth belong
" to the inviſible Church or the Kingdome of Heaven; if a man be
" known (or any ſort of men) to belong to the Church inviſible, then
" they

"they visibly belong to it; and then they are visible members of the "Church. *Plain Script. proof, &c. part* 1. *ch.* 31. *pag.* 105. *ch.* 17. *pag.* 73. He saith, "to be member of the visible Church, or of the Church "as visible, or a visible member of the Church are all one, and is no "more but to seem to be a true member of the Church of Christ, "(commonly called invisible) or of the true mystical body of Christ. *Answ. to my Valedict. Orat. pag.* 176. "You say you dispute them not "out of the invisible Church. *Answ.* 1. But will you yeeld that they "are so much as seeming probable members of the invisible Church? "If you do, then they are members of the visible, which you deny: "For to be a visible member of the Church, or a member of the vi-"sible Church as such, is no more then to be a seeming member of the "invisible Church, or one that we ought to take in probability to be "of the invisible Church. Wherein how Mr. *B.* is mistaken, is shewed in the 2d. Part of this *Review*, *sect.* 17. *pag.* 229, *&c.*

3. *Ch.* 20. *He imagines an universal visible Church existent, not dissolved*; which is all one as to say, there is or was an universal visible Church, consisting of individual members immortal, or perpetually visible: Which mistake of his will come under consideration in that which follows.

4. *Ch.* 5. *&* *ch.* 20. he imagines *having infants to have been of the essentials of the Jewish Church.* But therein he is mistaken: For though they may be termed substantial parts, yet not essential, (the Jewish Church had ben a visible Church though there had been no infant in it) but integral.

5. *Ch.* 20. that *the nature of the Jews church was not repealed*, that *the Jews Church was not repealed*, *ch.* 5. *that the Law or Covenant on which the species or essential form of their Church (and many of its accidents) was grounded, is not changed or repealed. Though the Jews are cast off, yet the law and nature of Churches is still the same.* Which speeches, with other more of the like kind, shall be (God willing) examined in that which follows, and the non-sence and vanity of them shewed.

6. *Ch.* 23. that *infants visible church-membership did not begin at the institution of circumcision, but rather with the first infant of faithfull Adam, though he after fell off.*

7. That this is grounded on a Law and Covenant of God, which is made higher then that, *Gen.* 17. 7. even that *Gen.* 3. 15. *Ch.* 23. Yes, he makes it to antecede the fall of *Adam*. *ch.* 19. it is said to be of *the Law of nature to have infants to be apert of a Kingdome*: And *ch.* 13. *therefore infants to be church members. Pag.* 60. *That infants must be church-members, is partly natural, and partly grounded on the Law of grace and faith*: as if Church constitution were natural, and not by meer institution.

8. *Animadv.* on Mr. *Bedfords treatise of Baptismal regeneration*, *Plain Script proof* pag. 326. pag. 15. and elsewhere *he makes the condition of the infants church membership and justification to be wholly without him in the faith of the parent.* The falsity of which conceit is shewed by me in the 2d. part of this *Review*, *sect.* 10, 17. and elsewhere.

9 That

9. That this visible church-membership, notwithstanding the continuance of the parents Faith the imagined Law and Covenant, yet endures not but til they, when they come to years, do themselves make profession. So *Plain Scrip. proof, part* 2. *ch.* 6 *pag.* 119. "He is not to be taken for a "Christian, who will not visibly by himself when he comes to age (as "he did by his parents in infancy) publickly profess both his assent to "to the fundamental Articles of Faith, and his consent that the Lord "onely shall be his God, and Christ onely his Redeemer, and so his "Saviour and Lord, and promise in heart and life to be true to him "accordingly: And I deliver the Sacrament to none that will not thus "profess and promise. And pag. 335. He saith, "He will not contra-"dict this proposition of *Davenant*, Those who in Baptism were truly "justified, regenerated, and adopted suitable to their infant state; "when they come to the use of reason, are not justified, regenerated, "and adopted suitable to the special state of the aged, unless by "repenting, believing, and abrenunciation, they fulfil their vow made "in Baptism.

10. That *there is no other way of admitting visible members now into the Church, but by Baptism*, pag. 24. 108. But they are visible members afore Baptism according to his tenet, pag. 24. *we and infants are Church-members before Baptism.*

11. I presume that when he saith, *All that ought to be admmitted visible church members, ordinarily ought to be baptized*, he means this of Christian Churches, church-members, and admitting into them, not the Jewish: For though I find him speak as if *the Jews Church were not repealed*, (as in his non-sence he speaks, *ch.* 30.) that is, as I imagine, in the nature or essence the Jewish Church visible and the Christian were the same, and so they that were admitted into the Jewish, are to be admitted into the Christian; which caused me to suspect at the Dispute an ambiguity in that expression [*ought to be admitted visible church-members.*] Yet I do not imagine that he holds the proposition in this sense, All that ough heretofore to be admitted visible church members in the Jewish Church distinct from the Christian, ordinarily ought then to be baptized afore Christs coming, while the Jewish Church stood: if he should, I should deny it.

12. That this admission which infants are to have is, as he often speaks, *into the visible Church*: But what this admission into the visible Church is, by whom, and unto whom it ought to be, according to Mr. *Bs.* judgment, is yet to me uncertain. Admission is, according to the common use of it, the taking in of a person into an Office, Army, or Family, or the like, to perform the work, enjoy the benefit, profit, *&c.* of such an Officer, Member, *&c.* And it is usually done by some Officer to whom that business is committed; and the person upon his admission, and by vertue of it, takes his place, work, benefit, or what else he is admitted to, as his right and due. But I know no such thing in the baptizing of infants. Indeed by Baptism regularly, a man is admitted to the Communion of the Church in prayer, hearing, receiving the Lords Supper, and such other acts of Christian Communion as belong to visible

church-

Church-members. But an infant by Baptiſm is not admitted to theſe Prayer and hearing are in ſome ſort allowed to unbaptized perſons, and they are admitted to them who are infidels, when infants baptized are ſent away as uncapable of them, and diſturbers by their crying and playing. The Lords ſupper they are not admitted to by their Baptiſm, till they themſelves profeſs, as Mr. *B.* and other Pædobaptiſts agree; The being, name, repute of Church-members is antecedent to Baptiſm, and therefore they are not admitted to it by Baptiſm. I muſt confeſs therefore I do not well know what this admiſſion of infants is which is by Baptiſm, and I think the propoſition in Mr. *Bs.* argument to be void of truth or ſenſe, if it be not thus conſtrued: All that ought to be admitted viſible church-members are baptized, or, which is all one, ordinarily ought to be baptized afore they are admitted, unleſs the admiſſion and baptiſm be one and the ſame, and then the ſpeech is an inept tautologie, as if he had ſaid: All viſible church members that ought to be baptized, ordinarily ought to be baptized. So that now Mr. *B.* may ſee ſome reaſon of my demur about his *major* propoſition, which though *it were as plain as he well knew how to expreſs himſelf*, yet there is ſo much ambiguity in it, that in the ſenſe which the words in any good conſtruction will bear, it is to be denied: But if he underſtand it in the later ſenſe, the Syllogiſm is nugatory, the *minor* and the concluſion being the ſame. Nevertheleſs, as in the Diſpute I let the *major* paſs, ſo I ſhall do in this anſwer, onely taking notice of ſome things in his proof of it, and inſiſt upon my denial of the *minor*.

The firſt argument of Mr. *B.* to prove admiſſion into the viſible Church is to be by Baptiſm, I approve, and thence conclude againſt infant Baptiſm thus. *If we have neither precept nor example in Scripture ſince Chriſt ordained Baptiſm, of admitting any by Baptiſm as viſible members* but believers by profeſſion, then *all that muſt be admitted viſible members ordinarily by Baptiſm*, muſt be believers by profeſſion. But *ſince Baptiſm was inſtituted (or eſtabliſhed) we have no precept or example in Scripture of admitting any as viſible members by Baptiſm*, but believers by profeſſion. Ergo, all *that muſt be admitted viſible members muſt* be believers by profeſſion. *I know not what in ſhew of reaſon can be ſaid to this. For what man* (yet Mr. *B.* and Pædobaptiſts dare) *dare go in a way which hath neither precept nor example to warrant it, from a way that hath full current of both? yet they that will admit* infants *into the viſible Church by Baptiſm do ſo.* If he ſay there's precept before, I anſwer, his own *major* requires precept or example ſince Chriſt ordained Baptiſm, and therefore that ſhift avoids not the retortion of his argument. To what he replies to this argument in his *Præſeſtin. morator, ſect.* 16. beſides what I have ſaid in the 2d. part of this *Review*, ſect. 4. pag. 66. 67. there is enough in the ſame book, ſect. 10, 11, 12 *&c.* to manifeſt, *that infants are not in any Scripture diſciples appointed to be baptized, Matth.* 28. 19. Nevertheleſs, I find *Alſtedius* in his *Supplement to Chamier de natura Eccleſia, cap.* 7. §. 4. thus writing. *Baptiſmus admittit in Eccleſiam particularem: ſed in Eccleſiam catholicam poteſt aliquis admitti ſine baptiſmo; quia hanc ad rem ſufficit vera fides.*

And whereas Mr. *Ball* in his *reply to the answer of the New-England Elders about the nine positions*, pag. 60. had said, *Baptism is the seal of our admission into the congregation or flock of Christ; but not evermore of our receiving into this or that particular society as set members thereof*: Mr. *Allin* rejoyns in his *Defence*, pag. 163. *Baptism doth not admit actually into the Church, and your own expression secretly implieth as much, when you say, Baptism is a seal of our admission into the Church or flock of Christ: If baptism be the seal of our admission, then there is admission thereunto before baptism: but who doth admit, and where and when is any admitted to the Church, but in particular congregations? Can any be admitted into a Church, that whole Church being ignorant thereof? Fulwood serm. of the Church, &c.* p. 14. *The children of believers, born in the Church, are not (though virtual) actual members of the visible Church before Baptism.* This I produce, to shew the uncertainty among Pædobaptists about admission into the Church by baptism, and membership before Baptism.

Like also what Mr. *B.* saith in his 2d. *arg. To be above ordinances is to be above obedience to God, and so Gods*: And when he saith in his 3d. *The nature and end of baptism, is to be Christs listing, engaging sign*; it is a good argument to prove that infant baptism hath not the nature and end of baptism, sith it is not Christs (that is, according to his appointment) listing, engaging sign, the infant neither lists nor engageth himself by it as Christ appointed: And when he saith, *If it be the use of baptism to engraff and enter us into the body or Church*, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. *and into Christ, as Rom.* 6. 3. *then sure it must be used at our engraffing and entrance*, it rather follows, it is before, sith the means is to be before the end in execution. To what he saith about Church-members, Disciples, Christians, enough hath been said in the 2d. part of this *Review*, sect. 10. *&c.*

In his 6th. argument, having formed an argument from *Ephes.* 5. 26. he saith of me. *Mr. T. in his Exercit. objecteth*, 1. *That then the thief on the cross, &c. were no church members. Answ. It followes not from* [*he that is baptized shall be saved*] *that therefore he that is not baptized shall not be saved: so here, for the former speaks but* ad debitum, *and the later de eventu; it will follow, that it is a duty to baptize all members where it may be done; but not that it shall certainly come to pass.*

Resat. What I said *Exercit.* pag. 21. of that text, *Ephes.* 5. 27. was not an objection against what Mr. *B.* would evince from the text, but in answer to an argument urged for infant baptism from that text by a *London* Minister, in a conference *anno* 1643. Which argument being drawn from an act or end of Christ, which was not one duty, but his performance: it was urged, *that if infants were not baptized, and to be baptized, they belonged not to the Church*: To which I answered, καὶ ἀνθυποφορικῶς, by an answerable illation, by the same reason the thief on the cross should not belong to the Church because not baptized. That which Mr. *B.* answers is not true, that *Mark* 16. 16. the former part speaks but *ad debitum*, and the later *de eventu*. For though a duty may be gathered from the subject of the proposition, it being clear, that salvation being promised to the believer baptized, Faith and Baptism are required

red duties to that end; yet the former part of the proposition doth as fully speak of an event as the later part doth. And though *Ephes* 5. 26. it is proved a duty to baptize, as also to preach the word, because it is Christs way (in which we are to concur with him) of clensing his Church: yet the clensing of the Church with or in the washing of water by the word, doth not note a duty, but an end intended, and event to follow by Christs action. Mr. *B.* proceeds.

2. *He objecteth, that therefore it must be understood of the more famous part of the Church, or that purification is to be understood of that which is for the most part. Answ. The Apostle speaks plainly of the whole Church; and to take it for part, is to cross the Text, except you shew a necessity for it.* 2. *It speaks of all* quoad debitum, *in regard of the means of it, which they are capable of.* 3. *And usually* quoad eventum *of the said means too.*

Refut. 1. It cannot be understood of the whole visible Church, in which are many reprobates; for it is that *Church which Christ loved with that peculiar love which is the Husbands pattern to love his wife by, for whom he gave himself, that he might sanctifie it, that he might present it to himself glorious, and a Church not having spot or wrinkle, or any of such things; but that it might be holy, and without blemish:* which are true onely of that part of the visible, which is also of the invisible Church of the elect. 2. Whomsoever it speaks of, [*that he might purifie it in or with the washing of water by the word*] it speaks of the intention of Christ; which being supposed that it is not frustrated, it follows, that those who are said *to be purified in or with the washing of water by the word*, are all in the event converted by preaching, and baptized with water. Which sith it cannot be said of all elect infants, for they are not purified by the word, it must be understood as I say, either by a *synecdoche* of the whole for the more famous or apparent part; or else the act is meant of that which is usually done, or for the most part, not what is universally and perpetually. 3. It is granted, that we may gather thence the duty of preaching the word, and baptizing with water, and that they who are sanctified by preaching are to be purified by baptism, and that this was usual in the event, a known use in the primitive times: But expresly it notes onely Christs act, not the Ministers duty, which is onely implied, and follows from this, that Christ doth it by them; and it supposeth, that they who are capable of the one, to wit. baptism, are capable of the other, the hearing of the word; for these two are conjunctively put, not disjunctively either the one or the other, as if some were purified in the washing of water onely, others by the word; but the same who are purified by the one, are purified by the other. Mr. *B.* adds.

Object. But some may say, that [*by the word*] *is here added, which infants are not capable of. Answ.* 1. *Infants are sanctified by the word of promise and precept to parents to dedicate them to God, though not by the word preached to infants.* 2. *The means is to each member as they are capable. washing by water to those that are capable of that, and by the word to those that are capable of that, which blind and deaf men are not any more then infants.*

Ref. There is no word of precept to parents to dedicate infants to God by baptism, though there be to pray for them; nor do I think M. B. would allow every parent to dedicate his or her infant to God by baptism, which they must do if there were a precept to them to do it. That there is no such word of promise as entitles every infant of a believer, or any definitely to baptism, much less that appoints parents to dedicate their infants to God by baptism, is amply shewed in this book before. Nor can the meaning be, *Ephes.* 5 26. of such a sanctification. For 1. no word of promise, and precept to parents to dedicate them to God, is that which Christ doth sanctifie or cleanse them by, partly because there is none such, partly because the word of precept to parents (if there were such) to dedicate them to God, would not cleanse or sanctifie the infants, it hath no effect on them, nor notes their duty: nor doth the precept sanctifie or cleanse, but the observing of it; nor was the parents dedication ever made by God a means to cleanse or sanctifie the child, as there is meant. Nor, were there such a word of promise to a parent, would that of it self sanctifie and cleanse. 2. *The word* there meant, is the word of the Gospel preached to those who are said to be cleansed by Christ. For 1, all along the N. T. and particularly in that Epistle, by [the word] is meant the word of the Gospel, as it is preached or published. *Acts* 10.22,36,37. *Rom.*10.8,9,17. *Ephes.*6.17, *Heb.*6.5. 1 *Pet.*1.25. *Luke* 3.2. *John* 3.34. & 6.63,68. & 8.47. & 12.47,48. & 15.7. & 17. 8. *Acts* 5.32. *Matth* 13.20,21,22,23. *Mark* 2.2. & 4.14,15,16,17, 18,20. & 16.20. *Luke* 1. 2. & 5. 1. & 8.11,12,13,15,21. & 10.39. & 11.28. *John* 5.24,38. & 8.31,43,52. & 14.23,24. & 17 6,14, 17,20. *Acts* 4.4,29 31. & 6.2,4,7. & 8.4,14,25. & 11.1,19. & 12. 24. & 13. 5,7,26,44,46,48,49. & 14. 25. & 15. 7,35,36. & 16. 6, 32. & 17.11,13. & 18.11. & 19.10. 1 *Cor.*1.4. & 14.36. & 15. 2. 2 *Cor.*2.17. & 4. 2. & 5.19. *Gal.*6.6. *Ephes.*1.13. *Phillip.*1.14. & 2.16. *Col.*1.5,25. & 3.16. & 4.3. 1 *Thes.*1.6,8. & 2.13. 2 *Thes.*3.1. 1 *Tim.*5.17. 2 *Tim.*2.9,15. & 4.2. *Tit.*1.3,9 & 2.5. *Heb.*13.7. *Jam.* 1.21,22,23. 1 *Pet.*1.8. & 3.1. *Revel* 1.9. & 6.9. & 12.11. & 20.4. 2. It is the word of the Gospel preached or published, by which persons are said to be purified, converted, regenerate, sanctified, *John* 15.3. & 17. 7. *Acts* 20.32. & 26.18. *Rom.*10.17. *Gal.*3.5. *Ephes.* 13. *Jam.* 1.18. 1 *Pet* 1.23. not any where by the word of promise barely as made by God, but as it was fulfilled and preached, is Christ said to sanctifie or cleanse his Church. And by this, all said to be purified, *Ephes.* 5.26. are cleansed, and therefore no infants, who are not at all capable of understanding it, and therefore not so capable of being cleansed by it as the blind and deaf. Mr. B. yet adds.

Object. But it is the invisible Church that Christ is said thus to cleanse,

Answ. 1. *Certainly those that are washed with water, or hearing the word, or either, are all visible members.* 2. *The visible Church hath the outward priviledges and titles of the invisible, because as to us they must in probability be judged to belong to both. Therefore* Paul *frequently calls them all saints and sons of God by faith, &c.*

Ref. Though they be of the visible who are so washed, yet the Church

Church *Ephes* 5. 25, 26, 27. cannot be meant of the meerly visible; but onely of them who are so of the visible, that they are also of the invisible, as is proved before from the things said of the Church, which agree to none other. And thus Mr. B. hath my answer to that *Cb.* and my apprehension of his *major*; let's now view his *minor*, and try his *Achilles* which he is so confident of.

SECT. L.

The fifth Chapter of Mr. Bs. Plain Scripture proof *&c.* Part. 1. *is examined and the texts* Gal. 4. 1, &c. Matth. 28. 19. *cleered so as to prove infants now no visible Church-members.*

CH. 5. *he begins thus.* "Though I have many and clear arguments "from the new Testament, to prove infants to be members of the "visible Church, as I shall let you see, God willing, when I come to "them; yet because I think it most orderly to take them before us from "the beginning, I will first fetch one from the old Testament, and that "such as is fully confirmed from the new: For I hope you are none of "those who have wiped out all the old Testament from your Bibles, or "that presently look upon a text as no text, if you hear it come from "the old Testament.

Answ. I Know none at *Bewdley* so erroneous or foolish. But Mr. *B.* may see (if his high soaring meditations and studies will allow him time to descend to view such a low argument, as hee oft disdainfully speaks) something written in the 2d. part of this *Review*, *Sect.* 2, 3. which tends to prove that no good argument can be drawn from the old Testament for his admission of infants visible Church members. And for his *many and clear arguments from the New Testament to prove infants to be members of the visible Church*; he did wisely put in the caution; *God willing when I come to them I shall let you see them*, to save his credit, though he never shew them. For my part I despair of ever seeing them. As for those I have found brought by him, the chief have been examined in the first and second *Part* of this *Review*, and found impertinent. The dispute that remains to be viewed is so immethodical, that had Mr. *B.* ever been bred up in Schools, I am confident he would have been ashamed of it. But I must now follow him in his own track.

I therefore, saith he, *argue thus*; *First*, *If by the merciful gift and appointment of God, not yet repealed, some infants were once to be admitted members of the visible Church, then some infants are to be so admitted still: But by the merciful gift and appointment of God not yet repealed, some infants were once to be admitted members of the visible Church: therefore they are so to be admitted still.*

Answ. Mr. *B.* pag. 14. plainly saith, that *by* [*admitting*] *he means solemn admitting, that since baptism was instituted* (*or established*) *we*

have

have no precept or example of admitting visible members any other way, that as a Souldier before listing, and as a King before crowning and taking his oath, so are we and infants Church-members before baptism: He saith pag. 26. of this argument, *I will first fetch you one from the Old Testament.* Whence 1. it is apparent that his visible Church membership and admitting visible Church-members, are not the same. 2. That a merciful gift and appointment of God of visible Church-membership is not all one with the merciful gift and appointment of God of admission of visible Church-members. 3. That a merciful gift and appointment of God of admitting visible Church-members, is by some solemn rite. Which is confirmed in that he speaks of admitting visible Church-members, as a duty to be performed by some persons, as when he saith *ch. 4. ought to be admitted visible Church members*, and in this place *were once to be admitted visible Church members.* Visible Church-membership might be and was a gift of God, not a duty, (which is some action to be done by man) but a state or relation resulting from the foundation, or cause, or reason of it. Now if Mr. *B.* cannot shew (as I am confident he cannot) any other gift or appointment of God of admitting infants visible Church-members in the old Testament unrepealed, besides that of circumcision, then either his antecedent (as hee terms it) must be meant of it, or else he mocks the people of God with a pretended merciful gift and appointment of God of admitting infants visible Church-members unrepealed, which is no where extant, but is fained by himself to delude them: and if it be that of Circumcision, then his *minor* asserts the appointment of Circumcision, and his conclusion is, that our infants are still to be circumcised. Nor can I, with all my enquiry and study, conceive (if he had understood himself) he could mean any other. For by his making admission solemn, comparing it with listing of a Souldier, crowning of a King, it is manifest that he understood it of a solemn Rite; and speaking of it as a thing that ought to be, he must mean it of an act to be performed by man; and limiting it now to Baptism, he intimates it was by some Rite answerable to Baptism heretofore, which I hardly think any learned man but would conceive must be meant of Circumcision and no other, sith no other was appointed by God to infants for admission of them as visible Church-members. It is true, he often, when I pressed him in the Dispute to speak plainly whether he meant by his appointment or Law unrepealed that of Circumcision, did deny it, and distinguished between the Law of infants visible Church-membership and that of Circumcision; but he never shewed me a Law of infants admission as visible Church members besides it. And in his arguments whereby he proves the not repealing, he concludes about the not repealing of the Law of infants visible Church-membership, not of their admission. Of which fallacy I had in the Dispute some obscure apprehension, and therefore pressed him so often to speak plainly, and told him he must mean it of Circumcision, (which fact of mine Mr. *B.* did in the Dispute, and doth here *ch. 23.* represent as defective *in tenderness of conscience, fear of God, love of truth, charity to a brother, common modesty*, after his usual

usual fashion of making out-cries without cause,) but could not then clear it, having not then so well understood his opinion, nor his shifting of the terms, nor being able to shew it for want of a Notary, and time to view his arguments, he being also very quick in urging and pressing me to answer, without allowing time to weigh his arguments: and therefore after much altercation concerning his meaning, gave way to his proof of the Law of visible Church-membership unrepealed, and neglected to keep him to the proof of the Law of admission unrepealed, to mine and the Causes great disadvantage. Whether Mr. B. did fraudulently or ignorantly manage the Dispute, belongs to God to judge; though I must needs say, that I did then, and do still suspect he was not free from deceit, or *dolus malus* in it: finding in a Copy I have of the Dispute, that he distinguished then between visible Church membership and admission. As for my self, had I perceived so clearly as now I do, his mind about the kind of visible Church-membership and admission of infants he asserts, I should have stuck to this, That though infants could have been proved visible Church members, according to the Law he pretends unrepealed; yet were they not to be admitted by Baptism, which is appointed onely for visible Church-members by profession of faith: And therefore whereas he saith he *contends more for infants visible Church membership then Baptism*, and makes that *the very heart of the controversie*, I conceive otherwise, and do let him understand, that were it not that I know that he hath very much abused me and others in that which follows, I should think my tenet not overthrown, nor much regard it, though his Law of infants visible Church-membership were yeelded, and my answer to his arguments omitted. But sith things are as they are, I resolve to go on.

"The Antecedent (saith he) hath two parts. 1. That by Gods merci-
"ful gift and appointment some infants were once to be admitted mem-
"bers of the visible Church: This is as far beyond all doubt as you
"can expect. 1. Mr. T. granted it in his publick Dispute: and so he
"doth in his Apology, pag. 66. where he saith [*I acknowledge that in*
"*the visible Church of the Jews, the infants were reckoned to the Church*]
"yet lest any should be so impudent as to deny it, I briefly prove it
"thus. 1. If infants were part of them that entred into Covenant with
"the Lord God, and into his Oath, that he might stablish them for a
"people to himself, and he might be to them a God; then infants were
"part of the Church: But the former is plain, in *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12.
"to any that will read it. Therefore infants were part of the Church.

Answ. What I did I still grant, that infants were part of the Jewish Church, and were circumcised; but the conclusion Mr. B. infers from *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12. is not that which Mr. B. should prove. For it is not all one to say, *Infants were part of the Church*, and *by Gods mercifull gift and appointment some infants were once to be admitted members of the visible Church*. Nor doth *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12. prove either infants were part of the Church, or their admission. Their entring into Covenant was not by any act of their own, but by the Elders or parents, who in like

manner

manner Covenanted for the unborn, *v.* 15. who could not thereby be visible Church-members, being not then existent; and therefore the Covenant there made them not visible Church-members. Nor is there any proof of their admission thence, they were admitted either after or before, the Covenanting was not their admission, for admission is the act of some person that hath that trust or office committed to him; but their Covenanting was the persons own act, and if it did admit the infants, then it did admit the parents, Elders, Captains, and so they did admit themselves, which is absurd; and the establishing them for a people to himself, is no more then as *Piscator* rightly *Schol. in Deut.* 29. 13. *That he might require from thee the worship of himself by obedience towards his precepts, and so may binde thee to himself. So the obligation of the people precedes, and he might be to thee a God, that is may in like manner promise to thee that he will follow thee with his grace, and do thee good and so make thee happy. So Gods promise followes.* It was a Covenant neither to make nor admit them visible Church members, but to engage them to obedience, and to assure them thereupon of protection and blessing: and this extended to their posterity *v.* 15. who could not be then visible Church-members, or admitted then as being not existent.

2. Saith Mr. *B. If infants were engaged to God by the seal of his Covenant (Circumcision) then they were members of his Church: But some infants were so engaged: therefore they were Church members; this is all undeniable. I never yet met with any that denied either.*

Answ Circumcision is not stiled in Scripture the seal of the Covenant, but I grant that infants were members in the Jewish Church visible, admitted by Circumcision, and engaged thereby though not by their own act, yet according to Gods injunction and severe exaction to keep the Law, and this is the onely proof of their admission Mr. *B.* brings out of the old Testament. He adds,

3 *If infants were part of those that were baptized to* Moses *in the cloud and sea, and drank the spiritual drink, even of that rock which was Christ, then sure they were part of the visible Church: But the antecedent is plain* 1 Cor. 10. 1, 2, 3. *They were all baptized*, &c.

Answ. I deny the antecedent to be plain, 1 *Cor.* 10. 1, 2, 3. and have proved the contrary to be true, in the 2d. part of this *Review* Sect. 21. whither I refer the Reader:

4. Saith he, *the Martyr* Stephen *calleth that assembly, whereof they were members* [*the Church in the wilderness*] Acts 7. 38. *Therefore they were Church members.*

Answ. The conclusion and proof is granted, but I observe that the conclusion to be proved is altered from this [*by Gods mercifull gift and appointment, some infants were once to be admitted members of the visible Church*] into this [*infants were Church members, part of the visible Church.*]

The 2d. part of his antecedent, which he saith *is the onely thing I deny, and which the whole weight of this argument lieth on*, is [*that this mercifull gift of God to infants, and ordinance of Church membership is*

not

not repealed] and he saith *he hath here the negative, and the proof lies not on him, yet he will examine my proofs, and then prove the negative by a multitude of evident arguments from the Scripture, that he hath shewed Scripture not questioned for it, and that he may justly expect plain Scripture or argument to prove the repeal of that Law.*

Answ. He hath shewed no plain Scripture, nor any argument for a Law or Ordinance that infants are, were or shall be visible Church-members of which I need prove a repeal, though I grant he hath proved a Law or Ordinance for the admission of infants by Circumcision, which is the onely Law or Ordinance I finde in him, either for infants visible Church-membership or their admission, and if he hold it unrepealed, I can quickly prove the contrary. Nevertheless I follow him in his wild goose race.

"And first, *saith he*, I expected some plain Scripture, 1. Because it "must be a plain word of God onely that can prove the repeal of any "part of his word, and mens reasonings may as likely prove vain in "this as any thing, if they be not grounded upon plain Scripture. And "2. because I deal with those men that call for plain Scripture proof of "infant baptism from us: therefore did I over, and over, and over, de-"sire Mr. *T.* to bring some word of God to prove the repeal of infants "Church-membership. But what text do you think he brought? In "his publike dispute he never offered to name one text: nay, in his "sermon which he preached after upon deliberation, he never offered "to name one text in all the Bible, to prove that God hath repealed "infants Church-membership. Is not this enough to make his cause "suspicious? Nay, I am confident he cannot bring one text for it.

Answ. And I have long expected from Mr. *B.* some plain Scripture in which I might see any such Law or Ordinance distinct from Circumcision for infants visible Church-membership and admission, which I might consider whether it be repealed or no, or capable of a repeal or not. 1. Because it must be a plain word of God onely that can prove such a law, and mens reasonings (as it will appear in the examining them Mr. *Bs.* are) may as likely prove as vain in this as any thing, if they be not grounded upon plain Scripture. And 2. because I deal with those men, particularly Mr. *B.* that pretend plain Scripture proof for infants Church membership and Baptism, but to those that justly call for such, bring no expres precep or example of infants baptism in the N. T. (which alone can be counted plain Scripture proof in this thing) but consequences from Circumcision and the Jewish Church-state, which have no validity but on the grant of such suppositions as are false; yea in these mens disputes against Papists, and Prelates, and others, are rejected; and yet they are so extreme blinde as to think, and so impudent as to bear the people in hand, these are plain Scripture proofs of infants Church membership and Baptism. And therefore did I over and over and over desire Mr. *B.* to bring me some word of God for such a law. But what text do you think he brought? In his publike dispute he never once offered to name one text: nay, in his *Præfat. Orator sect. 6.* printed some few years after upon deliberation he brings none,

though preſſed by me in my *Precurſor*. Nevertheleſs, ſith M. B. forceth me to it, I determine, as I have done to others, ſo to ſift Mr. B's allegations alſo. He goes on in his venemous way thus.

what if Mr. T. ſhould uſe Magiſtrates as he doth infants (as former Anabaptiſts have done) hath he not as good ground? and would they take it well? May be not as well ſay, when I ſhew him Scripture in the old Teſtament for Magiſtrates in the Church, and being Gods people [that it was from the peculiar ſtate of the Jews: God hath ſet up no Magiſtrates of Chriſtians in the Church now] would not our Magiſtrates bid him bring ſome Scripture to prove the repeal, or elſe they ſhall take their old Teſtament Commiſſion for currant? and let him bring me any more Scripture to prove the repeal of infants viſible Church membership, then is brought to prove the repeal of Magiſtrates in the Church if he can: (O how juſt is it with God, that thoſe Magiſtrates who favour, countenance and cheriſh thoſe men, that would keep all Chriſtians infants out of the Church, ſhould by the ſame men be put out themſelves, both of Church and State?)

Anſw. What Anabaptiſts in former times did or held, it is hard to ſay, ſith we have the narration of their facts and tenents onely from their adverſaries. Notwithſtanding *Auguſtines* reckoning *Jovinian* among heretiques, and *Hieromes* invectives againſt *Vigilantius*, yet learned Proteſtants have excuſed or defended both. Dr. *Reynold Conference with Hart, ch. 5. div. 3. Jewels defence of the Apol. Feild of the Church book ch. 30, 31. Cracanthorp vindic. Eccl. Anglic. contra Spalat. Andr. Rivet. ſum. contr. tom. 1. queſt. 1.* &c. Mr. *B.* himſelf would not paſs without a deep cenſure, if the writings of Mr. *Crandon*, Mr. *Eyre*, Dr. *Kendal*, &c. ſhould bee taken for good proof of his tenets. It is much harder, and indeed a moſt injurious thing, that the conceived opinions and practiſes of men of former times, ſhould be charged on Antipædobaptiſts now who do diſclaim them. And as for this ſpiteful paſſage of Mr. *B.* though I have ſaid enough to anſwer it in the 2d. part of this *Review ſect.* 3. yet I add. That I have not ſo good ground to deny Chriſtian Magiſtracy as infants viſible Church-membership, that I have Scripture to prove the repeal (if it muſt bee ſo called) of the pretended viſible Church-membership of infants, which was onely in the Jewiſh national Church now diſſolved, and another frame erected by Chriſt: but not ſo of the Magiſtracy which was not proper to the Jewiſh people. *Melchiſedech* was a King, *Job* was a Magiſtrate *Job* 29, &c. Civil Magiſtracy as the power of Parents, and Maſters, are of the law of nature and nations, Chriſt and his Apoſtles did not alter the ſtate of Magiſtracy, but left them as they found them, and confirmed them; ſundry converted Governours kept their place after converſion: but the viſible Church-membership of infants was onely in the Jewiſh Church, the frame of which is quite altered by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and not the leaſt hint given of any infants being in or ſolemn admiſſion into the Chriſtian viſible Church, but much to the contrary in the new Teſtament. We keep infants out of the Church no otherwiſe then Chriſt and his Apoſtles did, and if Magiſtrates do favour, countenance and cheriſh

us in this, they do but cherish us in the doing of what the Apostles of Christ did, and M. B. that doth animate the Magistrates to molest us, and in his 7th. humble advice to the Parliament *Decemb.* 24. 1654. would have us deprived of *all Pastoral Cure having the publique maintenance*, doth shew his minde to persecute us, and by his grounds had conceived himself bound in conscience to have dealt so with the Apostles, if hee had been in their dayes. But O how good is God to us, and just to him and such as he is, that the madness of such a *Balaam* is rebuked, his advice rejected as injurious, and pernicious, tending to take away that liberty of examining things received, and to impose on mens consciences new subscriptions and conformities, as intollerable as those the Prelates urged, and consequently shutting out light from shining, and inducing persecution afresh; and that he and such as he is, who are *partial in Gods law*, prophaning, yea quite changing or dissolving the prime solemn ordinance of Christ, and opposing (contrary to their solemn Covenant) the reformation of that abuse, *should be made contemptible before all the people* ! *Mal.* 2. 9.

Mr. B. adds, *yet in private I confess he cited two texts to prove the repeal of Gods Ordinance and merciful gift, that infants should be Church-members: and I will read the two places to you (which private conference I would not mention, but lest it should be thought a wrong to him to overpass his owely proofs) The first was* Gal. 4. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. *when I considered that such a man should deny all infants Church-membership, and affirm that God hath repealed that his Ordinance, and merciful gift, and have no more Scripture for it then such as this, and yet be so confident, it maketh me amazed. Hath he not a good wit, that can prove that Christ hath repealed his merciful gift, because he hath redeemed us from under our bondage and tutorage? or that he hath shut out all infants from his Church, because he hath delivered them from the inconveniences of their minority? If I had no better proof then this for infant baptism, I should be ashamed once to open my mouth for it.*

Answ. Had Mr. *B.* any true love, or justice towards me, as he seems to have by his pretended loathness to mention my private conference, he had not so often and with such false calumniatory inferences mentioned in his writings what past in private conference concerning my censure of mens not receiving the doctrine of Antipædobaptism, my plea for plurality of places, *&c.* whereby he hath done what in him lay, to defame me as proud, covetous, schismatical, and given over by God to a reprobate minde, though there was no necessity of such divulgings. But much experience hath taught me to expect no better usage from an intemperate Zelot for his opinion, though a pretended friend and seeming godly, then from an open enemy. Mr. *B.* is amazed that I alledged *Gal.* 4. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. as I did, and but that I have learned *nil admirari* of such passages, I should be amazed at his dealing with me, in setting down my proofs, though they were but in a private conference without study. The thing of which he urged me to prove the repeal, I remember not whether it were of the visible Church-membership of infants, or of their admission. The latter was it, the repeal of which he

denied; For ſo was his antecedent [*By the merciful gift and appointment of God not yet repealed, ſome infants were once to be admitted members of the viſible Church*] and this is proved plainly from *Gal.*4.1,&c. that the ordinance of admiſſion (which was no other then circumciſion) of infants is repealed; yea, if that explication of *Beza*, *Legem enim (id eſt totam illam legalem oeconomiam) dicit fuiſſe inſtar tutoris ſive curatoris ad certum tempus dati*, thus Engliſhed in the *New Annot. For hee ſaith that the law, that is the whole Government of Gods houſe according to the law, was as it were a kinde of tutorſhip or office of an Overſeer appointed for a time*, be right, the Church-memberſhip viſible of infants (which was peculiar to the Jews, and belonged to the legal Church-ſtate) is plainly limited in that place to a certain time now expired, and conſequently the ordinance of ſuch Church-memberſhip (if there had been ſuch) repealed. And *I* ſay, that if he had ſo good proof for his infant baptiſm, as this is for the repeal of his pretended ordinance of infants admiſſion and viſible Church-membe.ſhip unrepealed, *I* would plead for it as he doth. But Mr. *B.* as one that ha h a good wit, can by his Chymiſtry prove hence his non repeal.

Nay, ſaith he, *I pray you do but conſider, whether his own proof be not ſufficient againſt him? Doth not this text plainly tell us, that the heir in his minority is Lord of all? and ſo approve of the natural birth priviledge of our children in civil things? And will God then deny children to be heirs of any thing, and bereave them of their ſpiritual or Church-priviledge, and neither tell us why he doth it, nor that he doth it.*

Anſw. Gods heirs are but co-heirs with Chriſt *Rom.*8 17. true believers or elect p rſons, who are not depri ed by me of any truely ſo called ſpiritual Church priviledge. The priviledge of infants viſible Church-membership as it came with the ſpiri ual Church-ſtate of *Abrahams* family, ſo it ceaſed with the diſſolution thereof, of which God hath given us reaſon in that it was but for an appointed time by God, which as it began with Gods ſpeci l love to *Abraham*, ſo it ended upon his loathing his unbelieving poſterity, and ſetting his love on the Gentiles.

Again, ſaith he, *more plainly: if Chriſt came to free the heir from his bondage and tutorage onely, and from the ſervitude of his minority; is it likely that he came to free them from their Church-memberſhip? Can any man think that this was any part of the bondage? I require thoſe whoſe conſciences are not wholly enſlaved to their fancies and conceits, to judge of this ſoberly, whether they can poſſibly think it a bondage to be a member both of the univerſal Church and of a particular! Let them not here tell me that Circumciſion was a bondage, or that the Law was a Tutor; For I ſpeak of none of theſe, but of their being members of the Church of God.*

Anſw. Whom Mr. *B.* means by perſons *whoſe Conſciences are wholly enſlaved to their fancies and conceits* I cannot determine, *I* know few men who give me more cauſe of fear that they are ſuch then Mr. *B.* who ſeems to me to have more conceits and fancies then one, and thoſe with ſo much pertinacy and violent zeal promoted, as (me thinks) ſcarce agree to a ſober man. For my ſelf *I* ſay, that ſuch a viſible Church-

member-

membership as the infants of the Jews had, in my sobereſt judgement, I not onely can possibly think (which Mr. *B.* himself also may do, sith it implies no contradiction) but do verily think to have been a part of the imperfect state of the Church, and in some respect of the bondage. For though Churchmembership be a priviledge of it self, yet comparatively, and in respect of some consequents attending it, as namely subjection to the whole Law of *Moses*, it is a manifest imperfection and bondage. As the state of the Apostles was a state of minority, bondage, imperfection, while Christ was on earth in comparison of the estate after his ascension, when the spirit was powred out upon them *John* 16, 7. And I doubt not to affirm that Christ came to free his whole Church from that visible Church-membership it had then, by natural descent, and consequently to alter the visible, Church-membership of infants into a more perfect way, by setting up a Church throughout the world, not by carnal descent in one nation, but in a spiritual way by faith in Christ, through the preaching of the Gospel. And *I* must tell Mr. *B.* of *Circumcision and the Law, it's bondage and Tutorage* (whether it like him or not) sith infants had no where else visible Church-membership then in the Jewish Church, whereby they were in bondage to Circumcision and the Law. Nor can I tell what ordinance of admitting visible Church-members unrepealed he means, besides that of Circumcision, and therefore he must speak of these if he speak of the visible church-membership in the Jewish Church which had these annexed.

3. *Yet further*, saith he, *when this text tels us that Christ came to redeem us from under the Law, and the bondage of minority, is it not a clear proof that he hath brought us into a far better state then we were in before? and hath advanced us in his family, as the Heir at age is advanced? And can any man of common sence and conscience expound this of his casting all their infants out of his family? Christs Church is his family; and doth the Heir use to be freed by being cast out of the family? why may he not as well say, that all the body of the Jewish nation are now delivered by being cast out of the Church or Family of Christ? Is it not more agreeable to the scope of the Apostle here to affirm, that certainly they are so far from being turned out of the family or Church of Christ, that by Christ they are now brought into a far higher state, and made members of a far better Church, then that particular Church of the Jews was.*

Answ. It is true, Christ hath advanced his Church into a far better state then it was in before, and that is the reason why infants are left out (I say not cast out) of his visible Church. For whereas the particular Church of the Jews (in which alone infants were visible Church-members) was as well a civil Commonwealth as a Church of God, and was by descent of birth, and by proselytism made up of all in the Commonwealth; it seemed good to God to make his Church more spiritual, consisting onely of them who owned Christ as their Lord; and therefore till infants do so, they are no parts of the visible Church Christian. And thus men of common sence and tender consciences may and must expound the Apostle, it being agreeable to his scope, if they will speak rightly: And the body of the Jewish nation, I mean the greatest or

most

moſt conſiderable part, if embracing the Goſpel they had been baptized, their children being not baptized till they profeſſed, had been rightly ſaid to be delivered from the minority and bondage they were in before in the ſenſe before declared. Mr. *B.* adds.

4. *And if any yet ſay, that it is not the infants, but onely the parents that are thus advanced by Chriſt to a better ſtate, is not this text plain againſt him? For the Apoſtle extendeth redemption here to thoſe that were under the Law; and who knoweth not that infants were under the Law? And if it did not belong to each individual under the Law, yet it cannot in any tolerable ſence be denied to belong to each ſpecies or age: (yet I can prove, that conditionally this deliverance was to each individual perſon in the ſenſe as God ſent his ſon Jeſus to turn every one of them from their iniquity, Act. 3. laſt.) And now judge I pray, whether this be not a pittifull ground for men to prove the repeal of Gods merciſull gift and ordinance of infants Church-membership.*

Anſw. That which I ſay is, that the particular Church of the Jews being diſſolved, a Church of a better conſtitution is by God erected, and ſo the Church of God is advanced by Chriſt into a better ſtate, that is, from carnal to ſpiritual, which neceſſitates the leaving infants out of the viſible Church Chriſtian, till they be diſciples or believers: and this is a better eſtate to infants as well as parents, ſith that Church-ſtate did engage them to Circumciſion and the Law, which were their bondage. Nevertheleſs Mr. *Bs.* proof is not to be allowed: For it follows not, redemption is extended to thoſe that were under the Law, therefore to each individual, or to each ſpecies or age, the term being indefinite, and the ſpeech true if any under the Law, and thoſe of one ſpecies or age be redeemed; as in like ſort, when God is ſaid *to chooſe the poor, the weak things of this world*, this proves not univerſal election of the poor, or weak, ſith the terms being indefinite, they need not be underſtood univerſally except in neceſſary matter. I remember once in a Diſpute it was urged thus for univerſal redemption, *Chriſt came to redeem them that were under the Law, all are under the Law, Ergo.* To which I anſwered by denying the *minor*, producing *Gal.* 4. 21. *Rom.* 6. 14, *&c.* though I might have anſwered alſo by denying the indefinite term to contain all. But if Mr. *Bs.* reaſoning be good *that it cannot in any tolerable ſence be denied to belong to each ſpecies or age becauſe they were under the Law*, it will follow, that it cannot be denied in any tolerable ſence to each Jew, for they were under the Law, and then it will follow that the Jews were univerſally redeemed that they might receive the adoption of ſons. And it ſeems by his words in his Parentheſis, Mr. *B.* holds a conditional deliverance for each individual perſon meant *Gal.* 4. 5. concerning which, beſides what I have ſaid before, Sect. 33, 34, 35. I adde this cenſure of Mr. *John Collings. Provoc. provocatus* in anſwer to *Boatman*, ch. 5. pag. 61. *Univerſal redemption; conditional Covenant. Two Covenants, one abſolute, another conditional, are notions in Divinity I do not underſtand, and think them hardly reconcilable to truth, (if to ſenſe,) they are the canting language of thoſe that would ſupply* Franciſcus de Sancta Clara's *place, as to reconciling us and Arminians,*

nians, and are no better then Arminianism minced for the better digestion. But those words of Mr. B. that God sent his son Jesus to turn every one of them from their iniquities, Acts 3. last, in the sense he can prove (as he thinks) that conditionally this deliverance was for each individual person, do import that he holds that Christ was sent not onely for universal redemption conditionally, but also for universal conversion conditionally. Which if true, then Christ blesseth all by turning every one from his iniquity, Acts 3.26. conditionally; and then unless he can assign another condition than the act of a mans free will, he must hold universal grace of conversion, and conversion by Christs blessing conditional upon the concurrence of mans free-will, which is indeed the venome of Arminianism. Which if Mr. B. hold (as his words import) I may well say he stands on pitifull ground, a very quagmire, however men judge of my proof from Gal. 4. 1. &c. of the repeal of the pretended ordinance of infants Church-membership.

Mr. B. proceeds. *But one Text more was named, and that is my Text*, Matth. 28. 19, 20. *Go disciple all nations, &c. Is not this brave proving the repeal before mentioned? what saith this Text to any such matter?*

Answ. The first question hath so much insolent folly, that I think fit to give no answer to it. To the second I say, 1. This Text compared with *Mark* 16.15. proves, that Christ appointed after his resurrection, that his Church should be gathered in all nations by preaching the Gospel, and baptizing, and no otherwise; and consequently, the Church not gathered this way is not agreeable to Christs institution. The forepart of the antecedent is plain; For as *Paræus* rightly paraphraseth the words, *Com. in Mat.* 28. 19. Christs words have this sense, *Make to me Disciples, gather to me a Church among all nations by your preaching bringing them to the faith of the Gospel.* And *Piscat. observ. Matth.* 28. 19. *By the coherence of the sentences it is signified, first by the doctrine of the Gospel the nations were to be brought into the Church, then to be baptized when they should enter into the Church and profess the faith.* And that neither the institution of Christ, nor practise of the N. T. allows any other way of gathering the Church, is proved in the 2d. Part of this *Review*, sect. 5. *&c.* 2. I say this Text excludes infants from being baptized, as is proved in the same place, and consequently from being visible members of the Christian Church. The antecedent is confirmed from Mr. *Bs* words, *Plain Scrip. proof, &c.* against Mr. *Bed.* pag. 299, 300. where he proves from *Mat.* 28. 19. *Mark* 16. 16. *&c. That in the institution and every example of Baptism through all the Bible, the first grace is pre-requisite as a condition, which he makes to be faith included in the term* [*Disciple.*] The consequence is also proved from Mr. *Bs.* assertion, *Plain Scrip. proof, &c. Par.* 1. *ch.* 5. *pag.* 24, 25. and elsewhere, proved from *Mat.* 28. 19. *All visible Church members are to be baptized.* Whence I infer, All visible members of the Christian Church are to be baptized; No infant is to be baptized. Therefore no infant is a visible member of the Christian Church. Now if no infants are now visible members of the Christian Church, and the Church which is gathered

thered without making Disciples by preaching the Gospel first to them, and then baptizing them, is not agreeable to Christs institution, then Christ hath repealed the gift and ordinance of visible Church membership of infants. I expect now some brave answer from Mr. *B.* to these plain arguments without any bravery. But what do I meet with.

" Nay, *saith he*, I am confident the contrary will be proved from " this Text also: For if it be nations that must be discipled and bap- " tized, certainly all infants can never be excluded, but must needs " some of them at least be included. I do not believe that men were " to be made Disciples by force; nor that all were Disciples when the " King or greater part were so: But that the Apostles commission was to " disciple nations; this is their work which they should endeavour to " accomplish: and therefore this was a thing both possible and desira- " ble: therefore when the parents are by teaching made Disciples, the " children are thereby discipled also: As if a woman escape drowning, " the child in her body escapes thereby; yet this is not by any natural " cause, but by force of Gods grant or Covenant.

Answ. Though Mr. *Bs.* confidence, and his fooliſh admirations and exclamations have taken much with the ſhallow and heedleſs both Miniſters and people of this age, yet they appear ridiculous to me. His ſpeeches in this place are but dictates, that *if nations be to be diſcipled, infants cannot be excluded*; that *becauſe they were to endeavour the diſcipling all nations, therefore infants*; that *when the parents are by teaching made Diſciples, the children are diſcipled alſo*: all which I deny, and have demonſtrated to be falſe ſo fully in the 2d. Part of this *Review*, ſect. 5. *&c.* that I ſhall as ſoon expect the ſnow be proved black, as any of them proved by Mr. *B.* or any other. His ſimilitude is frivolous, no child being included in the parent in reſpect of diſcipling, as the child in the womb is in reſpect of drowning. If it were, then alſo in reſpect of baptizing, ſo that if the mother with child be baptized, the child alſo is baptized as wel as diſcipled, and then baptiſm of ſuch infants after would be rebaptization. Such a grant or Covenant, by force of which infants are made Diſciples is a meer figment. If infants were made Diſciples by a Covenant, it muſt be of God to them, wherein he promiſeth it to them upon their parents bei g diſcipled; and if ſo, then they are diſcipled ere they be born, and conſequently not made Diſciples by the Apoſtles, and ſo no part of the nation to be diſcipled by them, nor they to endeavour their diſcipling unleſs they ſhould *actum agere, do what is already done*; whence it will follow, that they had no commiſſion to diſciple or baptize infants, for they had no commiſſion to diſciple by Gods Covenant, or to baptize ſuch Diſciples, but thoſe who were made by their preaching Diſciples; and as Mr. *Collings* ſaith truly in his *Provoc. provoc. ch.* 5. *pag.* 54. *The Apoſtles notwithſtanding that precept*, Matth. 28. 19, 20. *did not think themſelves obliged to baptize any, but ſuch as believed and confeſſed their ſins* Mr. *B.* adds.

" When all that dwelt at *Lydda* and *Saron* were turned to the Lord, the whole cities, infants and all, were diſcipled.

Anſw.

Answ. Though our last translation read *Acts* 9. 35. *And all that dwelt at Lydda and Saron saw him, and turned to the Lord*; yet in the Greek, and agreeably the *vulgar*, *Beza*, &c. *And all that dwelt at Lydda and Saron saw him, who turned to the Lord*; which seems to import, that all they who turned to the Lord saw him, and so [*they that saw him*] is limited by [*them turned to the Lord,*] which is not to be said of infants. But were the reading retained as it is in our last translation, yet it is a grosse conceit of Mr. *B.* to apply this to infants. For it is said of these, 1. That they saw *Æneas* cure. 2. That they were converted to the Lord. 3. That by seeing the cure of *Æneas* they were moved to turn to the Lord, as *Piscator* in his *Scholie* saith, *to wit, moved by the miraculous healing of* Æneas *by* Peter. Now to affirm these things of infants, is in my apprehension (however it be in Mr. *Bs.*) against common sense. Besides me thinks Mr. *B.* should not be ignorant that frequently in the Scripture such expressions wherein the word [*all*] is used, are limited to a greater part, and those of years the matter so requiring it, as *Matth.* 2. 3. & 3. 5. *Acts* 8 10, &c. Mr. *B.* adds.

How can Christ bid them, Go and disciple all Nations, if infants and so all the Nation are utterly uncapable of being disciples? or how will Mr. T. expound the word all nations?

Answ. Had Mr. *B.* heeded the words of the 13. Section of the first part of my *Examen*, or the 14th. section of the *Postscript* to my *Apology* in answer to Mr. *Bl.* he might have found answer to these questions. But I conceive upon very probable signes Mr. *B.* never studied my writings, but lightly read them, and I finde he hath dealt with me in like manner concerning my answers in the dispute at *Bewdley*, and such passages as he excepts against which fell from me in private conference, and that this is the reason of these and many more unnecessary questions he puts me to answer. But if the Reader please to read the 2d. part of this *Review sect.* 5, &c. he may see a full answer to these questions, the sum whereof is this; that Christ bids them *Go*, and by preaching the Gospel *Mark.* 16. 15. make disciples of or out of all nations, and then baptize them, who by believing the Gospel became disciples, *Mark.* 16. 16. which may and must be understood with exclusion of infants, as when he bids them *preach the Gospel to every creature Mark.* 16. 15. & *Col* 1. 23. *it was preached to every creature under heaven*, yet no infant meant. And by way of retortion, I do seriously ask Mr. *B.* how he will expound the word *all nations*? and how Christ can bid them disciple infants without making Christ a fool and a tyrant in commanding that which is ridiculous and impossible?

Mr. *B* saith of me further. *He oft saith, It is here one and there one out of a city or nation that God will call: I shall say more to the shame of this speech afterwards: yet let me say this much at present. If it bee but some few, or here and there one, yea or but the most that Christ commandeth to disciple, then we must endeavour to make but those few or most disciples (for our endeavour must not go beyond our command and commission) But this is most horrid Doctrine, and notoriously false, [that Apostles and Ministers ought not to endeavour the discipling of all, but of some,] (For*

Paul oft profeßeth his longing and endeavour to the contrary:) *therefore it is an falſe that the command is not for the diſcipling all.*

Anſw. What Mr. *B.* hath ſaid to the ſhame of my ſpeech *plain Scripture proof*, &c. *pag.* 279, 280. (which is I think the place I ſee means) is to the ſhame of ſo impudent an affronting of plain Scripture proof retelled in my *Preeurſor ſect.* 22. which ſhame is not at all covered by his reply in his *præſtinis morator ſect.* 22. in which he doth not at all anſwer my proof out of Scripture for my ſpeech, but onely ſeeks to acquit himſelf from that which I charge him with as not rightly ſetting down my words, which is his frequent fault. Two parts of my ſpeech he excepts againſt, 1. that God will not call nor ever did, a whole nation ſo as that every individual ſhould be within the viſible Church. Againſt this he refers to his *Addition pag.* 339. 340. and there he turns me over to Mr. *Hudſon*, and refers me to the anſwering of him when I anſwer the 20th. Chapter of the firſt part of his *plain Script.* &c. But many of the texts, and conſequently the reſt are ſhewed to bee impertinently alledged, in the 2d. part of this *Review ſect.* 9. (where *pag.* 129. I was miſtaken in what I ſaid, I know not what is in Mr. *Bs.* addition *pag.* 339, 340. thinking then it had been ſome addition which was not in his firſt edition, which now I finde otherwiſe) and therefore if I ſay no more of that, the Reader will not want an anſwer to the allegations in his *addition pag.* 339, 340. 2. He excepts againſt what he conceives I ſay [that Apoſtles and Miniſters ought not to endeavour the diſcipling of all, but of ſome] which he terms *horrid doctrine and notoriouſly falſe.* On the other ſide if my meaning be rightly underſtood, to wit, of perſons that have not the uſe of reaſon, ſuch as infants, natural fools, &c. I aver the contrary doctrine to be horrid and notoriouſly falſe, for the reaſons fore-given. If he charge me with it, that becauſe I ſay God will not call a whole nation (which I mean of effectuall call alluding to 1 *Cor.* 1. 26, 27, &c.) therefore I mean that we ſhould endeavour to diſciple none but ſuch, his charge is but a calumny. No words of mine either in pulpit writing, or private ſpeech, tended to ſuch a ſenſe. As for what he ſaith, *Paul oft profeſſeth his longing endeavour to the contrary*, if he mean contrary to my aſſertion, it is moſt falſe. He no where profeſſeth his longing and endeavour to diſciple the whole of a nation, even the infants. The profeſſion he makes *Philip.* 1. 8. is the fulleſt and likelieſt to be meant by Mr. *B.* that comes to my thoughts, which it were ridiculous to apply to infants, [they all] being the ſame to whom he wrote entituled, *Saints in Chriſt* v. 1. with whom *he had fellowſhip in the Goſpel* v. 5. *in whom God had begun a good work* v. 6. *who in his bonds and in the defence and confirmation of the Goſpel were partakers of his grace* v. 7. *whoſe love* he mentions v. 9.

Thus much for the proof of which Mr. *B.* was confident. To his words, *If this* [my alleaging *Gal.* 4. 1, &c. *Matth.* 28. 19. as before] *be not to feign God to ſay what we would have him; yea contrary to what he doth ſay, then I am quite miſtaken.* I anſwer, I grant it, and add that I do not call to minde that ever I found a man of ſo much fame, and confidence, ſo fouly miſtaken as Mr. *B.* is in this point. I proceed as faſt as I can after Mr. *B.* who hath made the way foul by his ſcribling.

SECT.

SECT. LI.

The arguments from the altering of the Jewish Church constitution and call, the ceasing of the High Priest, &c. to prove Infants now no visible Church-members, are made good against Mr. Bs. 5th. Ch. plain, &c. part. 1.

But let us hear, saith he, *whether his arguments be any clearer then these texts for him. The sum of all his arguments, that I can hear, is this: If the Church constitution whereof they were members be taken down, then their membership is taken down: but the Church &c. therefore &c. To prove the antecedent this is added: If their Church call be altered, then their Church constitution is altered: but their Church call is altered, therefore, &c. To prove the minor, he shews the different calls then and now. 1. Then they were called by Moses or Abraham, the Magistrate; but now by Ministers. 2. Then all the nation was called in one day, even servants and all; but now God cals here one and there one. Besides he shews, that the Temple Priesthood, sacrifices are taken down, and therefore the Church constitution. This is the very strength of all that Mr. T. hath to say, to prove the repeal of Gods merciful Ordinance of infants Church membership. And I cannot chuse but say, They are silly souls, and tractable to novelty, and easily seduced from the truth of God, and far from the stability of judicious tender conscienc't Christians, who will be drawn by such misty, cloudy arguing, without any Scripture proof; yea and against so much Scripture.*

Answ. And I cannot chuse but say that Mr. *Bs.* dealing is disingenuous and Sophistical, in sore-stalling Readers by such censures, which are the mere evaporations of his own ignorance and confidence, and I might add arrogance. But to the argument. I deny that this is the very strength of all that I have to say to prove the repeal, or that it is cloudy, misty arguing, against any Scripture, But from it. The argument is taken from the notation of the word Church, put into the definition of it by the generality of Divines, yea by Mr. *B.* himself't *plain Script. proof, &c. pag* 71, 82, that *the Greek word for Church is from calling out, and that the Church is a people or a society of persons called out of the world.* Whence it follows, that they who are not called out of the world are not of the Church, they that have not an outward call, are not of the visible *Church*: But infants have not the outward call of the *Christian Church*, therefore are not visible members in the *Christian Church*. The *minor* is proved from the proper call of the *Christian Church*, which is proved negatively not to be as the *Jewish Church*, 1. by authority, 2. of a whole people together. 2. affirmatively by assigning 1. the onely way of outward call in the *Christian Church* to be by preaching the Gospel, 2. that this call is of single persons severed in their habitations, relations, *&c.* The former is proved by story. Two remarkable outward calls there were of the *Church* of Israel, one by *Abraham*, and that was *Gen.* 17. (perhaps there was some other, but no other occurs to me) and that was according to Gods direction

rection by authority, taking in all his house together, not by preaching as the Apostles did. The other of *Moses Exod.* 19 &c. which was done in like manner. The later is proved by institution and practise to be seen in these and many more Scriptures, *Ephes* 4. 11, 12, &c. *Acts* 2. 41. 47. *Act.* 8. 12, &c. But of this which is the onely outward churchcal infants are not the subjects, therefore neither of visible churchmembership, which is always this way and no other in the *Christian Churches*. This is further confirmed from those Scriptures which deny the new birth necessary to admission into the *Christian Church* to be by humane generation (which it must bee if it bee as the *Jewish* churchmembership was) as *Joh.* 1. 13. and ascribe it even in Jews the n. Iv s to the word *Jam.* 1. 18. 1 *Pet.* 1. 23. It is further confirmed in that the distinction of the *Church* visible and invisible, is from their different calling. They are not of the invisible who are not inwardly called, they are not of the visible who have not the outward call. *Primum illud quod acta Ecclesiam constituit, est vocatio: unde etiam & nomen suum accipit & definitionem.* Hudson *vindic. p.* 67. *external vocation and submission gave right* in foro Ecclesiæ *to be admitted members of the Church. Ecclesia enim est cœtus hominum vocatorum* 1 Cor. 1. 24. *cum* 10. 32. *Ames Medul Th. l.* 1. *c.* 31. §. 6. 7. But infants have not the outward call, they are not brought into the Church by the word. Therefore they are not visible Church-members.

What saith Mr. *B.* now? 1 *You must distinguish between the particular Church of the Jews, and the universal visible Church. And here I lay down these three propositions.* 1. *The Jews Church was not the whole universal visible Church that God had then in the world.* And this he alleageth as my opinion with others and confirms it by sundry arguments.

Answ. Though the *Assembly at westminster* say *Confess. of faith* ch. 25. art. 2. *The visible Church, which is also Catholick or universal under the Gospel (not confined to one nation, as before under the law) consists, &c.* yet I agree with Mr. *B* in his proposition though not in all his proofs. For the text *Gen.* 18. 19. proves not the continuance of the Church in any of *Abrahams* posteri y but those by *Isaac*, nor do, the instances of *Bethuel, Hiram*, the *Ninivites, Candace* Queen of the *Ethiopians*, evince a Church of God distinct from the Jewish.

His 2d. proposition is, *if the Jewish Church had been the whole visible Church, yet it would have been considerable in both respects; both as the Jewish Church and as the universal*, which I let pass. His third is.

There is no member of any particular Church, who is not also a member of the universal Church: Therefore infants were members of the universal visible Church as well as of the Jews particular Church; so that if it could be proved that their membership in that particular Church is overthrown, yet that is nothing to prove that they have lost their standing in the universal Church. But this I shall fullier improve and vindicate hereafter.

Answ. It is much to prove they have lost their standing in the universal, if they had no standing in the universal distinct from that in the particular: as an excommunicate, Apostate, &c. hath lost his standing in the universal visible Church, if he have no standing therein distinct from

from that in the particular Church, which he hath loſt. And this was the caſe of infants, they had no ſtanding in the univerſal diſtinct from that which they had in the Jewiſh Church; and therefore it, that particular Church-ſtate or frame be diſſolved in which alone infants are reckoned as members, (as it is,) and another erected in which they are not reckoned, infants are not any longer to be reckoned as viſible Church-members. And his I ſhall make good when I come to Mr. *Bs.* fuller improvement of this.

2. Saith Mr. *B. You muſt diſtinguiſh between the eſſentials, and ſome accidentals of the Jewiſh Church: The Prieſthood, Temple, Sacrifice, &c. were meerly accidental, and might be repealed without the repeal of the eſſentials, or the ordinance eſtabliſhing the Church it ſelf.*

Anſw. I grant the diſtinction, but find it of no uſe, till it be ſhewed what are the eſſentials, and what not; what the ordinance is that eſtabliſhed that Church, that it is of the eſſentials of that Church, that infants be viſible members is of the eſſentials of that Church: which to aſſert were all one as to ſay, the Jewiſh Church had been no Church viſible without infants, which I take to be abſurd.

3. Saith Mr. *B.* "You muſt diſtinguiſh between their Church conſi-
"dered in it ſelf, and conſidered comparatively as to others. The Jews
"were a peculiar people and Church of God, no other had the like
"priviledges. Now if they had believed, they ſhould have kept all their
"priviledges abſolutely conſidered: (except it be a loſing them to
"change them for greater.) But comparatively conſidered, they ſhould
"not have kept ſome relative priviledges: For they ſhould no longer
"have been a ſingular peculiar people, ſeeing others ſhould have en-
"joyed as great priviledges as they; yet this would have been without
"any loſs of theirs, much more without wholly unchurching them or
"their children. When a man hath but one ſon, he hath the priviledge
"of being his Fathers onely Son: But when his father hath many
"more, he hath loſt that priviledge; and yet is not therefore turned
"out of the Family; nay, the adding of more Brethren in our caſe, is
"an increaſe of the happineſs of each particular: for this is the very
"caſe of the Jews. The adding of the Gentiles would have made the
"Jews no more to be ſo peculiar as to be ſingular in their priviledges;
"and yet they ſhould have enjoyed never the leſs. Therefore mark it,
"the Scripture ſpeaking of taking in the Gentiles, it expreſſeth it as
"by taking down the partition wall, and making of both one Church;
"but it ſpeaks not of unchurching the Jews firſt, and their children, or
"bereaving them of their priviledges. And when in his Viſion *Peter*
"was taught the Doctrine of the Gentiles reception into the Church,
"*Acts* 10. it was not by making the Jews unclean, but by cleanſing the
"Gentiles to be clean as the Jews. So that if the Jews would have belie-
"ved, they ſhould have loſt only their comparative priviledges conſiſt-
"ing in the ſingularity of their enjoyments, which is no loſs to them, to
"have the Gentiles enjoy them as well as they; but their priviledges in
"themſelves conſidered, would not have been diminiſhed, but ſome
"leſſer turned into greater: And therefore certainly God would ne-

"ver

ver have turned their children all out of the visible Church.

Answ. The distinction is of the *Jewish* Church considered in it self, and comparatively as to others; but the application is (as if Mr. *B.* had forgotten his distinction) of their privileges considered absolutely, and comparative, and then he saith if the *Jews* had believed, they had lost onely their comparative priviledges, not in themselves considered. Concerning which conceits, it had been requisit, if he would be understood, that either he should have given a catalogue of each sort of privileges, or such a description of them as whereby we might understand which are of the one sort, which of the other. My opinion is, that had the *Jews* believed, that is every individual *Jew* of age, or the greatest part had received the Gospel, they should have enjoyed with the Gentiles all the priviledges of the Covenant of saving graces; the *Jewish* people should have enjoyed their possessions in their own Land, which me thinks Christs words import, *Luke* 19. 41, 42, 43. But deny that they should have this as a priviledge to them, that their children should be accounted visible members of the Christian Churches. For Gods purpose was to erect a Church universal uniformly by preaching the Gospel, and not by birth; and it appeared plainly by the practise of *John Baptist*, Christ and his Apostles, who never took in any believing parents infant to Baptism and the Christian Church, nor admitted any *Jew* without his own personal profession of Faith in Christ. Nor is the contrary proved by *Ephes.* 2. 14. but that very thing I assert. For the taking down the partition wall was by taking away the *Jewish* rites, and Church state, that none could be joyned to them without conformity to the Law, now one Church is made of both by faith through the Gospel, *Ephes.* 3. 6. And in like manner when *Peter* took in *Cornelius*, *Acts* 10. he declared Gods mind in his Vision, *v.* 35. *that in every Nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him*; but he doth not say that every one of their infant children are taken in to the Church, nor did he any act whereby to shew that to be Gods mind. Nor are Mr. *Bs.* observations of any force, for they suppose that if the Church state of the *Jews* were altered, *Paul would have spoken of their unchurching*, *Ephes.* 2. 14. and *Peter*, *Acts* 6. *of their making unclean*, which implies as if there were no other way then these to alter their Church-state, and to leave the infants out of the visible Church Christian; whereas I have often shewed the contrary, that it was done by taking in onely to baptism believers, releasing from the burden of Circumcision and the Law, which might have been though all the *Jews* of age had been believers.

14. Saith Mr. *B. So when we call the Jews* [*a National Church*] *and when Mr. T. saith God took the whole Nation to be his Church, it may be meant either in regard of the appropriation and restriction to that Nation onely, as if God had not called any other whole Nation: and so it may be true, that the Jews onely were a National Church (though yet it is doubtfull, as what is said of* Melchizedek *before sheweth:) and also in regard of their National and Church unity (which yet is the excellency and strength of all other Churches;) or else by a National Church may be meant, as if*

all

all were Church members that were of that Nation, and no more were required to the being a Church member but to be of that Nation: And thus I perceive it is by many understood. But this is notoriously false.

Answ. It is in this last sense I mean it, and I think it manifestly true with these explications. 1. That they were of that Nation by birth property, or proselytism. 2. That they were Church-members while they continued to be of that Nation any of these way. 3. That they were Church-members with some disparance or inequality of privileges. Let's view Mr *Bs.* proofs.

For it was then as well as now, the Covenant of God (wherein he took them for his peculiar people, and they took him for their onely God, the parents engaging for themselves and their children) which made them members of the Church. For 1. *No aged person, no not servants, much less ordinary proselites were members, except they entred the Covenant; though they are commanded to circumcise all in their house, yet it is supposed, that by their interest and authority, they caused them first to enter the Covenant: Therefore they were to circumcise the servants bought with money, as being absolutely their own, whom they had most interest in; but not the hired servants, whom they had no such authority over (except they became proselytes voluntarily)*

Answ. A mutual Covenant, such as that at Mount *Sinai*, I deny not to have made the people of *Israel* the Church of God, and consequently the infants then born visible Church-members. But I deny that it was then by reason of the parents engaging for themselves and their children, sith it appears plainly by *Exod.* 19.7,8. & 24.3. that the Elders of the people onely engaged for the whole Nation. And the same I conceive of the Covenant *Deut.* 29.10,11,12. The Covenant *Gen.* 17. if it were mutual, it doth not appear that any other then *Abraham* himself engaged for his house. Nor do I deny such a mutual Covenant, if the Lord should enter into it, or declare his mind concerning it, would make a Nation, and consequently infants Church members. But according to the constitution of the Christian visible Church I deny God makes any such Covenant or declares his mind that by such Covenant he will gather his Church. Yet were it yeelded that the Covenant made them members of the Church, the Propositions are true nevertheless with my explications, That all were Church-members that were of that Nation, and no more is required to the being a Church-member but to be of that Nation. And to what he alledgeth, I acknowledge that ordinary Proselytes at first admission were not members without their Covenant engaging them and theirs in their power to the observance of the Law of *Moses*, and the same reason I conceive of hired servants, and that thereby they became of that Nation, or as the *Jewish Doctors* say were regenerated, and lost their former kindred, and became Jews. But it was not enough to make them of that Church, though they covenanted or professed to take *Jehovah* for their onely God, except they took on them to observe *Moses Law*. Therefore *Cornelius* was no visible member of the Jewish Church, though *he feared God with all his house*, but was shunned by them, *Acts* 10.28. & 11.3. as *an unclean*

clean, uncircumciſed perſon of another Nation. Nor do I find any proof of that which Mr *B.* ſuppoſeth, that *all aged perſons, as ſervants bought were before they were circumciſed cauſed by their Maſters intereſt and authority to enter the Covenant firſt.* But this doth no whit overthrow the Poſitions, That all were Church-members that were of that Nation, and that no more was required to the being a Church-member but to be of that Nation. Nor is there any more force in what Mr. *B.* adds. 2. *And though they were taken into the Church in infancy yet if they afterward forſook or renounced the Covenant, they were to be cut off from the Church, yea to be put to death.* 3. *And in many caſes their children were to be put to death with them. And therefore their Church was not ſo National as that any in the Nation ſhould be a member of it who forſook the Covenant.* Which I grant: For then they ceaſed to be of that Nation, that is in that policy, or Commonwealth *de jure* at leaſt, if not *de facto.* What he adds, *Indeed God choſe the ſeed of Abraham in a ſpecial manner? but not to be Church-members immediately, but firſt to enter into his Covenant, and take him for their God, and ſo to be Church members,* is not true. For immediately upon their birth, the ſeed of *Abraham* were Church-members viſible, though neither they nor their parents, or any other entred into Covenant for them: and if this ſpeech of Mr. *B.* were true, neither had Jews infants been viſible Church members, and ſo not to be circumciſed (contrary to the command) nor according to Mr. *Bs.* and other Pædobaptiſts principles our infants viſible Church-members, nor to be baptized without ſuch entring into Covenant going before, which will nullifie the infant Baptiſm of many, and overthrow the argument from the Covenant, *Gen* 17. 7. produced as ſufficient for infant Baptiſm by moſt Pædobaptiſts without any other entring the Covenant.

5. Saith Mr. *B. You muſt diſtinguiſh betwixt breaking off that particular individual Church or ſome members of it, and the repealing or breaking off the ſpecies or eſſential nature of the Church.*

Anſw. The breaking off the particular individual Church of the Jews is a term I meet with *Rom.* 11. 20. But the term of *repealing or breaking off the ſpecies or eſſential nature of the Church* is a new term not uſed that I know of any where, but, if I may uſe Dr. *Kendals* phraſe, in the *Schola illuſtris of Kederminſter.* A repeal of a Law is an obvious word; but this term of *repealing of the ſpecies or eſſential nature of the Church* is like the ſpeech of a man doting. I have heretofore learned that the eſſences of things are invariable, eternal, definitions are of eternal verity, conformable to the *Idea* in Gods mind, though exiſtences be mutable: and therefore to expect a proof of a repeal or breaking off the ſpecies or eſſential nature of the Church, is to expect a proof of an impoſſibility.

6. Saith Mr. *B.* "And ſo you muſt diſtinguiſh between the repeal-
"ing of the Law or grant upon which the very ſpecies or nature of the
"Church is grounded; and the execution of the threatning of Law
"upon particular perſons or Churches offending. The repeal of the
"Law or ordinance doth take away all right to the mercy granted by

"that

"that Law or ordinance even the remote conditional right, and that "from all men, one as well as another to whom that Law gave that "right. But the punative execution of the threatening doth onely take "away the absolute right to the mercy and the right in it, and that "from none but the particular offenders. This punitive execution of "the Law (or the curse of the Covenant, as it is called *Deut.* 29. 20, "21.) is so far from being a repeal of the Law, that it certainly pro-"veth it is not repealed: For a repealed Law is of no force, and so "cannot be executed. And upon these two last distinctions, I add this "for application of them: The individual Jewish Church is (for the "most part) broke off, and so they that are so broke off are now no "Church, and consequently have lost their priviledges: But the Law "or Covenant on which the species or essential form of their Church "(and many of its accidents) was grounded, is not changed or repea-"led. So the Church of *Smyrna*, *Thyatira*, *Laodicea*, and the rest of "*Asia* (for the most part) are now unchurched: But this is but by a pu-"nitive execution of the Law for their sin, and no change in the Law, "or in the nature of the Church; And so it is with the Jews also in "their unchurching. Though they are cast off, yet the Law and Na-"ture of Churches is still the same; and onely the Laws about cere-"monial worship, and some other accidents of the Church are repeal-"ed. So that the casting off of them and their children, is no proof "that the whole species of infants is cast out of the Church vi-"sible.

Answ. The nature, species, essential form of the Church is that which is expresst in the definition of it, in which Mr. *B.* himself *pag.* 82. saith, *certainly all Divines are agreed, that it is a society of persons separated from the world, to God, or called out of the world*, &c. now a law on which this might be said to be grounded liable to repeal is in my apprehension a dream: Laws repealeable determine not of essences, but things to be existent, to wit, particular actions to bee done or omitted. Nor do I conceive that the essential form of the Church is grounded upon a Covenant. For though God separate or call a people to himself by a Covenant single or mutual, and so may bee of the existence of a Church, yet if God do separate or call by authority, preaching, power, or any other way, without a Covenant, they will have the essence of a Church. The Jewish Church I never conceived to be a *species*, but an individual, and of it I grant that it might be and was dissolved without the change of the nature, species or essential form of the Church, unto which the having of infants visible Church-members did not belong. For if so, without infants and that as visible Church-members it could not have been a Church. What the priviledges Jewish infants had as visible Church-members except preservation, as part of that people, such inheritance, and other benefits in part which their parents had, which they must needs lose with their parents breaking off, *I* do not well understand: Nor do I know any priviledge, which the believing *Jews* infants did lose by being left out of the Christian Church visible, which they should have had if they had been taken in. For the priviledges of

the *Jewish* infants by being visible Church-members, were, as I conceive, to cease upon the comming of Christ, and the erection of the Christian Church, not by any punitive execution of a Law, but a wise dispensation of God, as he conceived fittest for his own glory, and the enlarging of the Kingdome of his Son. The *species*, as Mr. *B.* speaks, that is, the whole order, rank, series or sort of men in infancy was never in the visible Church, but onely the infants of the Jewish Nation. Nor were they cast out of the Church visible by any judiciary sentence, but by altering the Church-state from Jewish into Christian as God thought best.

7. Saith Mr. *B. Again, you must distinguish betwixt breaking off primarily and morally onely by Covenant breaking and merit, (as an adulterous woman doth break the marriage bond, and so cast out her self;) or else breaking off in a following act by punishment (both morally and physically) as a man that putteth away his adulterous wife:) In the former sence all the Jews that were unchurched did unchurch themselves and their children; and God onely unchurched them in the later sence. And therefore the children of believing Jews (who did not adulterously violate the Covenant) were never unchurched; God casteth out none but those that first cast out themselves.*

Answ. If this last speech were true, absolute Reprobation should be an errour. But perhaps he means it of casting out by judiciary sentence, and so I grant it true of persons of age. But in the present business, the leaving out infants out of the visible Church was neither by any sinfull voluntary dissertion or transgression of Gods Law, morally deserving it; nor by any act of judiciary sentence legally, or punitive act executing or physically ejecting: But by a free act of his Soveraignty, altering the Church-state from a more carnal to a more spiritual, without any detriment to believers or their children.

Mr. *B.* applies his distinctions thus, *Let us now review Mr. Ts. arguments. 1. He saith, their Church constitution is taken down; and therefore their membership. To which I answer: 1. By [constitution] is meant either the essential nature, or some ceremonial accident: And by [taking down] is meant either [by repealing the Law, which takes down the whole species,] or [by meer punitive execution taking down that individual Church:] In the first sence of [constitution and taking down] I utterly deny the Antecedent, and may stay long enough I perceive before he prove it. 2. By [their membership] either he means the individual infants of unbelievers, unchurched Jews (which I grant,) or else the whole species of infants (which I deny.) 3. Besides, the argument concludeth not for what he should bring it: That which it should conclude, is [that the mercifull gift and ordinance of God, that some infants should be Church-members is repealed:] This is another thing from what he concludeth.*

Answ. 1. By [constitution] I neither mean the essential nature, nor some ceremonial accident, but the composing of the integral parts which make up a Church an entire whole or *totum integrale*. I do not find by such notes as I have of the Dispute at *Bewdley, January* 1. 1649.

that

that I uſed the term of [taking down,] but rather the term [altered,] which even Mr. *Bs.* ſetting down my argument ſhews to have been the term I uſed. And this alteration I conceive was made neither by repealing the Law which takes down the whole ſpecies, nor by meer punitive execution taking down that individual Church; but by a free act of his Soveraignty as Rector or Lord, who may at his pleaſure alter the frame of his Church as he pleaſeth: As when a Lord or Governour one while takes into his houſe men, and their wives, and children, another while onely ſingle men, he neither perhaps repeals a Law which made the whole ſpecies members of his houſe, nor puniſheth the individual perſons that were in his houſe, but becauſe it likes him better to have his houſe onely of ſtrong able men, alters the ſtate of his houſe in reſpect of the members; ſo it is in this caſe. 2. By [their Church-membership] I mean not either the individual infants of unbelievers, unchurched Jews, nor the whole ſpecies of infants; but the individual infants of the Jewiſh Church members, whether believing or unbelieving. 3. If I conclude (as I did) that the Church-membership of infants was altered in the viſible Church Chriſtian from what it was in the viſible Church Jewiſh, I prove the pretended gift and ordinance of God that ſome infants ſhould be Church-members is repealed. Let's view his anſwer to my proof.

" *He proveth*, ſaith Mr. *B.* that [*their Church conſtitution is altered, becauſe their Church call is altered.*] *To which I anſwer, 1. Here is ſtill nothing but the darkneſs of ambiguity and troubled waters to fiſh in. As we know not what he means by* [*conſtitution*] *as is ſaid before; ſo who knows what he meaneth by* [*their Church call?*] *Is it meant firſt of Gods Law or Covenant enacting, making, and conſtituting them a Church? 2. And, if ſo, then is it meant of the eſſential parts of that Covenant or Law giving them the eſſence of a Church* [*I will be to thee a God, and thou ſhalt be to me a people, Deut.29.11,12.*] *3. Or is it meant of the leſſer additional parts of the Law or Covenant giving them ſome accidentals of their Church, as the land of Canaan, the Prieſthood, the Sacrifice, &c. 4. Or is it meant of Gods immediate call from heaven to* Abraham *or any others to bring them into the Covenant? 5. And if ſo, whether of* Abraham *onely? or* Moſes *onely? or both? or whether* Aaron *and all other be excluded or not? And what he means by a Church call to infants that cannot underſtand, I know not; except by a call he meaneth circumciſing them? And 6. whether he mean that call by which particularly they were at firſt made a Church? or that alſo by which in every generation their poſterity were ſo made, or entred members? 7. And if ſo, whether that which was proper to the Jews poſterity? or that which was proper to converted proſelyted members? or ſome call common to both? and what that was? when I can poſſibly underſtand which of all theſe calls he means that is altered, then it may be worth labour to anſwer him.*

Anſw. The ſpeeches are inept of *the eſſential parts of the Covenant and the accidental, the eſſential parts of that Covenant or Law, giving them the eſſence of a Church,* [*I will be to thee a God, and thou ſhalt be to me a people, Deut.29.11,12.* Which ſuppoſe either God could not make

a Covenant without that promiſe, or that a Church could not be without that promiſe, or that Covenant might be without the promiſe of the land of *Canaan*, which was as eſſential to that Covenant as the other, they being both but integral parts, of which each is eſſential to the integrity of the whole. And for the eſſence of a Church, which conſiſts in the aſſociation, or union of the members, it is not given by a Covenant of God, promiſing what he will be to them, and they to him for the future, (for that aſſures them onely of continuance, doth not give their preſent eſſence.) but by ſuch tranſeunt fact as whereby he ſeparates them from others, and unites or incorporates them together, which I call, as uſually Divines do, the Church call; agreeably to the Scripture, *Rom* 9.24,25,26. 1 *Cor*. 1.2,24 *&c*. Which Church call is either inward by his Spirit, and is ſtill the ſame; or outward, and was, though by various acts of his providence, yet moſt manifeſtly by the authority of *Abraham* and *Moſes*, not by meer perſwaſion and begetting of faith, as in the Chriſtian Church, when the preachers of the Goſpel called the Chriſtian Church: But the authority and power of Rulers, who did as well by coercive power as by perſwaſive words, draw all in the compaſs of their juriſdiction into a policy or Commonwealth, which was called the congregation or Church of *Iſrael*, in which the infants were included, and by vertue of the ſettlement by *Abraham* and *Moſes* it ſo continued to the time of the diſſolution. This Mr. *B*. might have underſtood eaſily to be my meaning, by my inſtances which he ſets down, that the way, means, or manner of outward Church call into the Chriſtian viſible Church is altered from what it was in the Jewiſh: For the Chriſtian Church outward call was onely according to inſtitution and primitive practiſe by the preaching the Goſpel to each member of the viſible *Church Chriſtian*, and by that means perſwading perſons to receive Chriſt, and not by any coercive power of Rulers, whereas the *Jewiſh* was otherwiſe. Mr. *B*. proceeds.

"In the mean time briefly thus I anſwer. 1. The additional leſſer parts "of the *Covenant* giving them the ceremonial accidents of their *Church* "is ceaſed, and ſo are the ceremonies built thereon. 2. The Eſſential "part of the Law or *Covenant* is not ceaſed; God yet offers the *Jews* "to be their God, and them to be his people. If they heartily conſent it "may be done, onely the World is taken into this *Covenant* with them, "and neither *Jew* nor *Gentile* excluded, that exclude not themſelves. "3. Gods immediate call of *Abraham* and *Moſes* did quickly ceaſe, "when yet the *Church* ceaſed not. 4. And for the Miniſterial call, 1. "That which was by the perſon of *Abraham* and *Moſes* numerically did "ceaſe when their act was performed; yet the effect ceaſed not: Nor "did the *Jews* ceaſe being a *Church* when *Abraham* and *Moſes* were "dead and gone. 2. If he mean it of that ſpecies or ſort of Miniſterial call, then what ſort is that? And indeed for ought I can "poſſibly learn by his ſpeeches, this is that he drives at: [God "then called by Magiſtrates, but now by Miniſters: And ſecondly, "then he called all the Nation in one day, but now he calls here one and "there one.]

Anſw.

Answ. The Reader may hence easily perceive, that Mr. *B.* might have understood, or rather did understand me well enough, that I meant it of the sort of Ministerial call, which he could learn by my speeches, that drive at it. But whether he heeded not my words at first when he wrote the questions, or whether he thought it best to make shew of not understanding, what he could not well answer, he hath chosen to pretend ambiguity where all was plain. But for what he saith, that *the essential part of the Law or Covenant is not ceased, because God yet offers the Jews to be their God and them to be his people*, he therein shews two mistakes: 1. That he makes *that promise to be the essential part of the Covevnt*, as if God could not make a Covenant without it, which is false, the Covenant *Gen.*9.9,10. with *Phinehas*, *Numb.*25.12, 13. with the *Rechabites*, *Jer.*35.19. being without it. 2. That *the Covenant did not cease because God still offers*, which implies either the Covenant to be all one with an offer, or that there is a Covenant when there is an offer, whereas there may be an offer yet no Covenant, and there may be a Covenant and yet no offer upon condition of consent, as Mr. *B.* means. But Mr. *B.* proceeds thus

Let us therefore see what strength lies in these words. 1. What if all this were true? is there the least colour for the consequence from hence? It is as good a consequence to say, That when God judged Israel by Debora *a woman, which before was judged by men, that then Israel ceased to be a Commonwealth, or the constitution of the Commonwealth was altered. Or when the Government was changed from Judges to Kings, that then the essential constitution of the Commonwealth was changed, and so all infants lost their standing in the Commonwealth? what if the King inviting the guests to the marriage feast did first send one kind of Officer, and then another; first a man, and then a child, and then a woman, doth it follow that the feast is therefore altered? If first a man, and then a child, and then a woman be sent to call you to dinner, or to any imployment, or company, doth this change the nature of the company or imployment? what if a Bishop call one man to the Ministery, and a Presbytery another, and the people a third, is not the Ministerial work and office still the same? what if a Magistrate convert one man now, and a Minister another, and a woman a third, doth it follow that the Church or State that they are converted to is therefore not the same? what a powerfull argument is here for a man to venture upon to unchurch all the infants in the world? The efficient cause enters not the essence: or if it did, yet not every lest principal inferiour cause, such as the Messenger or Minister of our call is; If you had proved that God had repealed his Law which is the Charter of Church membership, then you had said something, else you say nothing to the purpose.*

Answ. I neither attempted nor needed to prove the essence, nature, or essential constitution of the Jewish Church to be altered, and therefore if the different call I assign prove it not, yet what I was to prove, that the Church constitution in respect of the integral parts, and consequently of infants being included, is altered, might be, and indeed is firmly concluded from thence. For as *Alsted. suppl. Chamier. de natura Eccl. ch.* 2, §. 3. *The matter of the Church are men called, Mat.*20.16.

The

The form is the call it self, and that is either simple, that is, either external onely, or internal onely; or conjunct, that is, external and internal together. §. 7. The inward call is that in which God calls inwardly by his spirit: the outward, in which he calls outwardly by the ministery of the Church. And this is the call of the Church, which as it is the action of God calling, is in God himself; but as it is received of the Church, is it's form: Oras *Amef med. Th. l. 1. c. 31. §. 6, 7. That first thing which in act constitutes the Church, is calling; whence also it receives it's name and definition. For the Church is a company of men called,* 1 *Cor.* 1. 24. *with* 10. 32. And *Cameron* in his *prælect.* of the *Church*, in his definition of the Church, makes it to be *a society of men called by the ministery of the word, and faith, called and believers are the same in Scripture.* Mr. *B. confes. of Faith, pag.* 284. *The Church is, Cœtus vocatorum vel fidelium.* If then infants be not called by the word, which is the onely way of calling into the Christian visible Church, nor believers, then they are no part of the visible Church Christian, and consequently the Church constitution is altered, and the Law of visible church membership of infants (if there were such a Law) is repealed. And this argument is powerfull enough (if there were no more) to venture upon to unchurch (though I like not the expression) all the infants of the world, that is, to prove none of them to be members of the visible Church Christian. That which Mr. *B.* objects, doth not invalidate the consequence. For the consequence is not grounded on this onely, that the Magistrate called then, and the Minister now; then all together, now here one and there another: but on this, the Magistrate did it then by his authority, though without perswading one after another; but in the Christian Church the Minister doth it by preaching the word, teaching and perswading one after another, as the word takes, and not by any commanding power, or outward force, or legislative, or coercive vertue. And this is sufficient to alter the constitution of the Church in this respect; because if none be called but those that receive the word, and none be members of the Church but the called, and infants be uncapable thereof, they are not members of the visible *Church Christian.* And therefore Mr. *B's.* frivolous questions all run upon the mistake which out of negligence he runs into, as his own words shew, as if I had argued onely from the different persons, and their different office, and not also from the different way, manner, or sort of call, whereas he acknowledgeth that my speeches do drive at this, that my meaning was of the species or sort of ministerial call; and so I might answer them all negatively, and grant what he would have me, and yet my proof stands good. And for what he saith, that *the efficient cause enters not the essence,* I find to the contrary in *Keckerm. syst. log. l. 1. par. 2. c. 2.* That *in the definition of accidents, the notion of distinction, or the difference is taken from the subject, efficient, end, and object.* Yet this, *if true,* were nothing against me, who do not make the Messenger or Minister of our call of the essence of the *Church*, no nor of the existence, though the Apostles words *Rom.* 10. 14. speak near to it: But this is that which I hold, no person is ordinarily a member of the visible *Church Christian*, but who is called by the outward

outward preaching of the word, who ever be the Messenger or Minister of the call; and sith infants are not so called, they are not members of the visible *Church Christian*.

Mr. *B.* adds, 2. *I utterly deny that there is any more truth in the Antecedent then in the consequent. God hath not altered the nature of the call in any substantial point, but in meer circumstances.*

Answ. What Mr. *B.* means by the nature of the call, and what points he makes in the call substantial, what near circumstances is not easie to tell, but that God hath so altered the *Jewish Church* call, as to exclude infants from the Christian visible Church is so apparent, that I know not how to conceive of the denial of it. but as a fruit of oppositeness without reason. For all the way that *John Baptist*, *Christ*, the Apostles and other teachers took and appointed to be taken for gathering the Christian visible Church, was by preaching the Gospel to all that would hear it, to make them disciples or believers, and so by baptism to joyn them to the Church. But that the *Jewish Church* call was different is apparent, in that there were no such teachers sent out to unite them, but that by the authority of the Magistrates, whether household or national they were imbodied. Rightly saith Mr. *Hudson vindic. ch. 4. sect. 5. pag. 94. Gods method of conveying Church. priviledges used in the national Church of the Jews, being in* populo Israelitico, *must needs differ from the method* in populo Catholico. And the same is true of Gods call. But what need we any other to shew the proper call of the *Christian Church visible* then Mr. *B.* himself, in his *Saints Everlasting rest*, *part. 2. ch. 6. sect. 1 Edit. 1. pag. 223, 224.* he is so ample, and his words so plain, that I think if there were no more to shew his perverse stiffness in this thing it were enough. I will transcribe some passages. *Consider in what way Christ spreads his Gospel: to bring men in from the world into his Church from Paganism, Turcism or Judaism to Christianity, he never gave the sword any such Commission; he never levied an army to advance his dominion; nor sent forth his followers as so many Commanders to subdue the Nations to him by force, and spare none that will not become Christians: He will have none but those that voluntarily list themselves under him: He sent out Ministers, and not Magistrates or Commanders to bring in the world.* Can he say this of the *Jewish Church*, and their call? But let's view his wincings against the plain truth, and in some sort against his own light, though perhaps forgotten when he wrote this later book.

It is, saith Mr. *B. said*, *it was then by Magistrates and now by Ministers. I answer*; 1. *what was by Magistrates? the first call? or all after? For the first I know not which or when it was, let him that can tell, see that he prove it. I finde when Circumcision was first instituted in* Abraham's *family*; *But never when their Church-membership begun*; *shall I dare to think that either* Abraham *or his family were no Church-members till they were circumcised?* Rom. 4. *would confute me.*

Answ. Mr. *B.* saith he answers, but indeed puts questions to me to answer, and those impertinent. For though I could not tell him which was the first call, nor when the church-membership of *Abrahams* family

ly

ly begah, yet it might be true and proved, that the call of the *Jewish Church* was by the magistrate. But yet for clearing of the truth, I shall make some answer. 1. That I find God calling *Abraham* out of *Ur* of the *Chaldees*, *Gen.* 12. 1. *Acts* 7. 3. *Isa.* 41. 2. and sundry times I find *Abraham* sacrificing to God, and God covenanting with him: Nor would I deny *Abraham*, *Sarah*, and those of his family who worshipped the true God, to have been visible church members before circumcision. 2. But yet I finde not the whole family of *Abraham* men women and children made a visible Church, by any act or rite which might be termed a Church call, whereby they were separated from all other people and united in a little nation unto God till the appointment of circumcision by God, and the performing of it by *Abrahams* authority. Now if Mr. *B.* could not tell which and when the *Jewish Church* call was, or the Jews childrens church-membership began, I think he is very unreasonable to require of me to shew a repeal of a thing which hee findes not when it began. But there is more of this wilde posing scribling to be answered.

2. Saith he, *Suppose it were true that* Abrahams *family began then to be a Church; (which will never be proved) yet did not God call them to Circumcision immediately? what is this to a ministerial call?*

Answ. 1. It will never be proved that any whole family, infants, servants, &c. were joyned in a little national Church as the Jewish before that time, there being no such covenant, and token of it till then. 2. God did immediately make his covenant with *Abraham* then and appoint circumcision, But the call of the Church was mediate, the revealing of the covenant, and the administring the token of it, whereby they were separated to be a people to God, being done by *Abraham* himself as the minister of this call. Yet we have more questions to answer.

3. *Are you sure that which* Abraham *did in it was as a Magistrate? and not as a Prophet? nor Priest? nor Master of family? prove that if you can.*

Answ. It is easie to prove that what *Abraham* did was done not as a Prophet, nor Priest: for then it should have been the work of Prophets and of Priests to have circumcised: but as the Master of the family, or parent, and consequently as the Magistrate of that house. For I count a parent or master of a Family to be a Magistrate in a little compass.

Yet more, 4. *what was it that* Abraham *did? He circumcised them when God had commanded; And was circumcising the call? then the infants in the wilderness, nor the whole camp almost had no Church call; And then the women had never any Church call.*

Answ. Circumcising was part of the call; the declaration of God concerning *Abrahams* posterity, and his other providences separating the *Israelites* in the Wilderness and with them the women, as bringing them out of Ægypt, bringing them into Covenant, giving them Laws by *Moses*, &c. which reached to women and males uncircumcised, were also a part of the Church call. Yet again,

What was it then that Abraham *did more then now may be done? If you*

(a),

ſay, he compelled them to be circumciſed by violence without their conſent, I deny it as a forgery; And if he had done ſo by thoſe at age, it had been no making them Church-members; for their conſent is abſolutely neceſſary therto. If you ſay, Abraham *by his intereſt and authority perſwaſion did win all at age in his family to conſent; dare you ſay, that every Maſter of a family and Magiſtrate ought not to do ſo now? So that I cannot finde any more that* Abraham *did in this call then may now be done.*

Anſw. I do not think *Abraham* did compel them by violence to be circumciſed, I think it could hardly have been ſo done; nor do I think *Abraham* did it as preachers do now, by reaſons and proofs of thei duty perſwading them to it, and leaving it free to them to conſent or not; (perhaps the time was too little to do it in, and not unlikely, *Iſhmael* would have then refuſed, being a ſcoffer, and then thirteen years old:) But he did it by his command, authority, and intereſt; which if Magiſtrates and Maſters of Families do uſe with perſwaſion to win perſons to conſent to the Goſpel, they do what is commendable, and in ſome caſes their duty: And if they win any, ſo they make them viſible church-members by their preaching to them, not meerly by Authority as *Abraham*, who I think was bound to have circumciſed by force if any had not yeilded to it, or elſe to have cut him off by that law which is *Gen.* 17. 14. And I hardly think Mr. *B.* will yield a Magiſtrate or Maſter of a family to do what *Abraham* did, to adminiſter as they call it, the initial ſeal, whether it be circumciſion or baptiſm. Yet were his concluſion yielded him, neither it nor any thing he hath ſaid doth at all overthrow my poſition, which was, that the *Chriſtian Church* call is by preaching, the *Jewiſh*, by the Magiſtrates authority, and ſo different.

Mr. *B.* goes on thus. *And then for* Moſes *what more did he? did he make them members without their conſent? No, he ſets before them life, and death, bleſſing and curſing; and bids them chuſe which they would.* Deut. 28, 29, & 30, chapters. *Doth he circumciſe them? No, not his own Son. Nor the infants forty years, nor the women at all. Doth he command them to obey the commands of God? And ſhould not every King and Magiſtrate do the like? Doth he perſwade them? why, you know he was a Prophet; and if he had not, yet ſure he muſt do it as a King, and as a ſervant of God. where then lies this peculiar call by the Magiſtrate? I think by that time we have ſearcht this to the quick, we ſhall finde the Magiſtracy leſs beholding to Mr. T. then was imagined. No wonder that he told the people in his pulpit that it was Doctrine of a dangerous conſequence which I delivered [that Magiſtrates had their power from Chriſt the mediatour, and not onely from God as creatour] I doubt by this arguing of his, that he will not allow the Magiſtrate to call all his people together and propound the Covenant of God to them, and command them to obey God. You finde not* Moſes *by priſon or fire forcing any man to conſent: And if he had, you muſt have a little further work to prove that it was that which made them a Church, or that the Magiſtrates may not ſtill do as much as was done herein then.*

Anſw. Mr. *B.* herein doth moſt ſhamefully wreſt my words and

 meaning:

meaning: For whereas to shew the different call of the Jewish and Christian Church, I alledged onely matter of fact, that the one was by the Magistrates authority, the other by Ministers preaching the Gospel, which could not take in infants; Mr. *B.* wrests my speech as if I had said, Magistrates might not do what *Moses* then did, and goes about to insinuate, as if the Magistracy were less beholding to me then were meet; and endeavours to encrease the suspicion of my lessening his power by my Doctrine in the Pulpit at *Bewdley*. But of my judgement in this thing, I have given account in the same Pulpit on occasion of the Swearing of the Magistrate there on *Rom.*13.4. in these Positions. 1. That all power is committed to Christ to manage as Mediator, *Mat.*28. 18. *Joh.*5.22,27. 1 *Cor.*15.24. And consequently, what they do for or against the Church, it is from Christ enabling or permitting even as Mediator. 2. That Magistrates as well as others are subject to, and are to yeeld obedience to Christs commands as he is Mediator, *Mat.*17.5. *Act.*3. 22. 3. That they have power & authority in many things which concern the Church of God, and are bound to use their power for *Christ*, and his Church, so far as their power extends, 1 *Tim.* 2. 1, 2. And in this sence it is that *Christ* exerciseth some of his Government by Magistracy under him, as also by Parents and Husbands, *Ephes.*6.4. But I conceive it a business of much difficulty, to set the right bounds of their power Many things few or none but Papists restrain them in, as the calling of Assemblies, judging of Ecclesiastical persons for civil crimes, ordering the maintenance, and estates of such persons, with many more such things as are to be done *circa Ecclesiam*, not *in Ecclesia*: On the other side, few or none but *Erastians* allow them power in the Church, so as to act as civil Magistrates in that which is by special commission appointed to proper Officers, *viz.* the preaching of the Gospel, administring the peculiar Rites of the Christian Church, ordination of Elders, government by Ecclesiastick censures, and such like things. The chiefest difficulty hath been, how far they are to use their power for making men profess Christianity, accept of Teachers, punishing of Hereticks and excommunicate persons, and such like acts, in which for the most part Magistrates by instigation of Popish Priests, Prelates, and others, have much miscarried, and been unhappy instruments of much oppression. Yet for my part I do not deny altogether their power about such things as these, especially if they go no further then what Mr. *B.* here speaks of, the commanding them to obey Gods commands, propounding the Covenant of God to them, restraining pernicious Teachers, and go upon very sure grounds, that they urge nothing but what is certainly Gods command, or agreeable to it, nor punish or restrain men for that which is questionable whether it be an errour, or pernicious. But this I hold, should a Magistrate as *Moses* did, by his authority, upon fears or hopes, or other compliance, draw all the people of the Land into a Covenant, to engage themselves and posterity to be Christians, yet this would not make the whole Nation to be a Christian Church, the infants visible church-members, capable of Baptism, sith Christ hath not appointed this way, but another, to wit, by preaching

the

the Gospel to call his Church, and the preachers of it to baptize believers so called. 4. I say, that a civil Magistrate is not an Officer of Christ as Mediator, sith he hath no new Commission from him as the Apostles, *John* 20.21. and others, *Ephes* 4.11. And I conceive to hold the affirmative is of dangerous consequence: it will follow, 1. That a civil Magistrate is bound to produce a further commission from Christ as mediator, besides the appointmen of God as creatour, which I neither think Mr. *B.* hath shewed, nor can shew. 2. That he who shews commission from Christ as mediator to rule, hath the authority of a civil Magistrate, which puts both Swords into Elders hands. 3. That if a civil Magistrate be an Officer of Christ as mediator, he is in the Church, in which alone Christ as mediator sets Officers; and then he must be a Christian or no Magistrate, yea, a church member, and then he hath rule in the Church, and power to do Ecclesiastical acts. 4. Then dominion is founded in grace, which it seems Mr. *B.* holds. *Praefatin. Mor. sect.* 19. as *most certain that it is founded in the grace of redemption and universal*; and brings for it *plain Scrip. proof, &c.* pag. 229. *Rom.* 14.9. which *v.* 8. shews plainly to be meant onely of those that live and die to him, and are his own peculiar people; and the word κυριεύση notes not such a Lordship as is over enemies, as Devils, and children of perdition by power and force; but such a Lordship as is with property over them as his possession, to whom he hath right as his own, 1 *Cor.* 6. 10. such as a wife, an obedient child, or servant. The other Texts prove but my first Position. The Reader I presume will pardon this excursion, being necessitated by Mr. *Bs.* frequent and continued mal gnant suggestions, tending to make me accounted an adversary to Magistracy. I now return to the point in hand. And in answer to Mr. *Bs* demand, I say, the peculiar call of the Church of the Jews by *Moses* the Magistrate was, in his bringing them out of *Ægypt*, into the Covenant at mount *Sinai*, setling them under Laws, Priesthod, Government, whereby they were fashioned or established as a national Church. But in the Christian Church, the Apostles and other holy Teachers did gather, and fashion, and establish the Church Christan by preaching of the word, without such a way of authority and power as *Moses* exercised. It is true he did as we read, *Deut.* 30.19. but not so as the Apostles, who when the Gospel was refused exercised no power over the refusers; for *Moses* would suffer none to live in the Commonwealth of *Israel* who did not own the God of *Israel*, and if they worshipped an Idol he put them to death.

Mr. *B.* adds. 5. *This argument, if good, would help the Seekers to prove that we have no Church on earth, because not called by Apostles, and so the Church. Constitution taken down, and none by God substituted. Let them that have better eys then I find out this peculiar church making call; for I cannot.*

Answ. My argument, the Church call is altered from the way of making the Jewish Church by *Abrahams* and *Moses* authority, into the perswasive way of begetting faith by Ministers preaching the Gospel, therefore the Church constitution is altered, doth not help Seekers, except

cept it be acknowledged, there is no Church now by Miniſters preaching the Goſpel, but by meer authority of Magiſtrates, which was heretofore the objection of Papiſts againſt the *Engliſh churches*, but refelled by Proteſtants, *Jewel*, &c. For I do not appropriate the Church call to the Apoſtles, or men who could ſpeak *that which was meerly, wholly, undoubtedly, inſite, implantedly the word of God*, as *Borelius* ſpake, but to the preaching of the Goſpel by any Miniſter of Chriſt, or other inſtrument, whereby faith is begotten, and whereby alone the Chriſtian viſible Church and all its members were called, in a different way from the Jewiſh Church call; which if Mr. *B.* do not ſee to have been the Chriſtian peculiar church making call, after his writing in his *Saints everl. reſt, par.* 2. *ch.* 6. *ſect.* 1. it ſeems he will not ſee it, and then wee may apply to him the Proverb, *who ſo blinde as hee that will not ſee?*

Mr. *B.* paſſeth on thus. *well, But may it not yet lie in the ſecond point* [*that they were all taken in to be a Church in one day?*] *Anſw.* 1. *what day was that? I would Mr. T. could tell me. He ſaith* Moſes *did it: but that's no truer then the reſt. For ſure they were a Church before* Moſes *time. Did they begin to be a Church in the wilderneſs? or did* Moſes *onely expreſs the Covenant to them more fully, and cauſe them oft to renew the Covenant, and ſo onely confirm them a Church? was not the circumciſed ſeed of* Abraham *a Church in* Ægypt? *and was the uncircumciſed Hoſt onely in the wilderneſs the Church? This is excellent arguing.*

Anſw. This is excellent anſwering, not to deny what is objected, but to propound croſs interrogatories. Suppoſe I could not aſſign the day, is not the thing true? But that Mr. *B.* may not loſe his longing, I tell him it was when *Abraham* circumciſed his houſe, *Gen.* 17. 23. When *Moſes* made a Covenant with them in *Horeb*, *Deut.* 29. 1. If I ſay *Moſes* did it, I ſay but what the Scripture doth, *Deut.* 33. 4, 5. nor doth it want of truth if it be no truer then the reſt. *It is not true* Iſrael *had their Church call from* Moſes, *for ſure they were a Church before* Moſes *time*; this is Mr. *Bs.* excellent arguing. As if the ſeed of *Abraham*, a fluent being, conſiſting of a ſucceſſion of people, might not have one Church call in one age, another in another; one by *Abraham*, another by *Iſaac*, another by *Jacob*, another by *Moſes*. Doth not Mr. *B.* himſelf, pag. 122. tell us, that *Moſes did cauſe them oft to enter and renew the Covenant*? I do not ſay they *began to be a Church in the wilderneſs*, or that *the ſeed of* Abraham *was not a Church in* Ægypt, or *onely in the wilderneſs*: But this I ſay, the Church call of that people was oft in ſeveral ages by the authority of the ſeveral Patriarchs and Rulers, as God ſaw it needfull to bring them into Covenant, for better faſhioning, eſtabliſhing, or recovering the Church fallen, but for the moſt part by the authority of Rulers; or if by a Prophet, in an extraordinary manner, as *Elijahs* days, 1 *Kin.* 18. and that not by the way uſed in the Chriſtian Church, by *a daily adding to the Church, and multiplying it* by preaching, as *Acts* 2. 47. & 6. 1. but by authority calling the whole nation and people together into Covenant at once.

Again

Again saith Mr. *B.* *But* Abraham *took all his family to be a Church in one day, you will say. I answer. First, It is not proved when they began to be a Church. Repl.* Nor needs it. *2ly. And would not Mr. T. now have a whole family made a Church in a day? Is that his charity?*

Repl. Yes, and the whole world, if it seemed good to God: But we find not that he doth so, or gives us any rule or president for us to do so, in the constitution of the visible *Church Christian*, any otherwise then by preaching the Gospel to them, and baptizing Disciples or believers, *Mat.* 28.19. *Mark* 16.15,16. And sure my charity must not be my rule about the use of Gods Ordinances, but my Lord and Masters appointment.

3*ly.* Saith Mr. *B.* *And what of it had been true if the whole Kingdome? either it was with their consent, or without: without their consent they could not be made church-members; for they could not enter into Covenant with God.*

Answ. If this be true, then no infants are church-members. And though it were true, that none could enter into Covenant with God who is of age without his consent, (which seems to me otherwise,) yet the consent obtained meerly by the authority of Masters or Governours, through fear or hopes without teaching, and free acceptance of Christ upon the preaching of the Gospel, doth not make a visible member of the *Christian Church*, however it did in the Jewish. I do not think the Americans forced to be baptized by Spaniards, or other people by the conquests of *Charls* the Great, and other Christian Princes, afore they knew Christ by teaching made Christians, were such, though there was some consent out of fear of loss of life or liberty if they were not. Mr. *B.* adds.

And never was any such thing attempted. Even Joshua *treads in* Moses *steps, and bids them chuse whether they will serve the Lord or not. Jos.* 24.

Answ. Whether *Abraham* had the free consent of all his house to enter into Covenant with the Lord, or whether he did circumcise some and take them to his Family Church without their consent, is uncertain: However, if *Abraham* had a slave refractory, which he was loath to lose, yet he must circumcise him against his will, because of the command with the penalty, *Gen.* 17. 12,13,14. And in the circumcising the *Sichemites* what was done and attempted is known. Neither *Moses*, nor *Joshua* did so leave it to the Jews liberty, but that they would have cut off from the people by death any that refused to acknowledge God, or that set up an Idol. *Asa's Covenant was of putting to death whosoever would not seek the Lord God of Israel*, 2 *Chron.* 15.13. Whereas there is no such Law in the Christian Church, that whoever shall not believe in *Christ* shall be put to death.

Yet further saith Mr. *B.* *And it being with their consent that the nation were church members, may not the like be done now? what, may not any or all the nations of the world be added to the Church, if they will consent, and enter the Covenant?*

Answ. Yes, they may, so many as upon knowledge of Christ do freely consent to receive him in all nations: But infants, natural fools, mad

mad-men in their fits, are neither fit to consent, nor to be members in the Christian visible Church, no nor such ignorant people as do not competently know the Christian faith. Mr. B. adds.

what then is this making them a Church in one day that Mr. T. so cloudily talks of? If he say, it is that then the infants were taken in: I answer, that is to prove the same by the same, or else to argue circularly: As to say, their Church call did take in infants, therefore the taking in of infants was peculiar to their Church call; this begs the question: Or to say, their Church constitution is ceased, because their Church call is ceased; or, their Church call consisting in the taking in of infants is ceased, therefore their Church constitution is ceased; and that Church constitution is ceased, therefore the taking in of infants is ceased. This arguing is like their cause.

Answ. I have sundry times told Mr. *B.* that the call in one day of the whole nation was by *Abrahams* authority, *Gen.* 17. and by *Moses*, *Exod.* 19 *&c.* otherwise then in the Christian visible Church, which was by a daily addition of believers out of several families, cities, and nations, by preaching to them the Gospel. And how my arguing is framed without begging the question, or any circle, is before shewed. And the [call in one day] I meant of *Abrahams* and *Moses* act, whether *the hearts of the whole nation were bowed to consent to take the Lord for their God*, or no. I neither *envy* nor deny *the enlarging of the Church by Christ*, nor do I think *the converting or taking in more or less makes an alteration in the nature of the Church call or constitution*; but a call by preaching the Gospel makes an alteration in the Christian visible Church call and constitution from the Jewish, sufficient to exclude infants from Christian visible church-membership. But Mr. *B.* clamours thus against me.

And what means Mr. T. to talk of here one and there one? To speak so contemptuously in such disparaging language of the Kingdome and Gospel of Christ? Is not the wonderfull success of the Gospel one of our strong arguments for the truth of the Gospel and our Christian Religion? And it seems Mr. T. will give this away to the Pagans, rather then admit infants to be members of the Church.

Answ. I mean to speak as the Holy Ghost speaks, 1 *Cor.* 1. 26 27, 28, 29. *James* 2. 5, 6. *Rev.* 5. 9. and as by the Histories Ecclesiastical may be made apparent, which rashly Mr. *B.* calls *speaking contemptuously in disparaging language of the Kingdome and Gospel of Christ*, as he formerly did my denial of infant Baptism *accusing of my own children*. Nor by my saying is the argument for the truth of the Gospel and Christian Religion a whit infringed. For the force of the argument is not from hence, that whole nations, cities, houses were converted by the Gospel; but that though the persons were contemptible who preached, their Doctrine likely to affright men, without arms, against opposition of great ones, there was so great success over the world as to convert so great numbers, though few in comparison of the rest, even in most barbarous countreys, from their long accustomed idolatry to embrace a crucified Lord. Yet saith Mr. *B.*

was it but here one and there one when three thousand were converted at once, and five thousand afterwards? and many myriads or ten thousands even of the Jews that continued zealous of the Law did believe? Acts 2.41. & 4.4. & 21.20. besides all Gentiles? was it but here one and there one, when all that dwelt at Lydda and Saron turned to the Lord, both men and women, Acts 9 35. and all that dwelt at Samaria, Acts 8.

Answ. It was but here one and there one as I meant it. 1. It was not any whole nation or city, and perhaps few whole households, sure I am not one infant in any of the places. For in *Acts* 2.41. they who were *baptized gladly received the word*; and *Acts* 4. 4. *they heard the word and believed*; and *Acts* 21.20. *they believed and were zealous of the Law*; *Acts* 9.35. *they saw it, and turned to the Lord*; *Acts* 8.12. *they believed Philip.* 2. These three thousand, five thousand, ten thousands inhabitants might, and likely were but one out of one house, and another out of another house: As God had *much people in Corinth*, *Acts* 18.10. yet but few households; the Husband a believer, the Wife an unbeliever; the Servant a believer, not the Master, 1 *Cor.*7.11,12,16,21. So many myriads might be, yet but here one and there one, considering that *Jerusalem*, especially at the Feasts, was full of people; and that the myriads are not restrained to *Jerusalem*, but might be in *Judæa*, or perhaps in remoter parts. It is evident that the number of Christians was not able to match the Persecuters, and that even in *Jerusalem*: Yea, it is said, *Acts* 21.30. that *all the city was moved against* Paul, *and the people ran together, all* Jerusalem *was in an uproar*, *v.*31. much ado the souldiers had to rescue him from the multitude, *v.* 35. even at that time when the myriads are said to have been of believing Jews, *v.*20. The Texts *Acts* 9 35. & 8.12. say not as Mr. *B.* that *all that dwelt at Samaria believed*, nor *all that dwelt at Lydda and Saron both men and women*, but *those that turned to the Lord*, as is shewed Sect. 50. before.

Yet more. *Let him shew me when three thousand Jews were made church-members in a day, if he can, before Christs time: I say, if he can, let him shew it me. Sure ever since* Abrahams *time (and I doubt not but before too) they were added to the Church by one and one as they were born.*

Answ. If I cannot shew it Mr. *B.* gains nothing, my assertion, that the Jewish nation were a Church together in one day by Magistrates authority, the Christian Church was gathered by Apostles and others preaching whereby one was made here one day, another there a believer another day, not a nation, city, nor always a house together, stands good. But sith M. *B.* wil allow me so much favour as to shew him any thing, me thinks he should not deny that more then three thousand were made church-members in one day, *Deut.*29.10,11,12,13,14,15. And if in the time of *Solomons* reign, *when Judah and Israel were many as the sand which is by the sea in multitude*, 1 *Kin.*4.20. three thousand were born in one day, by Mr. *Bs.* own grant there were three thousand added to the Church in one day.

Yet again saith Mr. *B.* *And I have shewed you before, that Christ sendeth his messengers to disciple all nations: It is a base exposition that shall*

say

say he means onely, Go and disciple me here one and there one out of all nations, and no more.

Answ. And what childish vanity, if not worse, he hath shewed in his ridiculous including infants to be discipled in that commission, is shewed before in the second Part of this *Review*, Sect. 12. *&c.* If it be a base exposition which he sets down, it is base dealing if he set it down as mine exposition: who yeeld that their commission was to disciple all of a nation who could be discipled, though it is true that they could not do it to a whole nation in a day as *Moses* did; and in the event they discipled but here one and there one in a house for the most part.

Yet more saith Mr. *B. And what means that in Revel.* 11.15. *Are not these Kingdomes added to the Church as well as Israel?*

I answer, That it means not as Mr. *B.* imagines, that the whole people of Kingdomes shall become Christs visible Church, but the rule or dominion of them shall be his, as the close of the *v.* and *ch* 12.10. shew, which makes nothing for Mr. *B.* as will appear by examining his frivolous arguing, *ch.* 13.

Yet again saith Mr. *B. like* a brave *Goliath, And are not all professors of Christianity in England, as truly in the Church as all in Israel were? I challenge any to answer me herein, and undertake to make it good against them (as far as will stand with modesty to challenge) whatsoever any Separatist (commonly called Independents) or Anabaptists may say to the contrary; (for I have pretty well tried the strength of their arguing in this.)*

And I have pretty well tried Mr. *Bs.* strength in disputes, and find it small though his words be big. I do not answer to the name of a Separatist or Anabaptist, they are Mr. *Bs.* abusive language of me. Let Independent Pædobaptists answer it as they please. I think if they will baptize infants from the rule of circumcision and the Jewish Church-state, they must assert a national Church, admit all that avouch themselves Christians to breaking of Bread, and their infant males to Baptism. And I conceive Presbyterians by the grounds they maintain Pædobaptism are debarred from keeping the ignorant and scandalous from the Lords Supper; and though I challenge not as Mr. *B.* yet presume I shall make both good in their season. As for the present question of Mr. *B.* I grant it, and then I hope we shall not fight about it. Yet I tell Mr. *B.* I do not take all for professors of Christianity whom perhaps Mr. *B.* doth, nor do I think Mr. *B.* can find me one professor of Christianity among all the infants in *England*.

Yet a little further, saith Mr. *B. Either Mr.* T. *by* [*Church call*] *means that which was the means of entring infants, or men at age or somewhat common to both. The Jews did all enter into the Church as members in infancy, even they that deferred Circumcision till forty years old, and the women that were not circumcised. And what call had these infants that cannot understand a call?*

Answ. The Church call of the Jewish nation or family of *Abraham* was by his authority, in a way common to men of age and infants: *Abraham* and his house were by circumcision and declaring Gods Covenant formed into a visible Church, and accordingly all that were born

of

of *Abraham*, and all that were taken into his house while they continued in that Family or Nation, were of that Church. And this way of Church call, by bringing into the bond of the Covenant the whole Nation, infants, servants, men and women together, was by the authority of *Moses* renewed at mount *Horeb*, and in the land of *Moab*, *Deut.* 29. 1. though circumcision were deferred for a time. And this call was of the infants, though not by themselves apart, yet conjunctly with the whole Nation, the chief representing the rest, *Exod.* 19. 7. *Deut.* 29. 10. and among them the infants, who might as well understand a call as a Covenant, into which Mr. *B.* contends they did enter.

Mr. *B.* adds. "The Proselytes, who were made Church-members "at age, were first converted to God, and professed the true Religion, "and so brought in their children with them: They were converted "not all in a day, but by times; not onely by *Moses*, or succeeding "Magistrates, but chiefly by Priests or Levites, or zealous people, or "by what way or means God was pleased to use for that end. *I* did in- "treat Mr. *T.* to shew me any material difference between the call of "these Proselytes into the Church in all ages till Christ, and the call of "us Gentiles into the Church: And truly he gave me an answer of "meer words for a put off, (wherein he hath a notable faculty,) which "I can find no weight nor sence in, nor am *I* able to tell what he would "say to it; nor can I conceive what possibly can be said of any mo- "ment. And as *Camero* well noteth, μαθητεύειν, is now used in the "Church as it were in the place of προσηλυτεύειν: Discipling now to "us, is as Proselyting was to them. So that you see now what this "Church call is which he layeth so great a weight on, and how much in "the main it differeth from ours.

Answ. When that time was that Mr. *B.* made this request to me, and what imperfect answer it was which I gave him, I do not well remember: I guess it was when I had conference with him alone, *Jan.* 25. 1649. in his chamber, when he drew me to a conference with him, pretending friendliness; but (as the event shewed, having *Jan.* 15. before, when I suspected no such dealing, written his abusive Epistle before his *Saints everlasting rest*, in which he falsly accused me and proclaimed his driving me to absurdities in the Dispute, *Jan.* 1.) drew from me what he could for his advantage, and then printed it in this Book, without my revising my answers, or his acquainting me with his printing them, or rightly according as they were printing them, as may be perceived by this *Review*; and mocking me with this fraudulent trick, when I expected according to his promise to see his arguments written from some of his own or my auditors to whom he would communicate them. But leaving him to the Lord, I shall now give a plain answer to his demand. Proselytes were of two sorts, 1. Of the gate, as *Cornelius*, owning the God of *Israel*, but not joyning to the Church and policy of *Israel*. These were not of the Jewish Church visible, though they were of the Church invisible of true believers, and of the Church visible universal of professors of the true God: For they were accounted unclean, and shunned by the Jews, *Acts* 10, 28. & 11. 2, 3. Their

calling I conceive was as ours is, by the word of God made known to them; nor do I find that infants were any part of the Church of them, whether domestick as in *Cornelius house*, *Acts* 10.2. or congregational, of which I find not an instance, nor of any rites or discipline they had. 2. Of righteousness, who were made such partly by persuasion as *Mat.* 23.15. and so far their call agrees with our call, and the other sort of Proselytes, partly by entring them into the Jewish Church, by Baptism, Circumcision, and an Offering, and with them wives and children; and this was done by authority of Elders imposing on them the precepts of *Moses* Law, and acting according to rules of their own. In which how much their Church call differs from ours is shewed in the 2d. Part of this *Review*, sect. 24. in answer to Dr. *Hammond*. Now though they were joyned to the Jewish Church one after another, and the infants of the Jews as they were born; yet the Jewish Church, whether at the first erection, or after establishing, were constituted of the whole Family and Nation together by the authority of *Abraham* and *Moses* differently from the call of the Christian Church visible in so material a point as excludes infants from church-membership, ὅπερ ἔδει δεῖξαι, which thing I was to demonstrate.

Mr. B. goes on thus. *But yet one other argument Mr. T. hath to prove the Church constitution altered, and consequently infants now cast out, or their church membership repealed: And that is this; They were to goup three times a year to the Temple; they had their Sanedrim, and High Priest: Now he appealeth to all, whether these be not altered: And therefore the Church constitution must needs be altered; and so infants put out.*

Answ. My argument is this, If that which had the same reason with infants church membership be altered, then infants church membership is altered: But that which had the same reason with infants visible church membership is altered, Ergo. The consequence is made good by the rule of Logick, Where there is the same reason of things, there is to be the same judgement. *De paribus idem est judicium.* The *minor* is proved thus. The High Priest, Sanhedrim, repair to their Feasts, had the same reason with infants visible church membership: But they are altered, Ergo. The *major* is proved thus. Infants church membership was no where but in the Jewish Church, we read of it no where else, nor upon any other reason but their being part of the Nation, which God had made his Church; they were visible church members upon no profession of their own, nor from any general determination of God, Law or Ordinance that the children should be reckoned of his Church with the parents in any countrey whatsoever, there being no such Law; but meerly from hence, because he would have the Nation of *Israel* to be his fixed people out of whom the Messiah should come, and so a National Church till then. And for the same reason he would have one High Priest, Temple, repair thither at solemn Feasts, a Sanhedrim, their genealogies kept, their possessions by lot, *&c.* But all these are altered now, the Church is not National, no one High Priest, Temple, Sanhedrim, *&c.* therefore neither infants visible Church-membership

membership, which had the same reason and no other. What saith Mr. B.

Alas, miserable Cause that hath no better arguments! are any of these essential to their Church constitution? How came there to be so strict a conjunction between Priesthood, Temple, Sanhedrim, &c. as that the Church must needs fall when they fall? may it not be a Church without these?

Answ. Alas miserable Cause that hath no better answers! Is infants church-membership essential to Church constitution? How came there to be so strict a conjunction between the Church and their membership, as that the Church must needs fall when they fall? may it not be a Church without these? If the Temple, *&c.* might be altered, and and were, because not essential to the Church; infants Church-membership did cease too, which was no more essential then those, and which hath been proved to have the same reason with these, to wit, Gods making his Church National out of which the Messiah was to come. Hitherto nothing is indeed answered, and what is said is retorted. The rest is according to Mr. *Bs.* vein of frivolous putting impertinent questions to me.

I would intreat Mr. T. or any Christian who hath the least good will to truth left in him, considerately to answer me to these. 1. *Was not the Jewish people a Church before they had either a Temple, or Sanhedrim, or High Priest, or any of the ceremonies of the Law of Moses?* Ans. *I* think not: there was no time they were a Church, but they had a Priest, an Altar, Sacrifices, distinction of clean and unclean beasts, *&c. were they not a Church in Ægypt, and in the families of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob?* Ans. They were. 2. *Did the adding of these Laws and ceremonies take down any former part of the Church?* Ans. No. *Or did every new ceremony that was added make a new Church, or constitution of the Church?* Ans. No. 3. *If the adding of all these ceremonies did not make a new Church, or overthrow the old, why should the taking of them away overthrow it?* Ans. Who saith it doth? 4. *If the Jews Church constitution before Moses time was such as took in infants, why not after Moses time?* Ans. Who denies it? *Or if infants were Church members long before either Temple, or Sanedrim, or High Priest, &c. why may they not be so when these are down? why must they needs fall with them when they did not rise with them?* Ans. Because if they did not rise with them at the same time, yet they were erected upon the same foundation, the Jewish National Church, as the walls fall with the roof, though they rise not together, because they rest on the same foundation. 5. *And if the very specifical nature of their Church be taken down, then men are cast out, and women too, as well as children.* Ans. *I* say not the specifical nature of their Church was taken down, but the particular Church constitution Jewish altered; and *I* grant it, that men and women under the consideration as they were in the Jewish Church, are left out (I will not say cast out, for they were never in) of the Christian visible Church as well as children. *If it be said that Christ hath appointed men and women to be church members anew, I answer, what man can imagine that Christ first repealed the Ordinance that men and women should be members*

of the Church, and then ſet it up anew? Anſ. And what man can imagine otherwiſe who reads the New Teſtament, but that (if there were ſuch an Ordinance that men and women being *Jews* by birth ſhould be members of the *Jewiſh Church*) Chriſt repealed it, when neither *John Baptiſt*, nor *Chriſt*, nor his Apoſtles admitted any *Jew* becauſe a *Jew* into the *Chriſtian* Church by Baptiſm, without his perſonal faith and repentance?

Mr. *B.* ſaith, *I will waſt no more time in confuting ſuch ſlender arguments, but ſhall willingly leave it to the judgement of any underſtanding unbyaſſed man, whether Mr. T. have well proved that God repealed his Ordinance, and revoked his mercifull gift, that ſome infants ſhall be Church members.*

Anſw. It is my burthen that I muſt waſte more time in refuting ſuch empty ſcriblings as theſe, containing queſtions, and thoſe not touching the argument, inſtead of anſwers; and I leave it to the Students of Divinity in the Univerſities, and elſe-where, who are underſtanding unbyaſſed men (if there be any) yea to any that have ſtudied Logick, to judge whether I have not proved a repeal of his pretended Ordinance, after I have added ſome more proof out of the New Teſtament in the next Section, and anſwered his Letters to me, to which I haſten.

SECT. LII.

It is proved, that infants were not reckoned to the viſible Church Chriſtian in the primitive times, nor are now.

1. I Thus argue, If no infants were part of the viſible Church Chriſtian in the primitive times, then whatever Ordinance there were of their viſible church membership before, muſt needs be repealed. But the antecedent is true, Ergo the conſequent. The conſequent of the *major* I think will not be denied: For ſuppoſing there were infants even of Chriſtians, and an Ordinance before, that the infants of the godly ſhould be viſible church members, and yet no part or members; then it muſt needs be from the revocation of that Ordinance, if there were ſuch a one. Now that the antecedent is true, I prove thus. If in all the days of Chriſt on earth, and the Apoſtles, no infant was a part or member of the viſible Church Chriſtian, then not in the primitive times: For the primitive times of the Chriſtian Church go no further, though *I* think *I* might extend my proof ſomewhat further. But the antecedent is true, Ergo.

That no infant was a part or member of the viſible Church Chriſtian in the dayes of Chriſt and his Apoſtles on earth, is proved by theſe arguments.

1. All viſible members of the Church Chriſtian were to be baptiſed. This is often aſſerted by Mr. *B. plain Scrip. proof, &c. pag.* 25. *The whole Church muſt be ſanctified by the waſhing of water, pag.* 342. *As the*

whole

whole Church is one body, and hath one Lord, and one faith, ſo it hath one common baptiſm. And he alledgeth 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. *Eph.* 5. 25, 26. *Eph.* 4 5. out of which this propoſition may be proved. But no infants were to be baptiſed. This is proved at large in the 2d. part of this *Review Sect.* 5, &c. Therefore no infants were viſible members of the Chriſtian Church.

2. They were not viſible members of the Church Chriſtian who were not of the viſible body of Chriſt. This is proved from Mr. *Bs.* words *plain Script.* &c. *pag.* 25. *The body* 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. *is the viſible Church.* pag. 342. *As the whole Church is one body* &c. pag 39. *What is the Church? Is it not the body of Chriſt?* The ſame he confirms *pag.* 60. 318. from 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. which he proves to be meant of the viſible Church, and it is affirmed by the Apoſtle *Col.* 1. 24. *Epheſ.* 1. 22, 23. that *the Church is the body of Chriſt*, and ſo the viſible Church is his viſible body. But no infant was of the viſible body of Chriſt. This is proved 1. from 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. all that were of the body were made to drink into one ſpirit, *namely in the cup of the Lords ſupper. Diodati annot. in locum hanc rationem confirmat teſtimonio baptiſmi & cænæ dominicæ piſcat. analyſ.* 1 Cor. 12. 13. *Arg.* 9. *Sacramento baptiſmi & cænæ dominicæ omnes fideles connectuntur. Dicſon expoſ. Anal.* 1 Cor. 12. 13. *ut utri uſque Sacramenti unus ſcopus & idem etiam eſſe intelligatur*, *Beza annot. in* 1 Cor. 12. 13. *Calicem quoque Domini in hanc ſpem bibimus. Grot. annot. in locum.* But no infant was made to drink into one ſpirit, for none of them did drink the cup in the Lords ſupper, *Ergo.* 2. From 1 *Cor.* 10. 17. All that were *one body and one bread, did partake of that one bread which was broken* v. 16. But no infant did partake of that one bread, if they did they muſt do ſo ſtill & be admitted to the Lords ſupper, *Ergo.* 3. From *Epheſ.* 4. 5. *The whole Church is one body, and hath one Lord and one faith. Mr. B. plain Script.* &c. *pag.* 342. But no infant hath one faith, *Ergo.*

3. They were no members of the viſible Church, who were left out of the number of the whole Church, all the believers, the multitude of the diſciples in all the places where there is an enumeration of the members of the Church, or mention of the whole Church, the number of believers or diſciples in the new Teſtament. But infants are left out of that number in all places in the new Teſtament, *Ergo.* The major is evident of it ſelf. For as we know who was in the church by their mention, ſo we know who were not by their being left out in thoſe paſſages, which make an enumeration or reckoning of all, there being no other way to know who were in or out; and if this be not true, the ſpeeches are falſe which mention all, the whole, the multitude, as the full number if they were not ſo. The minor is alſo proved from thoſe texts where ſuch enumeration is mentioned, *Acts* 1. 15. *Peter* is ſaid *to ſtand up in the mids of the diſciples*, and that *the number of the names together were about an hundred and twenty*. and in the verſes before are reckoned the *Apoſtles with the women, Mary the mother of Jeſus and his brethren*, and they are ſaid *to continue in one accord in prayer and ſupplication.* Here I conceive is an enumeration of the diſciples or church that then was at *Jeruſalem* viſible. Dr. *Lightfoot* in his *Com. on Acts* 15. ſaith, *the believers*

lievers at Jeruſalem no doubt were many hundreds if not thouſands at this time; though we read of no Converts in this book till the next chapter. For what fruit or accompt can elſe be given of all Chriſts preaching and pains beſtowed in that city? Let but Joh. 2. 23. & 3. 2. & 4. 1. & Mar. 3. 8 & Joh. 7. 31. & 8. 30. & 11. 28, 45. & 12. 19, 42. and divers other places be well weighed, and it will be utterly unimaginable that there ſhould be leſs believers in Jeruſalem now then many hundreds, much more unimaginable that theſe one hundred and twenty were all, who were all Galileans, and no inhabitants of Jeruſalem at all. The like is the arguing of the *Aſſembly* in their anſwer to the Diſſenters, *pag.* 66. Nevertheleſs it ſeems not improbable to me, conſidering the narration all along the chapter, that *v.* 4, 6. they are ſaid to come together, go to mount *Olivet*, and then to return to *Jeruſalem*, and their action noted with ſpecial notice of ſome, *v.* 13, 14. and then next, *v.* 15. that *Peter ſtood up in the midſt of the Diſciples*, that this enumeration of 120 is not an enumeration onely of men of note, but of all the diſciples of Chriſt then at *Jeruſalem*, me thinks the terming of *Peter a Galilean*, *Mark* 14. 70. doth intimate few of the Hieroſolymitans were diſciples of Chriſt; Chriſts preaching moſt in *Galilee*, his directing them to go into *Galilee where they ſhould ſee him*, *Matth.* 26. 32. *Mark* 16. 7. *the diſciples ſhutting the doors and aſſembling at evening for fear of the Jews*, *Joh.* 20. 19. do ſhew that moſt of the diſciples were Galileans, few of Jeruſalem; ſpecially when *all the diſciples forſook Chriſt and fled*, *Matth.* 26. 56. *the ſhepheard being ſmitten and the ſheep ſcattered*, *v.* 31. However the enumeration being of diſciples, and the women being reckoned with them, and not their children, nor the actions of prayer, *&c.* ſuch as are to bee aſcribed to infants, it is evident that infants were not then countted among the diſciples, and conſequently not for viſible members of the Chriſtian Church.

Acts 2. 1. They are *ſaid to be all with one accord in one place. The Aſſembly ubi ſupra* alledgeth reaſons why *they all ſhould be meant of the Apoſtles onely*, but not cogent. For 1. the narration doth not any more limit the words *Act.* 2. 1. by *Acts* 1. 26 then by *v.* 15. 2. not onely the Apoſtles, but others were filled with the holy Ghoſt women as well as men, *v.* 17. *Acts* 4. 31. & 6. 5. 3. though they were Galileans that ſpake *v.* 7. yet it proves not the [*all*] *v.* 1. to be Galileans. 4. the mention is of the Apoſtles *v.* 14, 37, 42. not to ſhew that it was a meeting of the Apoſtles onely, but becauſe they were the leaders and chief actors in that Church.

And that the meeting was of the whole Church at Jeruſalem then, is proved from *v.* 41. thus, The meeting was of them to whom the three thouſand ſouls were added; But they were added to the Church *v.* 47. not onely to the Apoſtles, or teachers. For then the ſenſe ſhould be, that that 3000 ſhould be added to the teachers, and ſo many more teachers added: whereas they are ſaid *to continue in the Apoſtles doctrine v.* 42. by their profeſſion of it, the Apoſtles teaching and not they. And hence I gather, that not one infant was reckoned to the Church, becauſe the [*all*] *v.* 1. are ſaid to bee *toge-*

ther

ther ὁμοθυμαδὸν *with one accord*, or one minde and consent, which is not to be said of infants.

From *Acts* 2. 41. I further argue, The Church did then consist of such persons onely as were of like sort with those who were added to it, which must be granted except it be said, the added and those who were added were of different sorts. But of those who were add d there was no one infant. This is proved from the words *v.* 42, 43. that *they continued stedfastly in the Apostles doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers, and fear came upon every soul*, v. 41. *they gladly received the word*, which cannot be said of infants; therefore no infant was reckoned then as a part or member of the visible Church Christian.

Again *v.* 44. the whole Church is meant by *all that believed*, who are said *to be all together, to have all things common, sold and imparted their possessions, continued with one accord in the temple, brake bread from house to house, eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praised God, had favour with all the people*, v. 45, 46, 47. which cannot be said of infants, therefore no infants were then reckoned as parts or members of the Christian visible Church.

Again *Acts* 4. 4. it is said, *many of them which heard the word believed, and the number of the men was about five thousand*. That this is an enumeration of the whole Church then at Jerusalem, is more probable then that it is an enumeration onely of the newly added; however the addition being of the same sort of persons with those to whom they were added, and no one infant reckoned to the Church, but all *men, that heard the word and believed*, it is clear that in the number of the christians or disciples infants were not reckoned, and consequently no visible church members then.

V. 23, 24. *Peter* and *John* are said *to go to their own company*, and *to report to them the speech of the chief Priests and Elders*, and then upon hearing *they lift up their voice with one accord to God*, v. 31. *to pray, to be assembled together, to be filled with the holy Ghost, to speak the word God with boldness*; and the *church* is called *v.* 32. *the multitude of them who believed, to be of one heart and one soul*. All which shew, that the *Church* consisted of a company of praying people, of a multitude of believers, which is not to be said of infants, therefore they were no visible church members then.

Acts 5. 11. it is said, *And great fear came upon all the Church, and upon as many as heard these things*. Here the whole *church* is mentioned as contradistinguished from the many that heard these things. But no infant was a member of the *Church*, sith none was capable of the great fear that came upon all the Church from the notice of *Ananias* and *Sapphira's* death, therefore they were not then church-members.

V. 13, 14. They who were *magnified by the people*, who were *joyned to the Lord, who were of the same sort with believers, who were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women*, were not infants: But such were the Church then, therefore it did not consist of infants then.

Acts 6. 1. The Church is expressed by *the number of Disciples*, by the

the multitude of Disciples, v. 2. *the whole multitude*, v. 5. *the number of the Disciples obedient to the faith*, v. 7. But none of these were infants, as their conventing, the speeches to them, and other acts shew; therefore infants then were not reckoned Christian visible church-members.

Acts 8. 1. *The Church at Jerusalem* are said to *be all scattered abroad except the Apostles*, v. 3. to consist *of men and women haled to prison*, which is not to be conceived of infants, therefore they were not then reckoned as visible church members.

Acts 15. 22. *The whole Church* is said *to send chosen men of their own company*. But this doth not agree to infants, therefore infants were not reckoned as part of the whole Church.

1 *Cor.* 14. 23. *The whole Church* is supposed *to come togeter into one place*. But this is not to be said of infants, they were no part of the company that met, they were not capable of the end and actions of the meeting, therefore they were no part of the whole Church, The same may be said of all other like places.

4. They were no part of the Christian Church visible, to whom the things ascribed to the whole Christian Church did not agree. But the things ascribed to the whole Christian Church visible did not agree to infants. Ergo. The *major* is of it self evident, as in like manner this is a plain truth, that they are no souldiers to whom what is said of the whole Army doth not agree. The *minor* is proved from many places of Scripture. *Matth.* 16. 18. Christ saith *he will build his Church on this Rock*, this is meant of the whole Church, and the building is meant of building by preaching, *Ephes.* 2. 20. & 4. 11, 12. But infants are not built by preaching, therefore they are not parts of the Church visible.

1 *Cor* 1. 2 The *Church* is of them *who are called to be Saints* which is by preaching the Gospel, v. 23, 24. But infants are not so called, Ergo, they are not of the visible *Church Christian*.

Acts 2. 41. 47. & 5. 14. They who *were added to the Church* did all *hear the word and believe*: But infants did not so, therefore they were not added to the *Church*, and consequently were not visible *church-members*.

They were not parts of the *Church* who *did not come together*, *were not gathered together*; for all *the Church did come together with one accord in Solomons Porch*, *Acts* 5. 11, 12. *were gathered together* by the Apostle, *Acts* 14. 27. But infants were no part of them, they were not with one accord any of those *to whom the Apostle told what God had done with them*, therefore they were not part of the visible *Church*.

They were no part of the *Church* of God, who were none *of the flock of God to whom the Elders were to attend as made overseers over them by the Holy Ghost to feed them*. For all these things are attributed to all the flock or Church of God at *Ephesus*, *Acts* 20. 28. But infants were none of the flock to whom the Elders were to attend as made overseers by the Holy Ghost to feed them, Nurses were to attend and feed infants, not teaching and ruling Elders, whose *work was in the word and*

and doctrine, 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. therfore infants were none of the flock or Church of God visible at that time.

They were no part of the *Church* of God, who were not in duty to be sanctified by the Word. For *the whole Church was in duty to be sanctified by the word*, as Mr. *B. plain Script. &c.* pag. 342. gathers from *Ephs.* 5. 25. concerning Baptism. But no infant is in duty to be so sanctified, it were a ridiculous thing to tie Preachers to sanctifie or wash infants by preaching the Word to them, therefore they were no part of the *Church. The Churches had rest, and were edified; walked, were multiplied, Acts* 9. 31. *Acts* 12. 5. *Prayer was made of the Church unto God for* Peter. The *Church* at *Hierusalem*, *Acts* 11. 22. is said *to hear tidings, to send* Barnabas, who with *Paul assemble with the Church*, v. 26. fit persons *to convene*, *Acts* 21. 22. *to receive orders*, 1 *Cor.* 16. 1. With many more such attributes, which neither are, nor can ordinarily be said of infants, no nor any attribute in all the New Testament, which is said of the visible *Church Christian* is said of infants, therefore they were not accounted visible members in the first *Christian Churches*, nor are rightly now so taken.

5. They who were not reckoned as Christs Disciples, were not visible church-members; For as Mr. *B.* rightly saith, *plain Script. &c. All church members are Christs Disciples.* But infants are no where reckoned as Christs Disciples. This is proved, 1. from the places in all the Acts of the Apostles, and elsewhere, where there is mention of Christs Disciples, there are such things declared of them as do exclude infants from the number of them. I omit *Acts* 1. 15. *& 6.* 1, 2, 5, 7. before mentioned. *Acts* 11. 26, 29. It is said that *Barnabas and Saul a whole year assembled themselves with the Church, and taught much people, and the Disciples were called Christians first in Antioch*: And upon the prediction of a dearth it is said, *Then the Disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judæa, which they also did, and sent it to the Elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul.* From whence this is apparent, that the Church, the Disciples, the Christians were then *Synonyma*, or terms importing the same persons, so that he who was not a Disciple was not of the Church, nor a Christian. But no infant was then reckoned as a Disciple. This is proved from what is said *of every Disciple*, v. 29. *they determined to send, and did send*, which none will say infants did. *Ergo*, infants were not then reckoned among Disciples, Christians, or members of the visible Church Christian.

Acts 14. 20, 21, 22. it is said, that *the Disciples stood round about Paul*, that *he and Barnabas taught many, or made many Disciples*, and *that they confirmed the souls of the Disciples, exhorting them to continue in the faith.* From whence it is manifest, that the Disciples then were such as stood round about *Paul*, that they were taught, or made Disciples by teaching or preaching the Gospel, that they were in the faith, capable of confirmation, and exhortation. But such were not infants. *Ergo*, they were not then reckoned as Disciples, and consequently not church-members. *Acts* 8. 3. *made havock of the Church. Acts* 9. 1. *against the Disciples*

ciples, v. 18. *the Saints at Hierusalem*, v. 19. *the Disciples at Damascus*, v. 25. *the Disciples*, v. 26. joyning to the Church is *joyning to the Disciples*, v. 35. *the Brethren*, v. 31. *the Churches*, v. 38. *the Disciples heard*, v. 41. *called the Saints*. *Acts* 15. 1. it is said *they taught the Brethren*, v. 3. *being brought on their way by the Church, they caused great joy unto all the Brethren*; v. 4. *they were received of the Church*. v. 10. the Disciples are they *whose hearts were purified by faith*; *the whole Church* v. 22. *are the Brethren*, v. 23. *who send greeting to the Brethren*, v. 30. *they were the multitude gathered together*, v. 32. *they exhorted the Brethren*, v. 33. *were let go in peace from the Brethren*, v. 36. *let us visit our Brethren*, v. 40. *recommended by the Brethren*, v. 41. *confirming the Churches*. *Acts* 16. 2. *well reported of by the Brethren*, v. 5. *And so were the Churches established in the faith, and increased in number daily*, v. 40. *and when they had seen the Brethren they comforted them*. *Acts* 17. 10, 14. *the Brethren sent away Paul*. Which passages do shew, that these terms were then of the same extent, and synonymous, the Church, the Disciples, the Brethren, the Believers, the Saints: But infants were none of the Church, the Disciples, the Brethren, the Believers, the Saints as all the passages where they are mentioned shew; therefore infants were not then visible church members

Acts 18. 18. *Paul took leave of the Brethren*, v. 22. *he saluted the Church*, v. 23. *strengthened all the Disciples*, which strengthening was by teaching and exhorting, as *Acts* 14. 22. shews: Which infants were not capable of, therefore they were not Disciples. V. 27. *the Brethren wrote, exhorting the Disciples to receive Apollos, who helped them much who believed through grace*. *Acts* 19. 1, 2. *Paul finds certain Disciples who were Believers*, v. 9. *separates the Disciples*, v. 30. *the Disciples would not suffer Paul to enter in unto the people*. *Acts* 20. 7. *upon the first day of the week, when the Disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them at Troas*. Which shews plainly, that the Disciples did use to break bread on the first day of the week, and that those who were Disciples did break bread; which cannot be said of infants, therefore they were not Disciples, and consequently not visible church-members.

2. The same is proved by those arguments which are in the second Part of this *Review*, sect. 10. to prove infants not Disciples appointed to be baptized, *Matth.* 28. 19. and by the answers to the allegations of Mr. *Cotton*, Mr. *B.* and others, Sect. 11, 12, *&c.* to prove them Disciples.

6. If in the distributions of the members of the Church then, infants are not comprehended, then infants were not visible church-members, this must needs be granted, or exception must be taken to those distributions. But in the distributions of the Church, where all sorts of members are expressed, infants are not comprehended; *Ergo*. The *minor* is proved from the distributions according to the sex, *Acts* 5. 14. *&* 8. 12. *men and women*, among whom was no infant, for in the former place they are termed *Believers*, in the latter they are said *to believe Philip preaching the things concerning the Kingdome of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ*;

Christ; which is not to be said of infants. 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. they are distributed into *Jews or Gentiles or Greeks, bond or free,* but none an infant, as is proved before, in that all were baptized, and did drink the Lords cup. The like is *Gal.* 3. 28. *There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus*: and that is by faith, *v.* 26. and therefore no infant meant. *Col.* 3. 11. *where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian bond nor free; but Christ is all and in all,* that is by faith, which is not to be said of infants.

To which I may adde, that in *Tertullians* time the children of believers were not accounted actually members of the visible Church, because he terms them in his book *De anima*, c. 39. *Designatos sanctitatis*, intended to be holy; that is, to be bred up to profess the faith, and so to be baptized. Which is the more apparent, in that *Hierome* expresseth the same as from *Tertullians book de monogamia*, in his Epistle to *Paulinus, tom.* 3*d. edit. Basil. That the children of believers are termed holy, because they are as it were Candidates of the faith.* And *Erasmus* in his *Scholie* on that Epistle saith, *Therefore they which are born of Christians, are called holy also before Baptism, because they do as it were seek and expect Baptism.* Which shews they were not counted actually church-members, but such as were designed to be believers, and so as it were seekers for Faith and Baptism, and consequently church-members onely in expectation.

2. I argue from the common received definitions of the visible Church. *Artic.* 19. of the *Church of England, The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithfull men.* In the *answer of the Assembly to the reasons of the seven dissenting brethren*, p. 48. of the Edition 1644. the first *præcognitum* is this; *The whole Church of Christ is but one, made up of the collection and aggregation of all who are called out of the world by the preaching of the word, to profess the faith of Christ, unto the unity thereof: From which union there ariseth unto every one such a relation unto, and dependance upon the catholick Church, as parts have to the whole.* Dr. *John Rainold 1d. concl. The Church of Christ betokeneth a company called out from among the multitude of other men, to life everlasting through faith in Christ Jesus. Ball, trial of Separ.* pag. 296. ch. 13. *The Church is a society of the faithfull. Hudson, vindic.* c. 1. p. 12. *The universal Church is the whole company of visible believers throughout the whole world.* ch. 6. sect. 3, 127. *The Church visible is called entitive, not because of the inward grace, which is essential to an invisible member; but from the reception and embracing the Christian catholick faith, which is essential to a visible believer.* Mr. *B* himself, *plain Script. &c. part* 1. *ch.* 26. *The common definition of the Church, affirmeth them to be a people called out of the world.* Hence I argue, All that are of the visible Church Christian are faithfull, called out of the world by the preaching of the word to profess the faith of Christ, visible believers receiving and embracing the Christian catholick faith. This is proved from the definitions of the Church, and positions received. And it is clear in reason, the Church being an aggregate, as a flock of sheep, a heap of stones; as it follows therefore every

part of the flock is a sheep, every part of the heap a stone, so every part of the Church a believer. But no infant is such. *Ergo*. In this very manner doth *Guliel. Apollonii considerat. controv. cap.* 1. *pag.* 8. argue. *Thus almost all the famous reformed Divines do affirm the matter of a visible Church to be men outwardly called, professing the faith of Christ. For they define it a company of men called out by an outward calling, or preaching of the word, and communicat on of Sacraments, to the worship of God, and to celebrate Ecclesiastical society among themselves.*

To this Mr. *M.* in his *Defence, part* 3. *sect* 3 *pag.* 113. saith. "I re-
"ply, it overthrows it not at all; for they all include the infants of
"such professors, as the visible Church among the Jews did include
"their infants, male (and female too, lest you say that Circumcision
"made them members.)

Answ. Mr. *M.* should have shewed who, and in what words of their definitions Protestant Writers include the infants of professors. That some of them, especially of late, have asserted infants of believers to be a part of the visible Church, I grant: But I think Mr. *M.* cannot make it good, that the Elder Protestant Writers did include them in their definitions of the visible Church. I have produced some of the later, who have so framed their definitions as that infants must be excluded. And if any do include them, they erre from the Scripture, which never accounted them visible Christian Church members, as is proved before. And Sect. 51. of this Part of the *Review* doth sufficiently shew the Christian Church visible to have another call and constitution from the Jewish, and that no person is a member of the Christian Church visible by natural generation of a believer, but by profession of faith. Wherefore Mr. *M.* saith.

"I adde also, Baptism now (as well as Circumcision of old) is a
"real, though implicite profession of the Christian faith.

Answ. That circumcision was a profession of the Christian faith either explicite in Elder proselites, or implicit in infants circumcision, doth not appear. The Apostles speech *Gal.* 5. 2, 3. and the tenet of the Jewish doctors *Acts* 15. 1, 5. is to the contrary. Baptism after a verbal profession of faith by the baptised being his act is a real, though implicit profession of the christian faith, it being used by the baptised to declare his putting on *Christ*, and so a signe of his assent to his verbal profession. But infants baptism is no profession of any faith either explicit or implicit, there being no act done by them tending to make any shew of faith, which they neither understand, nor take to bee true upon the trust of their teachers, as Papists do in their implicit faith (which yet we deny to be christian faith) but are every way passive, both in respect of the act of the baptisers, and the reason and end of it, they neither do any thing towards their baptism, nor understand any thing of it. Yea were it true that such an implicit profession of faith were in infants baptism, yet were it not enough to make them visible members of the christian church, no not according to the definition of Protestant writers, who when they define the church to be a company of professors of faith, do mean more then an implicit profession, to wit,

an

an intelligent and free profeſſion; and do blame the b ptiſing of the *Indians* by the *Spaniards*, forcing them to own the *Chriſtian Faith* afore they underſtand it, though there bee more implicite profeſſion of the faith by them, then is or can be by an infant.

3. I argue. They are no viſible members of the chriſtian church, to whom no note whereby a viſib'e chriſtian church, or church-member ſhip is diſcernible doth agree. For that which is viſible, is diſcernable to the underſtanding, by ſome ſenſible note or ſigne by which it is known: But to infants of believers no note whereby a viſible church, or church-member is diſcernable doth agree, *Ergo*. The *minor* is proved 1 by ſhewing the right notes of the viſible church and church-members not to agree to infants. The right notes of the chriſtian church and church-members are the profeſſion of the whole *Chriſtian faith*, the preaching and hearing of the Word, adminiſtration and communion in the Sacraments, joyning in Prayer, diſcipline, *&c.* with believers. *Hudſon. vindic. pag.* 229. But none of theſe agree to infants. Not profeſſion of of the whole *Chriſtian faith*, For they neither underſtand nor ſhew by any thing they do that they aſſent to the *chriſtian faith*. Not the preaching or hearing of the Word: For infants can neither preach nor hear the Word. I mean as it is ſpeech or ſignificative language, though they may hear it as a ſound, much leſs as yeilding aſſent to it, which hearing alone is a mark of a viſible church-member. Nor do they adminiſter or have communion in the Sacraments: None will ſay they adminiſter, nor though they ſhould be baptiſed in water by a Miniſter, or eat bread or drink wine at the Lords ſupper, can it be ſaid they have communion in the Sacrament. For he onely hath communion in a Sacrament, who uſeth it as a ſigne of that for which it is appointed, and this uſe onely is a note of a viſible church-member, otherwiſe a *Spaniards* forcible baptiſing of an *Indian* without knowledge of *Chriſt* ſhould make him partaker of the Sacrament, or doing it in ſport or jeſt ſhould make a viſible church-member. See Mr. *B.* himſelt *correct. ſect. 6. pag.* 253. But infants neither uſe bap iſm nor the Lords Supper as a ſigne engaging to Chriſt, with acknowledgement or remembrance of him, therefore they have no communion in the Sacraments, no not in baptiſm, nor is their pretended baptiſm any note of viſible Church membership. Nor do they joyn in prayer, diſcipline, or any part of Chriſtian worſhip or ſervice, which might ſhew they own Chriſt as their Lord, and therefore they are not diſcernable to be of the viſible Church chriſtian by any right note.

2. By ſhewing that the notes whereby they are conceived to bee diſcernable as viſible Church members, are not notes of their viſible church-membership. Two notes are uſually alledged, the one the covenant of God, the other the parents profeſſion of faith, neither ſhew them viſible Chriſtian church-members, nor both together. Not the covenant or promiſe of God: For there is no ſuch covenant that promiſeth to every believers childe, much leſs to every profeſſor of Faith's childe ſaving grace, or viſible church-membership, and a promiſe to ſave indefinitely, not expreſſing definitely who, is not a note whereby

by this or that person is discernable to be the person to whom it belongs. Besides, if there were such a promise to every childe of a believer, yet unless it were a promise of it to them in their infancy, it would not prove they were actually visible church members, but onely that in the future they should be. Nor is the parents Faith a note of the infants visible church membership. For whether it be a note of it self, or conjunctly with the covenant, it is a note of the infants visible church-membership because it is his child, and if so, then it is a note of his childs visible church-membership at twenty years of age, though he should be then a professed Infidel, as well as a day old, a note of an Embryo's visible church-membership in the mothers womb, as well as a childe born, which are absurd. Other reason then this I know not. But sure I am there is not the least hint in Scripture of a childes being discernable to be a visible Christian church member by the parents faith or profession, but to the contrary. To this argument briefly propounded in my *Examen* of his *Sermon part.* 3 *sect.* 3. Mr. *M.* replies not in his *Defence*, and therefore I see not but it stands good.

4. I argue. They who have not the form constituting and denominating a visible Christian church-member, are not visible Christian church-members. This proposition is most sure according to Logick rules, *take away the form, the thing formed is not; if the form denominating agree not the denomination agrees not; Scheibler Top. c. 5. de forma Stieri. præc. doct. Log tract. 2. c. 4.* But the form constituting and denominating a visible Christian church member, infants have not: *Ergo.* The *minor* is proved thus. They which have not the outward profession of Faith within, have not the form constituting and denominating a visible Christian church-member. For profession of Faith, is the form constituting and denominating a visible church-member, as is proved from the constant sayings of Divines. *Ames Marrow of Divinity, first book c. 31. §. 11. Faith is the form of the Church. §. 25. visibility is the affection or manner of the Church, according to its accidental and outward form. §. 27. The accidental form is visible, because it is no other thing then the outward profession of inward faith, which may easily be perceived by sense. c. 32. §. 7. It is a society of believers, for that same thing in profession constitutes the visible Church, which in its inward and real nature makes a mystical Church, that is Faith. Ball trial of separat. c. 13. p. 302. A lively operative faith maketh a man a true member of the Church invisible; and the profession of faith and holiness a member of the Church visible. Norton answer to Apollon. c. 1 prop. 2. pag. 10 An unmoved position. That same thing in profession constitutes the Church visible, which in its inward nature constitutes the mystical Church, that is faith. Hudson. vindic. ch. 4. p. 90. Every visible believer is called a Christian, and a member of Christs visible Kingdom, because the form (viz. visible believing) common to all Christians and all members is found in him.* And this may be proved out of Scripture, which denominates visible Christian church-members from their own profession of faith, in respect of which they are termed believers, 1 *Tim.* 2. 12. *Acts* 4. 32. & 5. 14. *&c.* nor is there any such denomination in Scripture, or hint of such a form

consti-

constituting a visible Christian church-member or believer as the faith of another, of the parent, church, &c. It is a meer novel device of Papists, who count men believers from an implicit assent to what the Church holds; and Pædobaptists, who ascribe unto infants faith and repentance implicit in their sureties, the Church, their owners, the nation believing, their parents next or remote faith. Which is a gross and absurd conceit. For that in profession alone makes visible believers, which makes in reality true believers. But that's a mans own faith *Hab.* 2. 4. not anothers; therefore a mans own and not anothers profession of faith makes a visible believer. Again, the form denominating must be inherent, or in or belong to the person denominated, so as that there is some union of it to him, but there is no inherence, or union of anothers faith to an infant, *Ergo.* Naturally there is none, nor legally; if there be, let him that can, shew by what grant of God it is. Infants may have civil right to their parents goods, a natural interest in their mothers milk, parents, and masters may have power over the bodies, labour, &c. of their children and servants, they have no power to convey Faith, or Ecclesiastical right without their own consent. But this conceit is so ridiculous, that I need spend no more words to refute it. I subsume. Infants make no profession of faith, they are onely passive, and do nothing by which they may bee denominated visible Christians as experience shews, yea at the Font while the faith is confessed by the parent or surety, and the water sprinkled on their faces they cry, and as they are able oppose it, *Ergo.*

To this saith Mr. *M. I answer, even as much as the infants of the Jews could do of old, who yet in their dayes were visible members.*

Answ. The infants of the Jews were never Christian visible church-members, though they were visible members of the Jewish Church: But Mr. *M.* neither hath proved nor can, that the same thing, to wit natural birth, and Jewish descent and dwelling, which denominated the Jewish infants visible members of that church, doth denominate a christian visible church member. And till he do this, the force of the argument remains.

5. I argue. If infants bee visible Christian church members, then there may be a visible Church christian, which consists onely of infants of believers; for a number of visible members makes a visible Church entitive, though not organical. But this is absurd. *Ergo,* Infants of believers have not the form of a visible Church-member.

To this Mr. *M,* saith, *I answer, no more now then in the time of the Jewish Church; it's possible, but very improbable, that all the men and women should die, and leave onely infants behinde them.*

Answ. 1. It is no absurdity to say that of the Jewish church which it is absurd to say of the Christian: For the Jewish church was the people of God of *Abrahams,* or *Israels* house, which they might be, though but infants. But the Christian visible Church is a people or company that profess faith in Christ, which infants cannot do, and therefore it is absurd to imagine that a Christian church visible may bee onely of infants of believers, whereof not one is a believer by profession, not so

of

of ths Jewiſh church. 2. The poſſibiliry acknowledged by Mr. *M.* is enough for my purpoſe, though it never were or ſhould bee ſo in the event, ſith the abſurdity followes upon that grant, as well as the actual event.

6. I argue. If infants be viſible Chriſtian church-members, then there is ſome cauſe thereof. But there is none, *Ergo*. The *major* is of it ſelf evident, every thing that is hath ſome cauſe by which it is. The *minor* is proved thus. If infants be viſible Chriſtian church members, by ſome cauſe, then that is the cauſe of all infants Chriſtian viſible church-membership or of ſome onely. But of neither, *Ergo*. I preſume it will be ſaid of ſome, ſith they account it a priviledge of believers infants. But to the contrary, there is no ſuch cauſe by which infants of believers are Chriſtian viſible church-members. Mr *B. plain Script. &c. part.* 1. *c.* 19. *pag.* 92 *Denies that the parents faith is any cauſe (not ſo much as inſtrumental properly) of the childes holineſs, by which he means viſible church membership, but he makes it a condition (which is an antecedent or* cauſa ſine qua non) *of childrens holineſs. I anſwer*, ſaith he, *fully: If this be the queſtion, what is the condition on which God in Scripture beſtoweth this infant holineſs? It is the actual believing of the parent: For what it is that hath the promiſe of perſonal bleſſings, it is the ſame that hath the promiſe of this priviledge to infants: Therefore the promiſe to us being on condition of believing, or of actual faith, it were vain to ſay, that the promiſe to our infants is onely to faith in the habit: The habit is for the act, yet is the habit of neceſſity for producing of the act: therefore it is both faith in the habit (or potentia proxima) and in the act that is neceſſary. But yet there is no neceſſity that the act muſt be preſently at the time performed: either in actu procreandi, vel tempore nativitatis, vel baptiſmatis. It is ſufficient that the parent be virtually and diſpoſitively at preſent a believer, and one that ſtands in that relation to Chriſt as believers do: To which end it is requiſite that he have actually believed formerly (or elſe he hath no habit of faith) and hath not fallen away from Chriſt, but be ſtill in the diſpoſition of his heart a believer, and then the ſaid act will follow in ſeaſon; and the relation is permanent which ariſeth from the act, and ceaſeth not when the act of faith intermitteth. It is not therefore the meer bare profeſſion of faith which God hath made the condition of this gift, but the former act and preſent diſpoſition.* Ch. 2. pag. 15. *The parents faith is the condition for himſelf and his infants. The cauſes of this condition of Diſcipleſhip or Churchmembership, may improperly be called the cauſes of our Diſcipleſhip it ſelf; but properly Chriſt by his Law or Covenant grant is the onely cauſe efficient.* Pag. 69. *All theſe Church mercies are beſtowed on the ſtanding Goſpel grounds of the Covenant of grace entred with our firſt parents preſently upon the fall.* Pag. 110. *The ſeed of the faithful are Church members & Diſciples, and ſubjects of Chriſt, becauſe they are children of the promiſe. God having been pleaſed to make the promiſe to the faithfull and their ſeed.* Pag. 59 *It is of the very law of nature to have infants to be part of a Kingdome, and therefore infants muſt bee part of Chriſts Kingdome.* Pag. 52. *That infants muſt be Church members is partly natural and partly grounded on the Law of Grace and Faith.* So

that

that Mr. *Bs.* opinion is, Christ by his law of nature, or nations, or covenant grant on the standing Gospel grounds of the covenant of grace, the promise to the faithful and their seed not without actual faith, formerly and present disposition, beyond the meer bare profession of faith, is properly the onely cause efficient of infants membership in the visible Church Christian.

Against this I argue. 1. If there be no such covenant of grace to the faithful and their seed, nor any such promise upon condition of the parents actual faith the childe shall be a visible Christian churchmember, nor any such law either of nature or nations, or positive, which makes the childe without his consent a visible Christian church-member, then Mr. *Bs.* opinion of the cause of infants of believers visible Christian churchmembership is false. But the antecedent is true, *ergo*, the consequent. The *minor* I shall prove by answering all Mr. *B.* hath brought for it, in that which followes.

2. The Covenant of grace according to Mr. *B.* is either absolute or conditional; the absolute, according to Mr. *B.* is rather a prediction then a covenant, and it is granted to be onely to the elect, in his *Appendix answer to the* 8th. *and* 9th. *object.* and elsewhere, and by this covenant God promiseth faith to the person, not visible churchmembership upon the faith of another. The conditional covenant is of justification, salvation on condition of faith, and this promiseth not visible Churchmembership, but saving graces, it promiseth unto all upon condition, and so belongs to all according to Mr. *B.* therefore by it visible churchmembership Christian is not conferred as a privilege peculiar to believers infants on condition of their faith.

3. If there were a covenant to the faithful and their seed to be their God, yet this would not prove their infants Christian visible Church membership; because God may be their God, and yet they not be visible Churchmembers, as he is the God of *Abraham*, of infants dying in the womb, of believers at the hour of death, yet they not now visible Churchmembers. 2. The promise if it did infer visible Church membership, yet being to the seed simply, may be true of them though not in infancy, and to the seed indefinitely may be true if any of them be visible Church members, especially considering that it cannot be true of the seed universally and at all times, it being certain that many are never visible Churchmembers, as all still-born infants of believers; many that are visible Churchmembers for a time, yet fall away; and therefore if that promise were granted, and the condition and law put, yet infants might not be visible Christian Churchmembers.

4. If all these which Mr. *B.* makes the cause, or condition of infants visible Church membership may be in act, and the effect not be, then the cause which Mr. *B.* assignes is not sufficient. But the antecedent is true. For the promise, the parents actual believing, the law of nature, of nations, any particular precept of dedicating the childe to God, the act of dedication as in *Hannahs* vow may be afore the childe is born, and yet then the childe is no visible Church member, *Ergo*. The consequence rests on that maxime in Logick, *That the cause being*

put, the effect is put. To this Mr. *B. plain Script. proof, &c. pag.* 100. *Moral causes (and so remote causes) might have all their being long before the effect, so that when the effect was produced there should bee no alteration in the cause, though yet it hath not produced the effect by the act of causing.* I reply this answer deserved a smile. 1. For Mr. *B.* as his words shew before cited, makes Christ by his law or covenant-grant, the onely cause efficient, therefore it is the next cause, according to him, and not onely a remote cause. 2. If the covenant or law bee as much in being or acting, and the parents faith and dedication afore the childe is born as after, and there is no alteration in the cause, though yet it have not produced the effect, then it is made by M. *B.* a cause in act, and consequently if the effect be not produced then it is not the cause, or the adequate sufficient cause is not assigned by assigning it. 3. Though moral causes may have their absolute being long before the effect, yet not the relative being of causes, for so they are together. So though the covenant and law might be a covenant and law, yet they are not the cause adequate, and in act (which Mr. *B.* makes them) without the being of the effect: nor is there in this any difference between moral and physical causes. And for the instances of Mr. *B.* they are not to the purpose. It is true, election, Christs death, the covenant, *&c.* are causes of remission of sins, imputation of righteousness, salvation, before these be, but they are not the adequate causes in act: For there must be a further act of God, forgiving, justifying, delivering, afore these are actually. They are causes of the justificability, the certainty, futurity of justification of themselves, but not of actual justification without mans faith, and Gods sentence, which is the next cause. A deed before one's born, gives him title to an inheritance, but not an actual estate without pleading entering upon it, *&c.* 4. I think Mr. *B.* is mistaken in making visible Churchmembership, the effect of a moral or legal cause. He imagines it to bee a right or priviledge by vertue of a grant or legal donation. But in this he is mistaken, confounding visible Church membership with the benefit or right consequent upon it. Whereas the Churchmembership and it's visibility are states arising from a physical cause rather then a moral, to wit, the call whereby they are made Churchmembers, and that act or signe what ever it be, whereby they may appear to bee Churchmembers to the understanding of others by mediation of sense. The priviledge or benefit consequent is by a law, covenant, or some donation legal or moral; not the state it self of visible Churchmembership. Which I further prove thus.

5. If visible Churchmembership bee antecedent to the interest a person hath in the Covenant, then the Covenant is not the cause of it; for if the Covenant be the cause it is by the persons interest in it. But visible Churchmembership is immediately upon the persons believing professed, which is a condition of his being in Covenant; therefore it is before the Covenant, and consequently the Covenant not the cause.

6. If the Covenant or law upon condition of the parents faith as the antecedent or cause without which the thing is not, be (as Mr. *B.* saith)

the

the cauſe of infants viſible Church membership the ſole efficient, then infants bought, orphans of *Turks*, &c. wholly at our diſpoſe, are not viſible Church members: For they have no covenant made to their parents, nor do their parents believe. But by Mr. *Bs.* doctrine *pag.* 101. where he would have them baptiſed, they are viſible Churchmembers, for ſuch onely are to be baptiſed, *Ergo*, the Covenant is not the ſole efficient, there may bee viſible Church membership without it. The ſame may be ſaid of foundlings, perſons of unknown progeny, *&c.*

7. If the Covenant or law with the parents actual faith without profeſſion, make not the parent a viſible Churchmember, neither doth it the childe; For the childe who is by vertue of the parents being a viſible Churchmember onely, a viſible Churchmember, cannot be ſuch without his being ſuch. But the parent by the law or covenant is not made upon his faith a viſible Churchmember without profeſſion, *Ergo*, *The parents faith is not the condition on which God beſtoweth the infant holineſs*, nor is it true *that the actual believing which hath the promiſe of perſonal bleſſings, is the ſame that hath the promiſe of this priviledge to infants.*

8. If perſons are viſible Church members and not by the Covenant of grace, then it is not true, that Chriſt by his Law, or Covenant of grace is the ſole efficient of viſible Churchmembership. The conſequence is plain, and needs no further proof. But the antecedent is true, *Ergo*. The *minor* is proved by inſtances of *Judas* and other hypocrites, who are viſible Churchmembers, but not by the Covenant of grace, for that promiſeth nothing to them.

9. If infants be viſible Churchmembers by the Covenant on the condition of the parents actual believing then either the next parents, or any in any generations precedent. If the next onely, let it be ſhewed, why the viſible Churchmembership ſhould be limited to it: if in any near generations, let it be ſhewed where we muſt ſtick, and go no further, why, ſuppoſe the viſible Churchmembership be ſtopped at the Grandfathers faith ſo as that we muſt go no further in our count, the great Grandfathers faith ſhould not infer the infants viſible Churchmembership as well as the Grandfathers: if there be no limit; why this viſible Churchmembership ſhould not be common to all the infants of the Jews, yea to all the world. If the ſucceſſion be broken off upon the Jews unbelief, why not upon the unbelief of each anceſtor?

10. If an infants viſible Churchmembership be by the covenant, upon the parents actual believing, and not a meer bare profeſſion, then it is a thing that cannot be known, becauſe the parents actual believing is a thing unknown. But that is abſurd. *Ergo* The *major* I have confirmed more fully in the firſt part of this *Review*, ſect. 35.

11. If other Chriſtian priviledges be not conveyed by a covenant upon the parents faith without the perſons own act or conſent, then neither this. But the antecedent is true, the child is not a believer, a diſciple, a miniſter, a ſon of God, *&c.* without his own conſent, *Ergo*. The conſequence of the *major* is confirmed in that there is like reaſon for them as for this.

12. If there be no Law or Ordinance of God unrepealed, by which either this infant visible Christian Churchmembership is granted, or the listing of infants, or entring into the visible Church Christian is made a duty, then that is not a cause of infants visible Churchmembership which Mr. B. assigns. But there is no such Law or Ordinance unrepealed, *Ergo.* If there be it is either by Precept or other Declaration, but by neither; *Ergo.* If by Precept, in the New Testament, or the Old: Not in the New, there is no Precept to Minister, or parents, or any other, to take infants for visible Churchmembers, or to list them as such: Nor in the Old, there is no such Precept I know but that of circumcision, which is repealed; vowing, praying, *&c.* did neither then, nor now of themselves make visible Churchmembers, although upon the prayers and faith, not onely of parents, but of others, God granted remission of sins, conversion, cure of plagues, yet did not these make any visible Churchmembers of themselves. If there be any other Declaration of God, it is either a positive law, or law of Nations, or of Nature: Not any positive law, if there be, let it be produced, not any law of Nations. This Mr. B. sometimes alledgeth, that as it is in Kingdomes and civil States the children are subjects and citizens as well as the parents, so in the Church: But if this were a rule in the Church of God, then not onely children must be visible Churchmembers, but also all the inhabitants where the Church is servants, and their children, as all in the territories and dominions of a King are his subjects; and sith Christs Kingdome is over all the world, yea if Mr. Bs. Doctrine were right in his *Sermon of Judgement*, pag. 14, 15. *All are bought by Christs death, and are his own*, every man in the world should be a visible Churchmember. Nor any law of Nature: For though Mr. B. sometimes pleads this, yet the vanity of it appears, 1. In that since the fall of man, the nature of man being corrupt, the call and frame of the Church is altogether by grace, and free counsel of God. 2. Churches if they should be fashioned after the way or law of Nature, where the husband is, there the wife should be a visible Churchmember, as well as where the paaent is a Churchmember, there the child should be so too. For the law of Nature makes them more nearly in one condition then father and child. But that is false, *Ergo.* 3. If the law of Nature should form Churchmembers then Churches should be by natural discent: But that is false, it is by calling, as is above proved. 4. Churches are by institution, therefore not by the law of Nature. This is proved from Mr. Bs. own hypothesis, that they are made Churchmembers by grant, covenant, gift on condition. 5. If they were by the law of Nature, all Churches should be domestical, not congregational or parochial; for they are not by nature, but by institution. 6. If Churches should be by the law of Nature, they should be formed by an invariable uniform way and model: But they are not so; they are called sometimes by Preachers, sometimes immediately by God, sometimes by authority; sometimes they are national, sometimes catholick; sometimes under one form of service and discipline, sometimes under another; sometimes the son is the means of making the father a visible Churchmember, sometimes

times the father the son; sometimes the wife of the husband, sometimes the husband of the wife, by which the order of Nature is inverted.

To all these arguments against infants visible Christian Church-membership, this one may be added, That there is neither example, rule, nor hint in all the New Testament, of their admission into the Church, or ordering in it, or care of the Elders and Officers of the Church for them as members, nor any other sign that Christ would have them reckoned as visible members in the Christian Church: which is a strong presumption against it. I know none that hath disputed for it, so much as Mr. *B.* I will therefore go on to examine what he saith.

SECT. LIII.

Letters between me and Mr. B. *are set down concerning the Law and Ordinance of infants visible Churchmembership unrepealed, which he asserts, whereby the point is stated.*

THat the Reader may understand the true state of the Dispute between me and Mr. *B.* he is to take notice, that when at first in the Dispute at *Bewdley*, *Jan.* 1. 1649. Mr. *B.* urged for infant Baptism his argument of the ordinance or law or appointment of God, whereby infants were once to be admitted members of the visible Church, now Printed in his book of *Baptism*, ch. 5. part 1. I not knowing what other it might be, and he denying it was that of circumcision, urged him often to tell me what it was, which he would not, which occasioned the Dispute to be more confused then otherwise it might have been. After, in my *Præcursor*, I again told him, I found it not but in the peculiar national policy of the Jews, no universal law or ordinance for it. To which what elusory reply he made, is shewed in the second Part of this *Review*, sect. 2. pag 8,9. Which moved me, being then upon the examining of his 4th. and 5th. ch. from *Bewdley* within two miles of *Kidderminster*, to write and send *April* 3d. 1655. this Letter to him.

Sir, Not finding yet that Law or Ordinance of infants visible Churchmembership which you assert in your book *of Baptism* to be unrepealed, I do request you to set down the particular Text or Texts of Holy Scripture where you conceive that Law or Ordinance is written, and to transmit it to me by this bearer, that your allegations may be considered by him who is Yours as is meet;

April 3. 1655. *John Tombes.*

The next morning I received from him this Letter, directed to me.

Sir, *I mean to see more said against what I have already written, before I will write any more about infant Baptism, without a more pressing call than I yet discern. I have discharged my conscience, and shall leave you and yours to take your course. And indeed I do not understand the sence*

of

of your Letter, because you so joyn two questions in one, that I know not which of the two it is that you would have me answer to. whether there were any Ordinance or Law of God that infants should be Churchmembers? is one question: whether this be repealed is another: you joyn both into one. For the first, that infants were Churchmembers, as you have not yet denied that I know of, so will I not be so uncharitable as to imagine that you are now about it: And much less that you should have the least doubt whether it were by Gods ordination. There are two things considerable in the matter. First, the benefit of Churchmembership, with all the consequent priviledges. It is the work of a grant or promise to confer these, and not directly of a precept. Secondly, the duty of devoting and dedicating the child to God, and entring it into the Covenant which confers the benefit: and this is the work of a law or precept to constitute this duty. I am past doubt that you doubt not of either of these: For you cannot imagine, that any infant had the blessing without a grant or promise, (that's impossible;) nor that any parents lay under a duty without an obliging law, (for that's as impossible.) Taking it therefore for granted that you are resolved in both these, and so yeeld that such a grant and precept there was, there remains no question but whether it be repealed: which I have long expected that you should prove. For citing the particular Texts in which the ordination is contained, though more may be said then is said, yet I shall think it needless, till I see the ordination contained in those Texts which I have already mentioned to you, proved to be reversed. Nor do I know that it is of so great use to stand to cite the particular Texts, while you confess in general, that such a promise and precept there is, by vertue of which, infants were till Christs time duly members of Christs Church (for Christs Church it was) even his universal visible Church. Still remember that I take the word [law] not strictly for a precept onely, but largely, as comprehending both promise and precept, and I have already shewed you both and so have others.

So much of your endeavour as hath any tendency to the advancement of holiness, I am willing to second you in, viz. that at the age you desire people might solemnly profess their acceptance of Christ, and their resolution to be his: But I hope God will find me better work while I must stay here, then to spend my time to prove that no infants of believers are within Christs visible Church, that is, are no infant Disciples, infant Christians, infant Churchmembers. I know no glory it will bring to Christ, nor comfort to man, nor see I now any appearance of truth in it. I bless the Lord for the benefits of the Baptismal Covenant that I enjoyed in infancy and that I was dedicated so soon to God and not left wholly in the Kingdome and power of the Devil. They that despise this mercy, or account it none, or not worth the accepting, may go without it, and take that which they get by their ingratitude. And I once hoped, that much less then such an inundation of direful consequents as our eyes have seen, would have done more for the bringing of you back to stop the doleful breach that you have made. I am fain to spend my time now to endeavour the recovery of some of your Opinion who are lately turned Quakers, or at least the preventing of others Apostacy: which is indeed to prevent the emptying of your Churches, which I suppose will be a more acceptable work with you, then again to write against rebaptizing, or for Infant

fant-baptiſm. Sir, I remain your imperfect brother, knowing but in part, yet loving the truth; Rich. Baxter.

Being the ſame day to return home, yet loth to be put off thus, I wrote immediately upon the reading of his Letter, this alſo to him.

Sir, I confeſs infants were by Gods fact of taking the whole people of the Jews for his people, in that eſtate of the Jewiſh Pædagogy (not by any promiſe or precept) viſible Church members, that is of the Congregation of *Iſrael*. I do not confeſs that there was any law or ordinance determining it ſhould be ſo, but onely a fact of God, which is a tranſeunt thing, and I think it were a fooliſh undertaking for mee to prove the repeal of a fact. Wherefore ſtill I preſs you that you would ſhew me where that law, ordinance, ſtatute or decree of God is that is repealeable, that is, which may in congruous ſence bee either by a later act ſaid to be repealed, or elſe to be eſtabliſhed as a law for ever. This I never found in your books, nor do I conceive that law is implied in any thing I grant; and therefore I yet pray you to ſet me down the particular text or texts of holy Scripture where that law is. Which need not hinder you from oppoſing the Quakers (in which I have not and hope ſhall not be wanting) of whom I think that you are miſinformed that they are Anabaptiſts, I think there are very few of them that were ever baptiſed, and have good evidence that they have been formerly Seekers, as you call them. And I think you do unjuſtly impute the direfull conſequences you ſpeak of to the denial of infant baptiſm, and to the practiſe of adult baptiſm, and that as your ſelf are deceived ſo you miſlead others. I yet expect your texts, knowing none in any of your books that mention that law of infants viſible Churchmembership which you aſſert either explicitly or implicitly, and am yours as is meet;

Bewdley this 4th. *of April.* 1655. *John Tombes.*

About a fortnight after I received this Letter to me from him.

Sir, *If you will needs recall me to this ungrateful work, let me requeſt you to tell me fully, exactly and plainly, what tranſient fact you mean, which you conceive without law or promiſe did make Church members: that ſo I may know where the competition lieth. When I know your meaning, I intend, God willing, to ſend you a ſpeedy anſwer to your laſt. Your fellow-ſervant,*

April 16. 1655. Rich. Baxter.

Upon the receipt whereof, I ſpeedily returned to him, on the day of the date of it, being then at *Bewdley*, this following Letter.

Sir, The tranſeunt fact of God, whereby infants were viſible Churchmembers, was plainly expreſt in my laſt to you, to be the taking of the whole people of the Jews for his people, which is the expreſſion of *Moſes*, *Deut.* 4. 34. *Exod.* 6. 7. And by it I mean that which is expreſſed *Levit.* 20. 24, 26. when God ſaid, *I have ſevered you from other people, that you ſhould be mine.* The ſame thing is expreſſed 1 *Kings* 8. 53. *Iſai* 43, 1. This I term [fact] as conceiving it moſt comprehenſive of the many particular acts in many generations, whereby he did accompliſh it. Following herein *Stephen*, *Acts* 7. 2. and *Nehem.*

hem, 9.7. I conceive it began when he called *Abraham* out of *Ur*, *Gen.* 12. 1. to which succeeded in their times the enlarging of his family, removing of *Lot*, *Ishmael*, the sons of *Keturah*, *Esau*, distinction by Circumcision, the birth of *Isaac*, *Jacob*, his leading to *Padan Aram*, increase there, removal to *Canaan*, to *Ægypt*, placing, preserving there, and chiefly the bringing of them thence, to which principally the Scripture refers this fact, *Exod.* 19. 4 *Levit.* 11. 45. *Nehem.* 1. 10. *Hos.* 11 1. the bringing them into the bond of the Covenant at Mount *Sinai*, giving them laws, settling their Priesthood, tabernacle, army, government, inheritance. By which fact the infants of the *Israelites* were visible Churchmembers as being part of the Congregation of *Israel*, and in like manner though not with equal right (for they might be sold away) were the bought servants or captives, whether infants or of age, though their parents were professed idolaters. And this I said was without promise or precept, meaning such promise or precept as you in your Letter say I confess, and you describe, *a promise conferring to infants the benefit of Churchmembership with all the consequent priviledges, a precept constituting the duty of devoting and dedicating the childe to God, and entering into Covenant, which confers the benefit.* For though I grant the promises to the natural posterity of *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. and the Covenant made with *Israel* at Mount *Sinai*, and *Deut.* 29. wherein *Israel* avouched God, and a precept of Circumcision, and precepts of God by *Moses* of calling the people, and requiring them to enter into Covenant, *Exod.* 19. and *Deut.* 29. Yet no such particular promise concerning infants visible Churchmembership, or precept for parents or others, concerning the solemn admission of infants as visible Churchmembers, besides Circumcision, as in your Book *of Baptism* you assert. Nor do I conceive that infants of *Israel* were made visible Church members by the promises in the covenants or the precepts forenamed, but by Gods transeunt fact which I have described. Which I therefore term [transeunt] because done in time, and so not eternal, and past, and so not in congruous sense repealeable as a law, ordinance, statute, decree, which determines such a thing shall bee for the future, though capable of continuance in the same or the like acts, or of interruption. Which continuance or interruption is known by narration of what God hath done, not by any legal revocation, or renewing, or continuance of a promise or precept concerning that thing. Now as the Churchmembership of the *Israelites* began as I conceive with *Abrahams* call, and was completed when they were *brought out of Ægypt to God*, *Exod.* 19. 4. so I conceive it ceased when upon their rejection of Christ as was fore-told *Matth.* 21. 43. they were broken off from being Gods people, which was completed at the destruction of *Jerusalem*, when the temple was destroyed, as Christ fore-told *Luke* 19. 43, 44. And instead of the Jewish people by the preaching of the Gospel confirmed by mighty signes, God gathered to himself a Church of another frame in a spiritual way, according to the institution of Christ, *Matth.* 28. 19, 20. *Mark* 16. 15, 16. in which he included not infants, the Jews themselves were no part of the Christian Church without repentance and faith in Christ professed at least.

Having

Having now fully, exactly. and plainly told you my meaning as you requeſt, I do now expect your ſpeedy anſwer to my laſt, and therein to fulfill my requeſt of ſetting down the particular texts of holy Scripture wherein that law largely taken comprehending promiſe and precept of infants viſible Churchmembership, which you aſſert to be unrepealed, is contained. If you ſhall in your anſwer ſet down wherein the bleſſing, benefit, and priviledges of infants viſible Churchmembership, which you aſſert unrepealed, did conſiſt; I may better underſtand you then I do: But I ſhall preſs you no further then you ſhall be willing in this thing. I am, Yours as is meet,

Bewdley, April 21. 1655. *John Tombes.*

On *May* 29. 1655. I received this following anſwer.

Sir, *A probability of doing or receiving good, is to me a call to action. Seeing no ſuch probability, I told you at firſt my purpoſes to forbear any further debates with you, till you had better anſwered what is ſaid. In your next you ſeemed to deal ſo plainly, as if ſome ſmall probability of good did yet appear: But in your* 3*d. you fly off again and eat your own words, and jumble things in much confuſion, ſo that I now return again to my former thoughts. For you that expreſly ſay and unſay, and contradict your ſelf, are not likely to be brought to a candid management or fair iſſue of the Diſpute. You'l ſure think it no great matter to be driven to a ſelf contradiction (which with others is to loſe the Cauſe) who ſo eaſily and expreſly run it upon it your ſelf.*

Anſw. It was a call ſufficient to Mr. *B.* to do what I requeſted in my firſt Letter, in that *a brother* and *fellow ſervant* (as he takes me to be) deſired it of him. If he love the *truth*, as he ſaith, he ſhould be willing to let us know his Scriptures he alledgeth for that which he aſſerts as a truth. If he conceive himſelf *imperfect*, *knowing but in part*, why ſhould he not be jealous of his own opinion, eſpecially reſting on remote conſequences, rather then violently oppoſe mine, which his own acknowledgements do make plainly agreeing with the New Teſtament? If I were a ſophiſtical adverſary, yet I ſhould think it were meet Mr. *B.* ſhould debate that with me which he hath ſo clamourouſly and confidently oppoſed me in. What better anſwer I need make to what is ſaid then I have done, ſo far as I have gone (which is if not the greateſt part, yet the chiefeſt, and indeed for Scripture Texts all that requires an anſwer) I ſee not. I have ſet down almoſt all my Antagoniſts words, in Mr. *Bs.* book, at leaſt all that is argumentative and pertinent, with my anſwers diſtinctly, fully, and plainly, in the two foregoing Parts of this *Review*: And what way any man could take, more candid and agreeing to Logick rules, then I have gone in my anſwers, is yet to me undiſcernable. Mr. *Firmin*, in his *Separation examined*, pag. 31. ſaith thus, *I can eaſily diſcern Mr.* Tombes *to diſpute more like a Sophiſter, then a Chriſtian, that did deſire to ſee truth*: and he cites the words of Mr. *M.* in his *Defence*, pag. 147. which I have anſwered ſo fully in my *Apology*, pag. 78, 79. and ſhewed that very way which Mr. *M.* chargeth me with, to be as contrary to ſophiſtical diſputing as light is to darkneſs, that I had thought impudence it ſelf would not have charged me

with that, in a book printed six years after the Edition of my *Apology*. Mr. *Simon Ford*, in his *Epistle Dedicatory to his* frivolous scribbled *Dialogue*, chargeth me with *railing down rather then disputing*, even in that which as he sets it down hath no shew of reviling, but a plain calling a straw a straw. And for *my heavy censure*, I still profess I know not how to conceive more favourably of Pædobaptists, but wish they would search their own hearts impartially. Mr. *Gataker* in his *letter* printed by Mr. *B.* to whom it was written, *doubts in part it to be my disposition to blaze my forehead, not regarding at all what men deem or say of me, so I may seem to say somewhat, and have the last word*; then which, a more unrighteous conceit could hardly have been entertained by him. Mr. *Bs.* printing it, together with other passages, makes me almost hopeless of ever meeting with any just, or candid dealing from Pædobaptists. Mr. *B.* here saith, *I jumble things in much confusion, that I contradict my self, eat my own words*; none of which is true: But he takes on him to prove it thus.

In your 2d. you say [*I confess* infants were by Gods fact of taking the whole people of the Jews for his people, in that estate of the Jewish Pædagogy, not by any promise or precept, then visible Church members, that is, of the congregation of Israel; I do not confess, that there was any Law or Ordinance determining it should be so, but onely a fact of God, which is a transeunt thing, *&c.*] *In your 3d. you say* [For though I grant the promises to the natural posterity of *Abraham*. *Gen.* 17. 4,5,6,7 8. and the Covenants made with *Israel* at mount *Sinai*, and *Deut.* 29. wherein *Israel* avouched God, and a precept of Circumcision, and precepts of God by *Moses* of calling the people, and requiring of them to enter into Covenant, *Exod.* 19. *&* *Deut.* 29. yet no such particular promise concerning infants visible Churchmembership, or precept for parents or others concerning the solemn admission of infants as visible Churchmembers besides Circumcision, as in your book of *Bapt.* you assert] *Before there was no* [Law or Ordinance determining it should be so, but onely a fact] *now there are Laws or precepts and promises that it should be so, but* [not such as I assert in my book] *And if I should shew you never so many, you may reply, they are not such as I assert in my book, and waste the time in that trial, when it is better for me to see first what you say to that book: For this is but to lead us about to trifling.*

Answ. 1. There is not a shadow of self contradiction in the latter words to the former. For though the latter acknowledge promises to *Israel*, yet not that by them they were visible Churchmembers; and Laws and Ordinances, yet not determining they should be visible Churchmembers. Had Mr. *B.* heeded my words, he had forborn this accusation, if he were not bent to find a knot in a bulrush. 2. If *I* should answer as he forebodes, *I* should answer rightly. And it is certain, that if Mr. *B.* should bring never so many promises, and not shew that they made infants visible Churchmembers, as he asserts in his book, he would waste time, and lead us about to trifling; and therefore it is just *I* should tie him to that, and his excepting against my so doing would

would shew his wrangling, and will be taken for a losing of his cause. But I am resolved to follow him, even in his vagaries, and to examine whether it be true which he saith, that *I jumble things in much confusion.*

To make any clear work, saith Mr. B. *upon the things in question we must necessarily speak to the questions distinctly, many of which you too much confound. The first question in order fit to be resolved is* [*whether infants before Christs incarnation were Churchmembers? or not?*] *you grant they were: and therefore this is past dispute with us. The 2d. Qu. and the first unresolved, is* [*what Church it is that infants were members of?*] *This you give me occasion to take in the way, because you twice explain your meaning, when you confess them Churchmembers, by an* [*i. e. of the congregation of Israel.*] *By which you seem to imply two things: First, that none but the infants of the congregation of Israel were Churchmembers: Secondly, that the infants of Israel were members of no Church but what is convertible with the congregation of Israel.*] *The 3d. Qu. is. What it is that gives the Israelites that denomination of* [*the Congregation of Israel*] *of which infants were members. For you jumble both together, both causes Civil, and Ecclesiastical, and of both those that make to the being and well-being. So that our enquiry must be, whether the Congregation and the Commonwealth be the same thing in your sense?*] *and what constituteth it formally? For in this you speak in dark ambiguities. The 4th. Qu. is,* [*whether there was any Law, Ordinance, or Precept of God concerning mans duty herein, or obliging him to the Covenant acceptance and engagement, and so to membership; and any promise, grant, or Covenant, conferring the right of Churchmembership and the consequent priviledges to infants?*] *To this you say both Yea and Nay, if I can understand you, or at least as to much of the Qu. concerning the being, and part of the effect of the precept and promise. Yet you conclude, that you* [*do not conceive that infants of Israel were made visible Churchmembers by the promises in the Covenants, or the precepts fore named, but by Gods transeunt fact.*] *I will not suspect that you imagine any other promise doth it besides that in the Covenant, because your tying the effect to the transeunt fact doth exclude them. Here we are cast upon these Qus. next. 5th. Qu.* [*whether there be such precepts and promises as you grant, (or as I shall prove) which yet make not infants Churchmembers?*] *6th. Qu.* [*whether there be any transeunt fact of God, which without the efficiency of precept or promise did make the infants of Israel Churchmembers?*] *7th. Qu.* [*whether those which you have assigned be such facts?*] *8th* [*which are the Texts of Scripture that contain or expres the said laws, precepts, or grants which I maintain?*] *this you insist upon. 9th.* [*whether such laws, precepts, or grants as I shall prove, are capable of a repeal or revocation?*] *10th. Qu.* [*whether they are actually revoked or repealed?*]

Answ. The 8th. Qu. is the onely Qu. needfull to be resolved. All the rest are brought in to clog the Dispute, to weary me, and the Reader, in an indirect way most of them raised out of my words; in which if I should be mistaken, yet were it not thereby proved, that there is such a Law or Ordinance of infants visible Churchmembership unre-

pealed, as Mr. *B.* asserts. Nor by waving of these questions did *I* jumble things in much confusion, but decline drawing in things impertinent. Nevertheless, sith Mr. *B.* hath used these shifts to clog the Dispute, *I* am resolved to prosecute it in his method, having first premonished the Reader, that many things here said are not true, as, that *I seem to imply that the infants of Israel were members of no Church but what is convertible with the congregation of Israel*; that *I jumble both causes Civil and Ecclesiastical, and of both those that make to the being and well being*; that *I say Yea and Nay to the* 4*th.* Qu. that *I tie the effect to the transeunt fact.* He adds.

"Before all these Qs. are well handled, we should easily be convinced that it had been better either have let all alone, or else, if we "must needs have the other bout, at least to have agreed on our terms, "and the stating of the questions better before we had begun. And I "think that even that is not easie to do. For when *I* desired your plain "exact and full explication of one word [transeunt fact] and you tell "me you have plainly, fully, and exactly told me your meaning: It "falls out, either through the unhappy darkness of my own understanding, or yours, that *I* know but little more of your mind then *I* "did before, and that you seem to me to have raised more doubts and "darkness then you have resolved and dissipated. Yet being thus far "drawn in, *I* shall briefly say somewhat to the several Qs. not following your desires to answer one alone: which cannot be done to any "purpose while the foregoing are unresolved, because it is the clearing up of truth, and not the serving of your present ends in your writings now in hand that *I* must intend.

Answ. I affect no more bouts with such a captious wrangler, nor know I any need to Dispute so many questions, or to agree on terms; I shall answer him as *I* see meet. What he desired *I* gave him, not onely an explication of one word, but also of the thing, which that it raiseth so many doubts, seems not to be from the darkness of the understanding, but either from the lightness of the fancy, or the bent of the will to find a way to blunt the Readers attention ere he comes to the 8th. Qu. which it was just Mr. *B.* should have answered alone, sith otherwise it were an unjust thing for him to put me to prove a repeal of *I* know not what. His serving me hereby in my present ends of writing had been equal, my ends and writing being onely for the truth: His appear to be for a shift to uphold a while by indirect courses a tottering corruption, which must fall. I follow him.

SECT. LIV.

Infants were visible Churchmembers onely in the Congregation of Israel.

"THe first question (*saith Mr.* B.) being resolved that infants were "once Churchmembers, to the resolving of the second question, I "shall prove these two Propositions. 1. That it was not onely the

infants

" infants of the congregation of *Israel* that were Churchmembers. 2.
" The infants of *Israel* were members of the universal visible Church,
" and not onely of that particular congregation. The first I have proved
" already in my book. And 1. *Isaac* was a Churchmember, yet none of
" the congregation of *Israel*; it was not *Israel* till *Jacobs* days. If you
" say that by the [congregation of *Israel*] you mean [the seed of *A-*
" *braham* which had the promise of *Canaan*] yet 2. I say, that *Ishmael*
" and *Abrahams* seed by *Keturah* and *Esau* had none of the promise, and
" yet were Churchmembers in their infancy. [*In* Isaac *shall thy seed be*
" *called*] that is that seed which had the promise of *Canaan*. And so it
" was confined to *Jacob*, who got the blessing and the birthright, which
" *Esau* lost, and was excluded, yet was of the Church from his infancy.
" The son of the bond woman was not to be heir with the son of the
" free-woman, yet was *Ishmael* an infant member. If you say, that by
" [the congregation of *Israel*] you mean all the natural seed of *Abra-*
" *ham*: I add 3. The children of his bond men born in his family, or
" bought with money, were none of *Abrahams* natural seed, and yet
" were Churchmembers in their infancy. If you go yet further, and
" say, that by [the congregation of *Israel*] you mean all that were at
" the absolute dispose of *Abraham* or his successors, and so were his own:
" I add 4. The infants of free Proselytes were none such, and yet were
" Churchmembers. If you yet go further, and say, that you mean by
" [the congregation of *Israel*] any that came under the government
" of *Abraham* or his successors: then I add 5. That the Sichemites,
" *Gen.*34. were not to come under *Jacobs* government, but to be his al-
" lies and neighbours, being so many more in number then *Jacob*, that
" they concluded rather that his cattel and substance should be theirs;
" yet were they circumcised every male, and so were made members of
" the visible professing Church. For it was not the bare external sign
" that *Jacob* or his sons would perswade them to, without the thing sig-
" nified: For the reproach that they mentioned of giving their daugh-
" ter to the uncircumcised, was not in the defect of the external abcision;
" for so *Moses* own son, and all the Israelites in the wilderness should
" have been under the same reproach, and all the females continually:
" But it was in that they were not in Covenant with the same God, and
" did not profess to worship the same God in his true way of worship
" as they did. And therefore as Baptizing is not indeed and in Scrip-
" ture sence Baptizing, if it be not used for engagement to God, even
" into his Name; so Circumcision is not indeed and in Scripture sence
" Circumcision, unless it be used as an engaging sign, and they be cir-
" cumcised to God.

Answ. By [the congregation of *Israel*] I meant the same with the *Hebrew* people, or house of *Abraham*, which I termed *the congregation of Israel* by an anticipation usual in Scripture; as when, *Gen.*12.8. it is said that *Abraham removed unto a mountain on the east of Bethel*, though it were not so named till *Jacobs* time, *Gen.*28.19. Which term I the rather chose, because it is most frequent in Scripture; and I remember not the phrase any where [the *Church or congregation of Abra-*

ham,

ham, but of Israel] in Scripture, the phrase of which I thought best to use. Now taking the congregation of *Israel* for the *Hebrew* people or the house of *Abraham*, I say, the infants onely of the congregation of *Israel*, as I say here, Sect. 51. by birth property, or proselytism were visible Churchmembers. Nor is it any thing against this my Tenet, that the *Sichemites* infants, *Gen.* 34. were visible Churchmembers; for they were circumcised as *consenting to become one people with them* as is expressed *v.* 16, 22. and therefore of the congregation of *Israel*. So that what ever were the reason of the reproach, *v.* 14. what ever were the ends of *Jacobs* sons or the *Sichemites*, how ever the fact is to be construed, or it be to be judged that they were circumcised or not, yet that instance proves not visible Churchmembership of infants any where but in the congregation of *Israel*, sith the *Sichemites* if they were truly circumcised, and so visible Churchmembers, it was because they were *by agreement one people*, and so of the congregation of *Israel*. Mr. *B.* adds.

6. "It was then the duty of all the nations round about (if not of "all the nations on earth, that could have information of the Jewish "Religion) to engage themselves and their children to God by Cir- "cumcision. That all that would have any alliance and commerce "with the Jewes must do it, is commonly confessed: that it must "extend to infants, the case of the *Sichemites* (though deceitfully "drawn to it by some of *Jacobs* sons) doth shew, and so doth the Jewish "practice which they were to imitate: that the same engagement to the "same God is the duty of all the world, is commonly acknowledged, "though Divines are not agreed whether the distant nations were obli- "ged to use Circumcision the Jewish sign. The best of the Jews were "zealous to make Proselytes, and no doubt but the very law of nature "did teach them to do their best for the salvation of others. To think "such charitable and holy works unlawfull, is to think it evil to do the "greatest good. And if they must perswade the neighbour nations to "come in to God by Covenant engagement, they must perswade them "to bring their children with them, and to devote them to God as well "as themselves. For the Jews knew no other Covenanting or enga- "ging to God. As the *Sichemites* must do, so other nations must do: "For what priviledge had the children of the *Sichemites* above the rest "of the world?

Answ. This argument in form would be thus. If it were the duty of all the nations round about to engage themselves and their children to God by Circumcision, then it was not onely the infants of the Congregation of *Israel* that were Church members. But the antecedent is true, *Ergo* the consequent. Of this argument I deny the consequence of the *major*, and the *minor* also. I deny the consequence, because they that did engage themselves and children to God by Circumcision, did thereby ingraff themselves and children into the congregation of *Israel*. I deny also the *minor*. For though I acknowledge it was the duty of all the world to engage themselves to God by covenanting to take him for their God, yet I do not conceive that they were all bound to do it by

circum-

circumcision. For I conceive that precept given onely to the *Hebrews* or house of *Abraham*. In which I am confirmed, in that *I* finde not that *Sem*, *Melchisedeck*, *Lot*, *Job*, ever did so or are blamed for not doing it. It is most certain that *Cornelius*, though a man *that feared God with all his house*, yet was neither he nor his house circumcised, *Acts* 10. 2. & 11. 3. and yet accepted of God. It is true, if any would keep the Passeover, and be admitted to the rites of the Tabernacle, he was to be circumcised with his males: But they might devote and engage themselves and children to God without it, nor was it necessary that God should be their God in covenant or to their salvation that they were circumcised, or joyned to the people of the Jews. I confess it was of much moment to reduce the nations, and to preserve them from the idolatry that defiled the world, to be of that people: for generally the uncircumcised who were *aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel*, *were without God in the world*, *without Christ*, *without hope aliens from the Covenants of promise*; and therefore it was a good office to endeavour to bring the nations to God by circumcision, and a desirable advantagious thing, as it is now to be in a well ordered fixed Church, yet *I* cannot say it is or was necessary for all, either as a duty or means of salvation to do either. Mr. *B.* goes on.

7. *In* Hesters *time many of the people became Jews* Hest. 8. 17. *who yet were not under their government. And to be Jewes is to be of the Jewish profession. And it is well known that this was to be circumcised, they and their little ones (as the Proselytes were) and so to keep the Law of Moses.*

Answ. Though they were not under the Jewes Government in respect of all power and command, yet they were incorporated into the Jewish people, and were under their government as far as other Jews by birth were, having some exercise and liberty of using their own lawes, though with subjection also to the *Persian* Princes. *I* confess their being Jews was by circumcising of them and their males, but hereby is not proved that any infants were visible Churchmembers but in the Congregation of *Israel*, but rather the contrary. Sith they *were become Jews*, that is of the Congregation of *Israel*.

8. Saith Mr. *B. The scattered and captivated Jews themselves were from under the Government of* Abrahams *successors, and yet were to circumcise their children as Churchmembers.*

Answ. Though they were from under the Government of *Abrahams* successor in respect of all power and command, yet they were under their Government so far, as they were permitted the exercise of the *Mosaick* Lawes, and were of the Congregation of *Israel*, and were Circumcised as members thereof; and therefore no infants yet proved visible Churchmembers out of that Congregation.

9. Saith Mr. *B. when* Jonas *preached to Ninive, it was all the race of man among them, without exception, from the greatest to the least, that was to fast and joyn in the humiliation*: Ergo, *all, even infants as well as others, were to partake of the remission. If you say, the beasts were to fast too: I answer, as they were capable in their kinde of part of the curse,*

so

ſo were they of part of the beneſit, but their capacity was not as mans: They faſted to manifeſt mans humiliation. And if by the humiliation of the aged the beaſts ſped the better in their kinde, no wonder if infants ſped the better in theirs, and according to their capacities, and that was to have a remiſſion ſuitable to their ſin.

Anſw. All this is quite from the buſineſs, for it proves not that either the aged or the infants were viſible Churchmembers out of the Congregation of *Iſrael*. If the faſting prove the viſible Churchmemberſhip, it proves the viſible Churchmemberſhip of the beaſts as well as the infant-men. If the repentance bee alledged to prove it, *I* hardly think ſuch a ſudden quickly paſt repentance will prove any of them viſible Churchmembers of Chriſt, any more then the *Mariners prayer, fear, ſacrificing, making vowes, Jonah* 1. 14. 6. If it do, yet it proves onely the aged *who turned from their evil way, Jonah* 3. 10. to be viſible Churchmembers; there's no proof yet of an infants viſible Churchmemberſhip out of the Congregation of *Iſrael*.

10. Saith Mr. *B. What I have ſaid of* Sem *and many others, and their poſterity already, I ſhall not here again repeat: and more will be ſaid anon to the following queſtions.*

Anſw. What is ſaid ſhall be anſwered in its place. Mr. *B.* goes on thus.

"The 2d. propoſition to be proved is, that [the Iſraelites children "were members of the univerſal viſible Church of Chriſt as well as of "the Congregation of *Iſrael*] But this you did heretofore acknowledge, "and therefore I ſuppoſe will not now deny. I ſuppoſe it paſt contro- "verſie between us; 1. That Chriſt had then a Church on earth. As "*Abraham* ſaw Chriſts day and rejoyced, and *Moſes* ſuffered the re- "proach of Chriſt, *Heb.* 11. 26. and the Prophets enquired of the ſal- "vation by Chriſt, and ſearched diligently, and prophefied of the "grace to come, and it was the ſpirit of Chriſt which was in thoſe Pro- "phets ſignifying the time, and teſtifying before hand the ſufferings "of Chriſt, and the glory that ſhould follow, 1 *Pet.* 1. 10, 11. So "were they part of the Church of Chriſt, and members of the body of "Chriſt. and given for the edification of that body: Though it was re- "vealed to them that the higher privigledes of the Church after the "comming of Chriſt, were not for them but for us, 1 *Pet.* 1. 12. 2. I "ſuppoſe it agreed on alſo between us, that there was no true Church "or Eccleſiaſtical worſhipping ſociety appointed by God in all the "world ſince the fall, but the Church of Chriſt, and therefore either "infants were members of Chriſts Church, or of no Church of Gods "inſtitution. *Moſes* Church and *Chriſts* Church according to Gods in- "ſtitution were not two, but one Church. For *Moſes* was *Chriſts* U- "ſher, and his ceremonies were an obſcurer Goſpel to lead men to "*Chriſt*: And though the fooliſh Jewes by miſ-underſtanding them "made a ſeparation, and made *Moſes* Diſciples to bee ſeparate from "*Chriſts* Diſciples, and ſo ſet up the alone [ſhadowes of things to come, "yet the body is all of *Chriſt*] *Col* 2. 17. and by ſo doing they viola- "ted Gods inſtitution, and unchurcht themſelves. 3. I ſuppoſe it a-

greed

" greed also, that *Christs* Church is but one, and that even those of all " ages that are not at once visible, yet make up one body. 4. And that " therefore whoever is a member of any particular Church is a member " of the universal. (Though the Church was more eminently called " Catholike, when the wall of separation was taken down.) But I re- " member I have proved this in my Book, *part.* 1. *chap.* 20. and there- " fore shall say no more now.

Answ. I grant as *I* did heretofore, that the *Israelites children were members of the universal visible Church of Christ, as well as of the Congregation of Israel*, or rather in that they were of the Congregation of *Israel*, nor do I deny that *Christ had then a Church on earth*, nor that *there was no true Church, or Ecclesiastical worshipping society appointed by God in all the world since the fall but the Church of Christ.* But as for the third, though I grant that Christs invisible Church is but one by unity of the same spirit and faith, and that the visible Church is but one in some respect, namely in respect of the profession of the same faith and hope in Christ: yet they are not so one, as that whoever is a visible member of one particular Church, is a member of each particular Church; and though I yeild that *whoever is a member of any particular Church is a member of the universal*, yet it follows not, which is it that Mr. *B.* drives at, and vainly talks of his proving it elsewhere, as will be shewed hereafter) that every one who was a member of the universal Church, in that he was a member of the Jewish Church particular, was a visible member of every particular visible Church of Christ; nor that every one that was a member of the universal Church, in that hee was a member of a visible particular Church of Christ, was a visible member of the Jewish particular Church. As for instance, *Cornelius* and *his house who feared God*, *Acts* 10. 2. were visible members of that particular Church of his house, and so of the universal, yet were not visible members of the particular Church Jewish, as may bee proved from their uncircumcision and shunning as unclean by the Jews, *Acts* 10. & 11. 3. The reason is manifest: For the universal hath not a distinct existence from the parts, nor is any part existing in another part, because it is part of the whole, as the finger is not in every part of the body because it is in the body, in that it is in the hand, which is a part. And therefore Mr. *Bs.* arguing (which he confides so much in, *part.* 1. *ch.* 20. of *plain Script.* &c.) will appear to be vain; that because infants were visible members of the Church universal, in that they were of the Church Jewish, therefore they are in the Christian, properly so called, contradistinct to the Jewish. Which speech I use, as commonly Divines do, because though the Jewish Church were *Christs* Church, yet the appellation of Christians being not afore the dayes of the Apostles *Acts* 11. 26. we may fitly say *the Church in the wilderness* was not the Christian properly so called, that is, which is gathered out of the nations by the Apostles preaching, nor *Moses* in the Christian Church, nor *Cornelius* in the Jewish Church, as *Ægypt* though in *Africa*, and *Persia* though in *Asia*, yet are not said to be in *Asia* the less, or *Africa propria*. Mr. *B.* proceeds,

Concerning the matter of the third Qu. I assert that [it was not onely of the Jewes Commonwealth that infants were members of, but of the Church distinct from it.] This is proved sufficiently in what is said before.

Answ. As yet I do not finde it proved, that the Jewish Church was distinct from the Commonwealth, or that there was any member of the Church who was not of the Commonwealth. What is said about it, *sect.* 43. may be there seen by the Reader.

Moreover, saith Mr. *B.* 1. *Infants were Churchmembers in* Abrahams *family before Circumcision, and after when it was no Commonwealth. So they were in* Isaacs, Jacobs, *&c.*

Answ. Abrahams family, and *Isaacs*, and *Jacobs*, were a Commonwealth, although they were but small; they had government within themselves. *Abraham* had his trained servants and made war of himself, *Gen.* 14. 14. *Isaac* made a league as a Prince co ordinate, *Gen.* 26. 31. so did *Jacob*, *Gen.* 31. 53. These with other acts shew they were an independent Commonwealth.

2. Saith Mr. *B. The banished, captivated, scattered Jews, that ceased to bee members of their Commonwealth, yet ceased not to bee of the Church.*

Answ. They were then of the Commonwealth of the Jews, as they were of the Church, both *de jure*, and *de facto*, they acknowledging themselves to be of that people, and to adhere to their laws, although somewhat restrained of their liberty, as a captivated, imprisoned King or subject is head or member of that Republique to which he hath not access.

3. Saith Mr. *B. The people of the land, that became Jews in* Hesters *time, joyned not themselves to their Commonwealth: Nor the Sichemites.*

Answ. The contrary is true; as concerning the *Sichemites* is shewed before.

4. Saith he, *Many Proselytes never joyned themselves to their Commonwealth.*

Answ. Those Proselytes were not of the Jewish Church visible members.

5. Saith he, *The children of* Abraham *by* Keturah, *when they were removed from his family were not unchurched; and yet were no members of the Jewes Commonwealth. But I shall take up with what is said for this already, undertaking more largely to manifest it, when I perceive it necessary and useful.*

Answ. Abrahams children by *Keturah*, when out of the Commonwealth of the *Hebrews* were unchurched, at least, in respect of the Church of the *Hebrews*; nor do I conceive Mr. *Bs.* larger manifestation of the contrary, will be any thing but more words without proof.

SECT. LV.

Infants of the Jewes were not visible Churchmembers, by Promise, or Precept; as Mr. B. teacheth.

MR. B. proceeds. *To the 4th. Qu. I assert that* [*1. There was a Law or Precept of God obliging the parents to enter their children into Covenant with God, by accepting his favour, and re-engaging and devoting them to God, and so entering them solemnly Churchmembers.*] *And* [*2. there was a Covenant, promise or grant of God, by which he offered the Churchmembership of some infants and actually conferred it, where his offer was accepted.*] *I should have mentioned this first, and therefore will begin with the proof of this. By these terms Covenant, promise, grant, or deed of gift, &c. we understand that which is common to all these,* viz. [*A signe of Gods will conferring or confirming a right to or in some benefit*] *such as we commonly call a Civil act of Collation as distinct from a mere Physical act of disposal. I call it* [*a signe of Gods will de jure*] *because that is the general nature of all his legal moral acts: they are all signal determinations de debito, of some due. 2. I say conferring or confirming right to some benefit*] *to difference it from precepts which onely determine what shall be due from us to God, and from threatnings, which determine what punishment shall be due from God to us.*

Answ. That which Mr. *B.* asserts here, is in opposition to what I said in my 2d. Letter; I confess infants were by Gods fact of taking the whole people of the Jews for his people, in that estate of the Jewish pædagogy (not by any promise or precept) visible Churchmembers, that is of the Congregation of *Israel*; and in my 3d. I explain my self, a promise conferring to infants the benefit of Churchmembership, with all the consequent privileges, a precept constituting the duty of devoting and dedicating the child to God, and entring into Covenant, which confers the benefit (which were his own words in his first Letter) so that if we prove by any other grant or deed of gift, physical or moral, which is not a promise of it, by which it is conferred, or by any Law which is not such a precept, he contradicts not my speech, and so disputes not *ad idem*. Which whether he do or no, will be perceived by examining what follows.

Having thus, saith he, *explained the terms, I prove the proposition. If infants Churchmembership with the priviledges thereof were a benefit conferred, which some had right to or in, then was there some grant, covenant, or promise, by which this right was conferred: But the antecedent is most certain:* Ergo, *so is the consequent. I suppose you will not deny that it was a benefit to be the covenanted people of God, to have the Lord engaged to bee their God, and to take them for his people, to bee brought so near him, and to bee separated from the common and unclean, from the world, and from the strangers to the Covenant of promises, that live as without God in the world, and without hope.*

Answ. I do not deny it, but I deny that this is to be visible Churchmembers formally, or connexively. For men may be visible Churchmembers, and yet not have all this benefit, and they may have all this benefit who are not visible Churchmembers. Hypocrites may be visible Churchmembers, yet not be Gods covenanted people to have the Lord engaged to be their God, and to take them for his people, to be brought so near him, *&c.* And some believing Saints that are dumb, may have all this, and yet not be visible Churchmembers.

Mr. *B.* adds, *If it were asked what benefit had the Circumcision? I suppose you would say, much every way.*

Answ. I should, but I would add; that to bee *the Circumcision* is not all one as to be visible Churchmembers: *Cornelius* and his house were visible Churchmembers yet not *the Circumcision:* Nor were the benefits mentioned *Rom.* 3. 1 2. conferred to them as visible Churchmembers, (For then all visible Churchmembers had been partakers of the same benefits, they had *had the Oracles of God committed to them, the giving the Law, Christ from them after the flesh,* &c. *Rom.* 9. 4, 5. which is false) but as to a people specially loved and gratified with these priviledges.

He adds. *If Infant-Churchmembership were no benefit, then they that had it, were not (when they came to age or their parents in the mean time) obliged to any thankfulness for it. But they were obliged to be thankful for it. Ergo, it was a benefit.*

Answ. Visible Churchmembership simply notes onely a state, by which was a benefit. By the infant visible Jewish Churchmembership was a benefit of honour and special dignity above other people, which God then vouchsafed to the Jews, and doth not so now to infants of believing Christians as such, and for it the Jew parents and children were to be thankful.

He goes on. "The next thing in the antecedent to be proved is, "that there was a right conferred to this benefit, and some had "a right in it. And 1. if any had the benefit, then had they right to or "in that benefit: But some had the benefit, *Ergo.* The consequence of "the *major* is certain. 1. Because the very nature of the benefit consisteth in a right to further benefits. 2. If any had the benefit of Church-"membership, Covenant-interest, *&c.* without right; then they had "it with Gods consent and approbation or without it. Not with it: "For hee is just, and consenteth not that any have that which "hee hath not some right to or in, not without it: For no man "can have a benefit from God against his will, or without it. "2. If no infants had duely and rightfully received this benefit, God "would have somewhere reprehended the usurpation and abuse of his "ordinances or benefits. But that hee doth not as to this case, *Ergo.* "3. God hath expressed this right in many texts of Scripture, of which "more afterward.

Answ. Mr. *B.* is guilty of that which he chargeth me with unjustly, jumbling things together which are to be distinguished, visible Churchmembership, right to or of visible Churchmembership, to the bene-

benefits of it, duly and righ fully receiving of it. The infants of the Jews were visible Churchmembers, not by a legal right to it, anteceedent to their being such visible Churchmembers, which they or any for them might claim as due; nor was it capable of duly and rightfully being received or usurped: For it was nothing but a state of appearing to be part of that people, who were in appearance from things sensible, Gods people; and this they had by Gods fact of making them to be a part of that people visibly, to wit, his forming them and bringing them into the world, and placing them so as to be ranked among his visible people, and known by things obvious to sense to be of this people, from which this state resules without any such receiving as may be denominated duly or rightfully done or usurped. Yet I grant they had a right in it, that is, they had it by Gods donation, without any usurpation by them or any other; and they had right to the benefit consequent, as to the honour and esteem and dignity absolutely, and to other benefits, if there were any other annexed to it, whether absolutely or conditionally. Yet to the proofs of Mr. *B.* I say, 1. That it seems to me not true, that *the nature of the benefit* of infants visible Churchmembership *consisteth in a right to further benefits*. 2. That if it were true, yet I see not how it proves this consequence, If any had the benefit, then they had right to or in that benefit. A man may have a benefit without right, though the nature, or as I would speak, the condition of it be such as to draw with it a right to further benefits; as a man may have a Lordship without right, which gives him a right to further benefits. 3. That Mr. *B.* jumbles together *Churchmembership*, *Covenant interest*, *&c.* whereas a person may have no interest in Gods Covenant, who is a visible Churchmember; and he may have interest in Gods Covenant, who is no visible Churchmember. 4. His speech, *God is just, and consenteth not that any have that which he hath not some right to or in*, as the words seem to import, is not right. For 1. they intimate as if visible Churchmembership were given out of distributive justice, which gives to every man his own. But this I conceive to be very erroneous. For as Regeneration, so also visible Churchmembership are of bounty by God as Soveraign Lord, not of distributive justice by God as a Judge. 2. That all that any man hath from God, he hath of debt, contrary to the Apostle, *Rom.* 4. 4. 3. That visible Churchmembership is conceived as a thing offered, and to be duly and rightfully received, or to be attained by usurpation and abuse of Gods ordinances or benefits. But this I understand not how it is according to Mr. *Bs.* Doctrine. 1. He conceives visible Churchmembership distinct from Circumcision. What Ordinance is there then which may be abused by receiving visible Churchmembership? 2. The visible Churchmembership of infants among the Jews, doth not to me appear to be a thing tendered or offered by God upon condition of parents faith, and to be accepted or refused: but to be a state resulting from Gods fact forementioned without such offer. 6. What is in the Scriptures after expressed, shall be viewed in it's place.

Mr. *B.* adds, *I am next to prove the consequence, that* [*this right*

was

was conferred by some grant, promise, or Covenant of God.] *And this is as easie as to prove that the world was made by Gods power and efficiency or will; or to prove that God is the owner of all things, and no man can receive them but by his gift.* 1. *If there be no other way possible for right to be conveyed from God to us, but onely by his grant, promise, or Covenant, (which we call donation, and is a moral civil action,) then it is by this means that it is conveyed. But there is no other possible way of such conveyance:* Ergo. *we have no right till God give us right. His will signified createth our right. No man can have right to that which is wholly and absolutely anothers, but by his consent or will. This will is no way known, but by some signs of it. These signs of such a will for conveyance of right to a benefit, are a civil moral action, called a donation or gift simply. If the sign be in writing, we commonly call it a Deed of gift. If it be by word of mouth, conferring a present right, we call it a verbal grant or gift. If it confer only a future right, we call it a promise, and sometimes a Covenant; and sometimes the word Covenant signifieth both, that act which gives a present right, and promiseth the continuance of it. Right being a moral or civil thing, can be no way conveyed but by a moral or civil action. A gift that was never given, is a contradiction. So that this part of our controversie is as easie as whether two and two be four.*

Answ. Visible Churchmembership is not a right, but a state of being; as to be healthy, strong, rich, *&c.* which are not given by a civil moral action, but by providence of God acting physically, as the soveraign disposer of all. It is certain, that it is by Gods will, as all things are; but this will is no otherways signified then by the event, as conversion and many other gifts of God are. My meaning is, though these things are by vertue of Gods will, and are signified in the general by some Declaration of Gods purpose and order by which he acts, which may be called his Covenant; yet in the particulars, I mean for the persons, time, *&c.* there is not any Covenant that assures these persons conversion or visible Churchmembership, or that estates infants in either of those benefits as their right by vertue of Gods promise as the sole efficient of it, upon that condition Mr. *B.* asserts, that is, the parents faith, as I have proved before, Sect. 52. I deny therefore that there is such a promise of God as conferred infants visible Churchmembership upon the parents faith. And to Mr. *Bs.* argument I say, that though it be easie to prove that visible Churchmembership is by Gods donation, or grant; yet to argue therefore it must be by a promise, such as Mr. *B.* asserts, follows not, it being no good argument which is drawn affirmatively from the *genus* to the *species*, it must be by Gods gift or grant, *ergo* by promise. Yea, according to Mr. *B.* here a *promise confers onely a future right*, and therefore it doth not make actually visible Churchmembers without some further act, and therefore not the promise or Covenant of God is the next adequate cause of it, but some other act of God, and consequently there is another possible yea manifest way, without the promise of it upon condition of parents faith, which Mr. *B.* asserts.

But Mr. *B.* saith. 2. *God hath expresly called that all a Covenant or promise*

promise by which he conveyeth this right: which we shall more fully manifest anon when we come to it.

Answ. These are but words, as will appear by that which followes.

"The 2d. Proposition, *saith Mr. B.* to be proved, is, that [there was a "law or precept of God obliging the parents to enter their children "into Covenant and Churchmembership, by accepting of his offer, "and re-engaging them to God.] And this is as obvious and easie as "the former. But first I shall in a word here also explain the terms. "The word [law] is sometimes taken more largely, and unfitly, as "comprehending the very immanent acts or the nature of God, consi- "dered without any sign to represent it to the creature. So many call "Gods nature or purposes the Eternal Law: which indeed is no law, "nor can be fitly so called. 2. It is taken properly for [an authorita- "tive determination *de debito constituendo vel confirmando.*] And so "it comprehendeth all that may fitly be called a law. Some define "it, [*Jussum majestatis obligans aut ad obedientiam aut ad pœnam.*] "But this leaves out the præmiant part, and some others: So that of "*Grotius* doth, *Est regula actionum moralium obligans ad id quod rectum "est.* I acquiesce in the first, or rather in this, which is more full and "exact; [A law is a sign of the Rectors will constituting or confirm- "ing right or dueness.] That it be a sign of the Rectors will *de debito "constituendo vel confirmando*, is the general nature of all laws. Some "quarrel at the word [sign] because it is logical and not political: "As if politicians should not speak logically as well as other men! "There is a two-fold due; 1. What is due from us to God (or any "Rector;) and this is signified in the precept and prohibition, (or "in the precept *de agendo & non agendo.*) 2. What shall be due to "us; and this is signified by promises, or the præmiant part of the "law, and by laws for distribution and determination of proprieties. "All benefits are given us by God in a double relation, both as Rector "and Benefactor: or as *Benefactor regens*; or as *Rector benefaciens*: "though among men that stand not in such a subordination to one ano- "ther as we do to God, they may be received from a meer benefactor "without any regent interest therein. The first laws do ever constitute "the *debitum* or right: afterward there may be renewed laws and pre- "cepts to urge men to obey the former, or to do the same thing: and "the end of these is either fuller to acquaint the subject with the for- "mer, or to revive the memory of them, or to excite to the obedience "of them: And these do not properly constitute duty, because it was "constituted before; but the nature and power of the act is the same "with that which doth constitute it, and therefore doth confirm the con- "stitution, and again oblige us to what we were obliged to before. "For obligations to one and the same duty may be multiplied. 3. Some "take the word [law] in so restrained a sence as to exclude verbal or "particular precepts, especially directed but to one; or a few men; "and will onely call that a law which is written, or at least a well "known custome obliging a whole society in a stated way. These be

"the

"the most eminent sort of laws: but to say that the rest are no laws, is "vain and groundless, against the true general definition of a law, and "justly rejected by the wisest politicians. That which we are now to en-"quire after, is a precept, or the commanding part of a law, which is "[a sign of Gods will obliging us to duty,] of which signs there are "materially several sorts, as 1. by a voice, that's evidently of "God: 2. by writing: 3. by visible works or effects: 4. by se-"cret impresses, as by inspiration, which is a law onely to him that "hath them.

Answ. Mr. *B.* undertook to explain the terms, and he onely, and that unnecessarily and tediously, explains one term, to wit [law,] which was not the term in my Letter, to which his Proposition was to be opposed, but the word [precept;] whereas he should have explained what he meant by the parents entring their children into Covenant and Churchmembership, and what offer he meant they were to accept, and how, and how they were to engage them to God, and how this entring, accepting, re-engaging did confer the benefit of visible Churchmembership to their children, and what precept it is that is unrepealed distinct from the precept of Circumcision, which I presume he doth not hold unrepealed. All these were necessary to have been distinctly set down, that I might have known his meaning, and thereby have known whether his assertion opposeth my position, and whether he prove it or not. But that the Reader may the better perceive where the point to be proved lies, I shall set down distinctly what I conceive Mr. *B.* means, and then what I assert, and what Mr. *B.* should prove in opposition to my assertion.

1. I conceive he imagines an offer of God to parents, which he calls a promise or Covenant, that upon their taking him to be their God, he would be a God to their children, even their infants. 2. That parents are and were bound to accept of this offer for their children. 3. That by it they do enter them into Covenant, that is, they do Covenant for them that they shall be Gods people, and consequently they partake of the Covenant that God is their God. 4. That by vertue of this entring into Covenant, accepting, and re-engaging them to God, they are visible Churchmenbers.

I assert 1. There is no such offer, promise, or Covenant. 2. That though there are precepts for parents to pray for their children, to breed them up for God by example, teaching, *&c.* yet they are not bound to believe this; that upon their own faith God will take their infant children to be his, and he will be a God to them, nor to accept of this pretended offer, sith there is no such promise or offer. 3. That though parents may enter into Covenant for their children, that is, they may do it as those, *Deut.* 29. 12. either by charge and adjuration, or by wishing a curse to them if they did not cleave to God, as *Nehem.* 10. 29. *Josh.* 6. 25. and this may have an obligation on them beyond the precept, and influence on them as a motive, as the Oath to the *Gibeonites*, *Josh.* 9. 16. yet by this their entring into Covenant for them, they do not make them partakers of the Covenant or promise that God wil be their God.

4. That

4. That if there were such a promise, and such a duty of accepting the pretended offer, and re-engaging; yet this neither did then, nor doth now make infants visible Churchmembers. So that the point between us is, Whether there be such a precept to parents besides Circumcision, of entring into Covenant, accepting an offer of God to be their God for their children according to a promise that he will be so, and re-engaging them to God, whereby they become actually visible Churchmembers? This Mr. *B.* affirms, I deny. He speaks thus.

"Having thus opened the terms [law and precept,] I prove "the Proposition thus. 1. If it was the duty of the Israelites to accept "Gods offered mercy for their children, to engage and devote them "to him in Covenant, then there was a law or precept which made this "their duty, and obliged them to it. But it was a duty: *Ergo*, there "was such a law or precept. For the antecedent, 1. If it were not a "duty, then it was either a sin, or a neutral indifferent action: But it "was not a sin, (for 1. it was against no law, 2. it is not reprehend-"ed;) nor was it indifferent, for it was of a moral nature, and *ergo* ei-"ther good or evil, yea sin or duty: For properly *permittere* is no "act or law, (though many say it is,) but a suspension of an act: and "so *licitum* is not *moraliter bonum*, but onely *non malum*; and *ergo* is not "properly within the verge of morality. 2. If there be a penalty "(and a most terrible penalty) annexed for the non-performance, "then it was a duty: But such a penalty was annexed (as shall anon "be particularly shewed) even to be cut off from his people, to be put "to death, *&c.* If it oblige *ad pœnam*, it did first oblige *ad obedientiam*: "For no law obligeth *ad pœnam*, but for disobedience, which presup-"poseth an obligation to obedience. 3. If it were not the Israelites "duty to enter their children into Gods Covenant and Church, then it "would have been none of their sin to have omitted or refused so to "do: But it would have been their great and hainous sin to have "omitted or refused it; *Ergo*. Now to the consequence of the *major*. "There is no duty but what is made by some law or precept as it's pro-"per efficient cause or foundation: *Ergo*, if it be a duty, there was cer-"tainly some law or precept that made it such. Among men we say, "that a benefit obligeth to gratitude, though there were no law: But "the meaning is, if there were no humane law, and that is because the "law of God in nature requireth man to be just and thankfull. If there "were no law of God natural or positive that did constitute it or oblige "us to it, there could be no duty. 1. There is no duty but what is "made such by Gods signified will, *ergo*, no duty but what is made such "by a law or precept. For a precept is the sign of Gods will obliging "to duty. 2. Where there is no law there is no transgression, *Rom.* 4. "15. *ergo*, where there is no law there is no duty; for these are con-"traries: it is a duty not to transgress the law, and a transgression not "to perform the duty which it requireth of us. There is no apparent "ground of exception, but in case of Covenants. Whether a man may "not oblige himself to a duty meerly by his consent? I answer, 1. He "may oblige himself to an act, which he must perform, or else prove

" unfaithfull and dishoneſt: but his own obligation makes it not ſtrict-
" ly a duty: *ergo*, when God makes a Covenant with man, he is as
" it were obliged in point of fidelity, but not of duty. 2. He that ob-
" ligeth himſelf to an act by promiſe, doth occaſion an obligation to du-
" ty from God, becauſe God hath obliged men to keep their promiſes.
" 3. So far as a man may be ſaid to be his own ruler, ſo far may he be
" ſaid to oblige himſelf to duty, (that is duty to himſelf, though the act
" be for the benefit of another;) but then he may as fitly be ſaid to
" make a law to himſelf, or command himſelf: ſo that ſtill the duty
" (ſuch as it is) hath an anſwerable command. So that I may well
" conclude, that there is a law, becauſe there is a duty. For nothing
" but a law could cauſe that duty, nor make that omiſſion of it a ſin.
" Where there is no law, ſin is not imputed, *Rom.* 5. 13. But the omiſſion
" of entring infants into Covenant with God before Chriſts incarnati-
" on would have been a ſin imputed; *ergo*, there was a law commanding
" it. 2. If it was a duty to dedicate infants to God, or enter them into
" Covenant with him, then either by Gods will, or without it: cer-
" tainly not without it. If by Gods will, then either by his will reveal-
" ed, or unrevealed. His unrevealed will cannot oblige; for there
" wants promulgation, which is neceſſary to obligation: And no man
" can be bound to know Gods unrevealed will, unleſs remotely, as it
" may be long of himſelf that it is not to him revealed. If it be Gods
" revealed will that muſt thus oblige, then there was ſome ſign by
" which it was revealed. And if there were a ſign revealing Gods will
" obliging us to duty, then there was a law, For this is the very nature
" of the preceptive part of a law, (which is the principal part,) ſo that
" you may as well ſay, that you are a reaſonable creature, but not a
" man, as ſay that men were obliged to duty by Gods revea'ed will, but
" yet not by a law or precept. 3. We ſhall anon produce the law or
" precept, and put it out of doubt that there was ſuch a thing. In the
" mean time I muſt confeſs, I do not remember that ever I was put to
" diſpute a point that carrieth more of it's own evidence to ſhame the
" gain-ſayer. And if you can gather Diſciples even among the godly,
" by perſwading them that there were duties without precepts or laws,
" and benefits without donations, covenants, or promiſe confirming
" them, then deſpair of nothing for the time to come: You may per-
" ſwade them that there is a ſon without a father, or any relation
" without it's foundation, or effect without it's cauſe, and never
" doubt but the ſame men will believe you, while you have the ſame
" intereſt in them, and uſe the ſame artifice in putting off your
" conceits.

Anſw. This te ious unneceſſary diſcourſe I have ſet together, leſt it ſhould be ſaid I omitted it becauſe I could not anſwer it, though I might have well done it, and granted him his concluſion without any revocation of what I had written to him. For his concluſion is, that *there was a law or precept to the Iſraelites to accept of Gods offered mercy for their children to engage and devote them to him in Covenant*, which I never denied, onely I denied that this was any other then Circumciſion,

or

or that this conferred the benefit, that is, made them visible Church-members, or that this mercy, as he calls it, was offered by a Covenant to be a God to believers and their seed, or that parents did by their act enter the children into Covenant, that is, Gods Covenant to be their God, or Covenant to God, in proper speech whereby they covenanted to be his people. And for the first, it seems to me, 1. That Mr. B. can produce no other law or precept binding the Israelites to this duty besides that of Circumcision, because he neither here nor elsewhere that I know of produceth any other. 2. That he means no other by two passages in this discourse; 1. because he saith *there was a most terrible penalty annexed to this law obliging Israelites for non-performance (as shall be anon particularly shewed) even to be cut off from his people, to be put to death, &c.* which he neither shews to be any other, nor do I think he could mean any other then that of Circumcision: 2. He saith, *the omission of entring infants into Covenant with God before Christs incarnation, would have been a sin imputed*; his limiting it to the time before Christs incarnation, intimates he meant it of Circumcision. 3. That he deals like as if he meant deceitfully, in putting off the naming the law or precept to another place, which it had been requisite for the Answerer and Reader to have found here, that it might be discerned what law he meant. And for the 2d. I say, if he could prove or produce that or any other law or precept; yet if he did not prove that thereby the infants were made visible Churchmembers, he proves not the contradictory to my writing. The other two points belong to the two foregoing and following questions. As for his confession, though his injurious insinuations of me are so frequent and so frivolous, that I could pass by them as the hissing of a Goose, or the snarling of a Curre; yet because his speeches do much wrong the truth and way of God through my sides, I judge it fit to reply, 1. That I see not reason to be ashamed of my assertion, but Mr. B. hath cause to be ashamed of his own heedlesness, and misrepresentation of my assertion, and roving from the point he should prove. 2. That I gather no Disciples to my self; but endeavour to reform the abuse of Infant Baptism, and to restore the right use of Christian Baptism, according to the plain appointment of Christ in Scripture, and practice of his Apostles. 3. That he that will be perswaded by Mr. B. that infants are Disciples meant *Matth.* 28.19. and that in *Gen.* 1.26. & 3.15. is a law or ordinance of God for infants visible Churchmembership, will believe any thing that he saith. 4. That were it not for the opinion he hath obtained of godliness by his Book of *Rest*, the esteem he hath gained by his writings for the Ministery, and the advantage they have by his Book of *Baptism* to maintain their practice and station, it were not likely so vain a Book would be esteemed among Schollers. 5. That were it not for the affrightments of Mr. B. through his calumnies and slanders, as if Ranters, Quakers, and all sorts of errours and sects sprang from Antipædobaptism, godly tender conscienc'd persons durst not maintain as they do so gross a corruption as their Baby sprinkling is, nor neglect so great and fundamental a duty as Baptism is according to the Scripture.

eure; But the Lord will judge betweene us. I proceede.

The 5th Qu. saith Mr. B. *requireth me to lay down this assertion, that* [*there is no law or precept of God which doth not oblige to duty; and no actual promise or donation, which doth not confer the benefit.*] *This I aver on occasion of your last Letter, where in contradiction to the former, you confess* [*the promises* to the natural posterity of *Abraham*, Gen. 17. and the Covenants made with *Israel* at Mount *Sinai*, and Deut. 29. and a precept of Circumcision, and precepts of God by *Moses*, of calling the people, and requiring them to enter into Covenant, *Exod.* 19. *Deut.* 29.] *Yet you* [do not conceive that the infants of *Israel* were made visible Churchmembers by the promises in the Covenants, or the precepts forenamed.] *If so, then either you imagine that among all those precepts and promises there was yet no promise or Covenant that gave them the benefit of Churchmembership, or precept concerning their entrance into that state; or else you imagine that such promises were made, but did not actually confer the benefit, and such precepts were made, but did not actually oblige. Your words are so ambiguous in this, that they signifie nothing of your mind to any that knows it not some other way. For when you say* [there is no such particular promise concerning infants visible Churchmembership, or precept, *&c.* besides Circumcision, as in my Book of Baptism I assert,] *who knows whether that exception of* [Circumcision] *be a concession of such a precept or promise in the case of Circumcision? or if not, what sense it hath? and what you imagine that precept or promise to be which I assert? and before the sence of your one syllable* [*such*] *is discerned by trying it by a whole volume, I doubt you will make what your list of it. However, if you should mean, that such precepts there are as have for their subject* [*the avouching God to be their God, the entring into Covenant Circumcision*] *of infants, but not their Churchmembership; then* 1. *I have proved the contrary to the negative before;* 2. *and more shall do anon;* 3. *and it's a palpable contradiction to the precedent affirmative. But if you mean that Churchmembership of infants as well as others is the subject or part of the subject of those promises or precepts, and yet that infants were not made or confirmed thereby; it is the contrary that I am asserting, and I have no further need to prove, then by shewing the contradiction of your opinion to it self. For an actual Covenant or promise that doth not give right to the benefit promised (according to it's tenour and terms,) is like a cause that hath no effect, a father that did never generate, and it's all one as to say, A gift or Covenant which is no gift or Covenant, seeing the name is denied, when the thing named and defined is granted. So a precept or law to enter infants solemnly into Churchmembership, which yet obligeth none so to enter them, is as groß a contradiction as to say, the Sun hath not heat or light, and yet is truly a Sun.*

Answ. I grant his assertion, that *there is no precept of God which doth not oblige to duty, nor donation which doth not confer the benefit*; though sundry things which have the title of Gods lawes oblige not to duty, and an actual promise doth not put the thing promised in present being as the next cause, but the thing promised is thereby onely made future, yea a promise that it shall be doth suppose it not to be, and

that

that there is something else the next and immediate cause of its actual being. The imagined contradiction in my later to my former Letter, is before cleared not to be so *Sect.* 53. Though I have said enough before in this and other fore-going Sections, yet to take away all colour of charging me with ambiguity, 1. I acknowledge that the Covenant at Mount *Sinai*, and the Covenant *Deut.* 29. did declare the people of the *Jews* to be Gods people, or his visible Church; in that the Covenant was mutual, and open between them and God. 2. That they were Gods visible Church not barely by Gods promise to them to be their God, but by their promise to God: Gods call of them made them his Church, their promise to God with other acts made them visibly so. 3. The promises of God *Gen.* 17. did not of themselves make the house of *Abraham* Gods visible Church. 4. The call of God, and such acts as whereby he separated them from others to bee his (which were many) made the house of *Abraham* Gods Church. 5. The infants were members of that Church, in that they were part of that people. 6. Such things as whereby they were visibly of that people, their birth, cohabitation, *&c.* did make them visible Churchmembers. 7. Circumcision was one sign not by it self but with other things, whereby the male infants and adult were known to be of Gods visible Church. 8. No promise of God, nor duty of parents did make the infants actually visible Churchmembers, as the next cause in act either formal or efficient. If Mr. *B.* or any Reader will heed these passages, with what goes before, hee may easily discern my minde, and acquit me from self-contradiction, if not I think it in vain for me to use more words. I pass on to that which follows.

SECT. LVI.

That the People, and thereby the Infants of the Hebrews, *were made visible Churchmembers by a transeunt fact, is made good against Mr. Bs. exceptions.*

"I Come next (*saith Mr.* B.) to the 6th. Qu. Whether indeed there "be any transeunt fact, which without the causation of any promise "or precept, did make the Israelites infants Churchmembers. This "you affirm (if you would be understood;) whether this your ground "of infants Churchmembership or mine be righter, I hope will be no "hard matter for another man (of common capacity) to discern. By a "[transeunt fact] thus set as contradistinct to a law, precept, or pro-"mise, either you mean the act of legislation and promise making, or "some other merely physical act. If the former, it is too ridiculous to "be used in a serious business: For you should not put things in com-"petition excluding the one, where they both must necessarily concur, "the one standing in a subordination to the other. Was there ever a "Law or Covenant made in the world any other way then by a transe-"unt fact? Sure all legislation is by some signification of the Soveraigns

"will

"will. And the making of that ſign is a tranſeunt fact. If it be by voice "is not that tranſient? If by writing is not the act tranſeunt? If by "creation it ſelf, the act is tranſeunt though the effect bee permanent. "And certainly if legiſlation or promiſing be your tranſeunt fact, you "do very abſurdly put it in oppoſition to a law (or promiſe) it being "the making of ſuch a law. And the legiſlation doth no way oblige the "ſubject, but by the law ſo made: nor doth the making of a promiſe, "grant or covenant, confer right to the benefit which is the ſubject of "of it, any otherwiſe then as it is the making of that grant which ſhall "ſo conferre it. As the making of a knife doth not cut, but the knife "made: and ſo of other inſtruments. So that if the law oblige not, "or the grant confer not, certainly the legiſlation or promiſe-making "cannot do it. I cannot therefore imagine that this is your ſenſe, "without charging you with too great abſurdity. As if you ſhould "ſay, It is not the will of the teſtator, *i. e.* his teſtament, that entileth "the legatary to the legacy, but it is the tranſeunt fact of the teſtator "in making that will: or it is not the Soveraigns commiſſion that au-"thoriſeth a Judge, ſouldier, *&c.* but it is the tranſeunt fact of wri-"ting or making that commiſſion. It is not the ſign that ſignifieth, but "the tranſeunt fact of making that ſign. Were not this a contemptible "arguing? To charge you with this were to make you *tantùm non* un-"reaſonable. And yet I know not what to ſay to you, that is, how "to underſtand you. For if you mean a mere phyſical tranſient fact, "which is no ſuch legiſlation or promiſe-making, then it is far more "abſurd then the former. For if it be not a ſigne of Gods will obliging "to duty, or conferring benefit, then can it not ſo oblige to duty, nor "confer benefits. It is no other tranſeunt fact but legiſlation that can "oblige a ſubject to duty, nor any other tranſeunt fact but promiſe, or "other donation, that can convey right to a benefit, or oblige the pro-"miſer. A moral or civil effect muſt bee produced by a moral or civil "action, and not by a mere phyſical action; which is unfit to produce "ſuch an alien effect, and can go no higher then it's own kinde. What "ſenſe therefore I ſhould put on your words, without making them ap-"pear unreaſonable, even much below the rates of ordinary rational "peoples diſcourſe, I cannot tell. For to ſay, It is not a law but legi-"ſlation, is all one as to ſay, It is not the *fundamentum*, but the lay-"ing of that foundation that cauſeth the relation, or from which it doth "reſult. And to ſay it is an alien phyſical act, which hath no ſuch "thing as right for its ſubject or *terminus*, is to confound phyſick and "morals, and to ſpeak the groſſeſt abſurdities; as to ſay that the tran-"ſient fact of eating, drinking, going, building, *&c.* do adopt ſuch an "one to be your heir. I muſt needs think therefore, till you have bet-"ter cleared your ſelf, that you have here quit yr ſelf as ill, and for-"ſaken and delivered up your Cauſe, as palpably as ever I knew man "do, without an expreſs confeſſion that it is naught. When men muſt "bee taught by this obtuſe ſubtilty to prove that infants Churchmem-"berſhip needed no revocation, forſooth [becauſe their Churchmem-"berſhip was not cauſed by a law, precept, promiſe or covenant, but

"by

" by a transeunt fact] then which as you leave it, the world hath scarce " heard a more incoherent dream. But I pray you remember in your " reply that you being the affirmer of this, must prove it. Which I " shall expect, when you can prove that you can generate a man by " spitting or blowing your nose, or by plowing and sowing can pro- " duce Kings and Emperours.

Answ. I make not the Jews infants visible Churchmembers by bare legislation or promise-making, but by the transeunt fact described in my Letters, which was without promise or precept, that is promise of it on condition of the parents faith, or precept of accepting that offered mercy, entering into Covenant, and re-ingaging them to God, which are the promise and precept Mr. *B*, derives their visible Churchmembership from. Infants were visible Churchmembers among the Jewes, in that they were visibly a part of that people, who were Gods Church. So that to visible Churchmembership was requisite, 1. that God should make that people his Church, this he did by the transeunt fact described. 2. That the Infants should be visibly a part of that people, this he did by their bringing into the world, ranking them among his people, so as that they were discernable by their birth, nursing, circumcision, habitation, genealogy, and such other signes, to bee part of that Church. Their visible Churchmembership imports a state of visibility in the relations, 1. of a part to the whole, 2. of a people that are Gods, that is 1. separated from other people, 2. called and taken or brought to God. These things are done by various acts, which I conceive I did fitly call a transeunt fact. A physical and moral cause are thus described by *Scheibler*, *Metaphys. lib.* 1. *c.* 22. *tit.* 13. *Topic. c.* 3. *tit.* 14. *Stierius part. Gen. Metaph. c.* 12. *A Physical or natural Cause, is that which truly flows into the effect, and nextly reacheth it by its activity. A Moral Cause, is that which doth not flow into the effect so as to reach to it, yet so behaves himself, that the effect may be imputed to him to praise or dispraise, reward or punishment. Such are causes applying the agent to the patient, counselling, commanding, perswading exhorting, instigating, meriting, permitting when they might and should hinder, &c.* Visible Churchmembership is not as Mr. *B.* conceives it, formally *a right to a benefit*, or *a benefit*, though it may be so consecutively, or they may follow on it. But it is a complex term, noting a state with a double relation and imports a natural effect or term of action, as well, if not more then a moral, and is from physical as well as moral causes; and in infants visible Churchmembership, I judge it altogether an effect of a physical cause, as not knowing any moral action of God or man that makes them such; though to the visible Churchmembership of the people or body of which they are a part acts physical and moral do concur: which I shall clear in answering Mr. *Bs.* exceptions to my last Letter to him. As for his outeries of *grossest absurdities, incoherent dreams, unreasonable even much below the rates of ordinary rational peoples discourse, contemptible arguing, obtuse subtility, contradictions, palpable forsaking and delivering up my Cause, generating a man by spitting or blowing my nose*, with the rest of his Canine Scoptical Rhetorick, I

pass

pass by it as being of ill savour, hoping Mr. B. will in time come to better consideration of his writings, and either shew me my errour, or discern his own.

Mr. B. goes on thus. *In consideration of the 7th. Qu. I shall consider the nature and effect of the transient fact which you here describe. And first of the reason of that name. You say that you call it* [*transeunt*] [*because done in time and so not eternal, and past and so not in congruum sense repealeable as a law, ordinance, statute, decree, which determines such a thing shall be for the future.*] *And do you think this the common sense of the word? or a fit reason of your application of it to the thing in hand.* Answ. I do.

1. Saith Mr. B. *I think your intellection and volition are immanent acts, and yet not eternal.*

Answ. Yet all Gods immanent acts (of whom I spake) are eternal.

we use, saith he, *to contradistinguish transient acts from immanent, and that because they do* transire in subjectum extraneum. *Answ.* So do I.

But it seems you take them here as distinct from permanent.

Answ. Yea and immanent too.

But use your sence as long as we understand it.

Answ. With your good leave then I may use this term, if you understand it, if not I must alter it.

2. Saith Mr. B. *If it be onely* [*past*] *actions which you call* [*transeunt*] *it seems your long fact which was so many hundred years in doing, was no transeunt fact till the end of all those years, and so did not (by your own doctrine) make any Churchmembers till the end of those years.*

Answ. It doth but seem so: the truth is, in this long fact each particular act was a transeunt fact in each year, and in each age and space of time in which those acts were done, Churchmembers were made by one or more of those and other acts used by God to that end, and yet the transeunt fact not so fully accomplished, but that there was an addition till that people came to their ἀνδρα, or full stature, in which respect I comprehended all those many acts which I set down under the name of a transeunt fact, which I hope when he understands it, Mr. B. will give me leave to do.

3. Saith he. *But Sir the question is not, whether it were a transeunt fact that laid the foundation by legislation or promise making; but whether the effect were trasient, or the act as it is* in patiente: *whether the law were transeunt which was made by a transeunt fact? and whether the moral action of that law were permanent or transient? it being most certainly such a moral act that must produce a title, or constitute a duty. Gods writing the ten Commandements in stone was a fact soon past, but the law was not soon past, nor the moral act of that law,* viz. *obligation. There are verbal laws, that have no real permanent sign: and yet the law may be permanent, and the obligation permanent, because the sign may have a permanency* in esse cognito, *and so the signifying vertue may remain by the help of memory, though the word did vanish in the speaking.*

Answ. The question between us is, Whether the infants of the Jews were made visible Churchmembers by a promise of God to be the God of believers and their seed, and a precept obliging the parents to accept

of

of this mercy offered for their children, and to enter them into Covenant; or by the tranſeunt fact I deſcribe. The queſtions which Mr. *B.* here ſets down, ſo far as I underſtand them, are no queſtions between us: and therefore this exception is but roving from the matter in hand.

2. Saith he, *when you come to point out this tranſient fact individually, you ſay* [*it is Gods taking the whole people of the Jews for his people,*] *which you term* [*fact*] *as conceiving it moſt comprehenſive of the many particular acts in many generations whereby he did accompliſh it.*] 1. *I did not well underſtand before that* [*a fact*] *did ſo vaſtly differ from an* [*Act,*] *as to contain the acts* (*rather then the facts*) *of many generations.*

Anſw. Though I think in uſe there is ſome difference, that *act* is applied to the particular actions, *fact* to them as they amount to ſome thing brought to paſs by them; yet if there were no ſuch difference, me thinks if Mr. *B.* had not been minded to multiply exceptions unneceſſarily, he might have allowed me to uſe a term (which in Diſputes is frequent) for my purpoſe eſpecially ſith he underſtands it.

2. Saith he, *This is a long fact according to your meaſure, even from* Abrahams *call out of* Ur: *but how long it ſeems you are not well agreed with your ſelf For in the firſt part of your Letter you enumerate to the other acts that compoſe this fact* [*the bringing them into the bond of the Covenant at Mount* Sinai, *giving them Laws, ſetling their Prieſthood, Tabernacle, Army, Government, inheritance:*] *But before you end, you change your mind, and ſay* [*the Churchmemberſhip of the Iſraelites began as I conceive with* Abrahams *call, and was compleated when they were brought out of* Ægypt *to God.* Exod. 19. 4.] *But ſure that was long before the ſetling their inheritance. Your fact according to your laſt account was about 430 yeares in doing; but according to your firſt opinion, it was about 470 years long.*

Anſw. In my firſt and laſt account there is no change of my mind. I did conceive, that the taking the whole people of the *Jews* for his people was compleated when they were brought out of Ægypt to God, *Exod.* 19. 4. as *Chriſt* ſaid *It is finiſhed, John* 19. 30. and yet more was to be done, becauſe the chief or hardeſt thing then was done which would draw after it all the reſt. As after the great battel at *Arbella, Alexanders* conqueſt might be ſaid to be finiſhed, though more were after to be done. I never meant to limit the fact to the time of their bringing out of Ægypt to God, but included all other additionals, though it were the main, and which brought along with it the reſt.

3. Saith Mr. *B. If it were one individual fact of about 470 years long that made infants Churchmembers, then they could not be Churchmembers till that fact was paſt: For the effect is not before the cauſe, or cauſality of the efficient; the relation cannot be before the* fundamentum *be laid: and it ſeems this long fact was the laying of the* fundamentum: *But the conſequent is certainly falſe; for infants were Churchmembers before the end or compleating of your long fact: For they were Churchmembers (you'l grant) when* Iſhmael *and* Iſaac *were circumciſed.* Ergo, *it*

was not this long fact that made them Churchmembers.

Answ. I said I termed Gods taking the people of the Jews a fact, as a collective term, comprehensive of the many particular acts in many generations whereby he did accomplish it. By which it may easily be perceived, that I did not make the fact an individual action, for I called it many acts, nor did mean that the Churchmembership was not till all the acts were past, but that it was accomplished by them, that is, they were brought to full stature and growth as a formed people and Commonwealth: As we say a child is a man accomplished when he is brought to the years of a man, and yet he is a man before. And I answer to Mr. *B's.* argument taken from my words; that when I drew out the fact so long, and said, by it the infants were visible Churchmembers as a part of the Congregation of *Israel*, my meaning was, that respectively as the Congregation of *Israel* were made a Church by that fact, so were the infants members. By the call out of *Ur*, whereby God separated *Abraham* and his house from other people, the Congregation of *Israel* began to be Gods Church, and if there had been infants they had been visible Churchmembers; but they were not a compleated Church till they were *brought out of* Ægypt *to God*, *Exod.* 19. 4. nor infants members of a Church compleated till then when they were become a great nation, and were formed into a Theocratical Commonwealth. And being thus rightly understood (as my words imported) I said nothing which infers the absurdity of putting the effect afore the case, nor the putting off infants visible Churchmembership till the end of 470 years.

4. Saith he, *If you mean that it was not the whole, but some part of this long fact that actually made infants Churchmembers, then you would have assigned that part, when that was the thing desired, and which you pretended exactly to perform; or at least you would not have told us it comprehended all these acts.*

Answ. I did exactly tell Mr. *B.* in my Letter, it began with the call of *Abraham* out of *Ur*; and when I told him that the fact comprehended all those acts, yet I added for explication, [whereby it was accomplished or compleated.]

5. Saith he, *And if each particular act did make infants Churchmembers, or lay a sufficient ground of it, then it seems that it was done before the institution of Circumcision. For Gods calling* Abraham *out of* Ur *was before it. So that the children born in his house must be Churchmembers upon that; and a sufficient ground laid for his own to have been such, if he had then had a natural issue: And it seems then that* Ishmael *was born a Churchmember many years before Circumcision.*

Answ. I grant all this,

6. Saith he, *If this be your meaning, I pray you be so just and impartial as to accept of the proof which I shall give you of infants Churchmembership before* Abrahams *days, if I make it appear to be as strong as this call of* Abraham *from* Ur.

Answ. I shall.

7. Saith he, *If you should mean that some one of these comprehended acts should of it self make any infants Churchmembers, then it must be any one;*

one; for you no more assign it to one of them then to another, (onely say [chiefly the bringing them from Ægypt:] But surely some of these acts particularly cannot do it, As the leading to Padan Aram, *the removal to* Canaan, *to* Ægypt, *placing, preserving there, setling their Army,* &c. *Did any one of these make infants to become Churchmembers?*

Answ. No: But I did assign it to one of them more then to another, to wit, the beginning to *Abrams* call, the accomplishing to the *bringing of them out of* Ægypt *to God,* Exod. 19. 4

8. Saith he, *Nay, suppose you mean that all these acts must concur to make them members, (and so that they were no members till many hundred years after the institution of Circumcision,) yet could not your Doctrine hold good: For some of these acts are of an alien nature, and no more apt to cause infant Churchmembership, then a bull to generate a bird. What aptitude hath the setling of an Army to be any part of the causation of infants Churchmembership? None, I think; at least if it be such an Army as ours: For surely the setling of ours caused no such thing, as you well know. What aptitude hath the leading to* Padan Aram, *or removal to* Ægypt, *to make infants Churchmembers? Nay, how strange is it, that the removing of Churchmembers, and such as had been infant Churchmembers, as* Ishmael, Keturahs *children,* Esau, *must cause infant Churchmembership? Sure it was no cause of their own.* Keturahs *children were Churchmembers in infancy: I enquire of you by what act they were made such? You say [by Gods fact of taking the whole people of the Jews for his people] whereof the act of removing* Keturahs *children was a part. Very good. It seems then that removing from the Congregation of* Israel *a people of the Jews, is a taking of the removed to be of that people: or else it is not onely the taking that people, but also the removal from that people that maketh Churchmembers, even the removed as well as the taken, both which are alike absurd.*

Answ. 1. I mean not as Mr. *B.* supposeth I might. 2. The setling of the Army had remotely causation of infants Churchmembership, for by it the *Israelites* were a well formed Congregation, Church, or Commonwealth, and by which the infants were a part, which is their Churchmembership. 3. I know that our Army hath done so much for the setling of the Church, as that the Antiprelatists congregations had been either none, or much oppressed, if they had not broken the force of the opposite party. Nor dare I be so unthankfull to God, or them, as not to acknowledge the great mercy and benefit we at this day enjoy thereby, however Mr. *B.* fret at our liberty, and jibe at the instruments. 4. The leading to *Padan Aram*, removal to *Ægypt*, were acts of providence whereby *Jacobs* house were encreased and preserved, which I conceive were some of those acts whereby he made them a people to himself. 5. *Ishmaels*, *Keturahs* children's, *Esau*'s removal, were some acts whereby the congregation of *Israel* became Gods severed, or a peculiar people. 6. *Keturahs* children were visible Churchmembers while they were part of *Abrahams* house, called after the people of the Jews, by Gods taking of the people of the *Jews*, and consequently them as a part; and yet the removal of them was after one act whereby the people of the

Jews were made to God a severed people from them; and consequently their infants Churchmembers. Distinguish the times and the different state of things and intentions of God in his providences, and these seeming incoherences will be found consistent.

9. Saith he, "And I pray you tell me yet a little better, how an "act can make a man a Churchmember that was one long before that "was done? You cannot here say, that it was before *in esse morali*, and "had a moral causation. How then could your chiefest act, the bringing "out of *Ægypt*, make those infants Churchmembers that were born in "*Ægypt*, and were Churchmembers before? Or how could it be any "part of the cause? Did the bringing out of *Ægypt* concur to make "*Moses* a Churchmember when he was in the basket on the waters? "And when you answer this, you may do well to go a little further, and "tell me, how such an act concurreth to make him an infant Church-"member that was dead an hunded or two hundred years before that "act was done. For example, how did the setling of the *Israelites* "Army, or inheritance, or the Covenant on Mount *Sinai*, make *Ish-"mael*, or *Esau*, or *Isaac*, or *Jacob* Churchmembers?

Answ. The infants of *Israel* were Churchmembers in that they were a part of the congregation or people af *Israel*, which was a fluent body, and was taken to be Gods Church by a succession of acts, whereof some were causes which began, some continued, some compleated, and the several acts made the Churchmembers of that age, yet all by vertue of the first call of *Abraham*, whereby God declared his intention to make his house a Nation, and his Church, first more obscurely, then more clearly. The bringing out of *Ægypt* tended to make the *Israelites* a severed people, and consequently all that were Churchmembers were by that act such; the setling of the Army, inheritance, Covenant at Mount *Sinai*, tended to make them a well formed people, and to the accomplishment of the taking the Jews to be Gods people, and consequently the infants to be Churchmembers which came after them. Which if so understood, there is nothing in my conceit which infers the making that a cause which is after the effect.

10. Saith Mr. *B.* "I desire you also to tell me by the next, what "be the nerves and ligaments that tie all these acts of 430 years at least "together, so as to make them one fact? And whether I may not as "groundedly make a fact sufficient for this purpose of the acts of an "hundred or two hundred years onely? and whether you may not as "well make all the acts from *Abrahams* call till *Christ* to be one fact, "and assign it to this office?

Answ. 1. These acts are knit together into one fact by the unity of end designed and work accomplished, as the many acts of several ages did make one fact, of which the Poet speaks, *Tantæ molis erat Romanam condere gentem*, to raise the Roman Empire. 2. You might, if God had so contrived it, and brought the thing to pass in that time which he did in a longer. 3. I may make all the acts from *Abrahams* call till Christs towards the Hebrews, one fact of making the Jews his people, and assign it to this office rightly, onely using the word fact or making,

making, as it comprehends not onely the beginning, and increasing, and compleating of that people; but also the continuation, recovery from captivity, and preservation of that people.

11. Saith Mr. *B.* "You say that you call this *fact* [transeunt] be- "cause it's [past,] (and so till it's [past] it seems *Isaac* and *Jacob* "that were dead before, are no Churchmembers;) I would then fain "know whether it be this same transeunt *fact*, or some other, that makes "infants Churchmembers five hundred years after it is past? If it be "this same, then how comes a meer transeunt *fact* to work effectually so "many hundred years after it is past? unless it made a Law or Cove- "nant which doth the deed? If it be a new transeunt *fact* that must "make infants Churchmembers after the compleating of this (the set- "ling their Inheritances;) then I pray you let me know, whether it be "one *fact* exercised on the whole nation in gross, or must it be a *fact* up- "on every infant member individually? If on the nation, remember "to tell us what it was; and do not onely tell us the cause of the member- "ship of former infants. And seeing it must be such as the membership "of every infant till Christs time at least must be caused by, I pray you "remember to make your work sure and full, and be sure to assign "us no other kind of *fact*, then what you will prove to have been so "frequently repeated in every age, and so fully extensive to every in- "fant among the Jews, as that it have no gaps but may make all mem- "bers that were so in each age. And remember, that it is no law, pre- "cept, promise, or covenant that you must assign for the cause; for "that's it you are engaged against: but a constant succession of tran- "seunt *facts* extending to each individual member. O what work have "you made your self? and what a sort of new political Doctrine shall "we have from you, when these things are accomplished according to "the frame you have begun? Such as I believe the Sun never saw, nor "the wisest Lawyer in *England* ever read before? Which makes me the "less marvel that so many of your opinion are so much against the "Lawyers; for I dare say they will be but few of them for you, "if these be your grounds, or at least not for these your grounds.

Answ. I call the whole transeunt *fact* past, because it consists of many transeunt *acts*, which are past being done: But I do not limit the being of Churchmembers to the entire transeunt *fact*, as if none were Churchmembers till each *act* was past which I set down; but the accomplishing or compleating the Congregation of *Israel* to either all or the chief of the later *acts*. That which made *Isaac* and *Jacob* Churchmembers, was the transeunt *fact* or *acts* of Gods providence in their age, whereby they became to be part of *Abrahams* house, which God by his call of *Abram*, setting up his worship in it, and other ways had made his Church. The same transeunt *fact* in kind, though not individual, which made *Isaac* and *Jacob* Churchmembers in their age, made infants visible Churchmembers in the several ages till Christs time; to wit, the continuance of the Jews to be Gods people, in the continuing his ordinances, laws, worship, *&c.* among them: And each infant was made a visible Churchmember by such transeunt *fact* in each age renewed and repeated,

repeated, by which the infant was made and known to be a part of that people, which what it is hath been often before said, and shewed not to be by such Covenant and precept as Mr. *B.* asserts. All which was plainly expressed in my Letter, (and is such work as I need not be ashamed of,) without any new political Doctrine or Law, as Mr. *B.* imagines, it being cleared by the History of the Bible, and other Histories which set down this fact of God: And if Mr. *B.* or any Lawyer gainsay this, they gainsay the plain narration of the Bible. His foolish exclamations I let pass, as shewing nothing but his own inconsiderateness and vanity. That many of my opinion are against the Lawyers, is more then I know; they know well that I honour their profession and study, though I do no whit flatter them in their injurious and covetous practises: Nor do I doubt but conscionable and understanding Lawyers will be for me upon my grounds, as soon as other men, if they peruse my writings with love to the truth; and so would all godly learned Divines also, if it were not for prejudice, and some other partial affection. But I must attend on Mr. *B.*

12. Saith he, "But all this yet is but a light velitation: The prin-
"cipal thing that I would enquire into, is, what your great compre-
"hensive fact is in the true nature of it, which you call [Gods taking
"the whole people of the Jews to be his people.] Doth the word [ta-
"king] signifie a meer physical taking or fact; or a moral, such as
"among men we call, a civil action? If it be a meer physical taking,
"then 1. it cannot produce a moral effect, such as that in question is.
"2. And then it must have an answerable object, which must be indi-
"vidual existent persons. 3. And then you cannot call it one fact,
"but many thousand: even as many as there were persons taken in to
"the Jews in above four hundred years. 4. And then what was the
"physical act which is called Gods taking? was it such a taking as the
"Angel used to *Lot*, that carried him out of *Sodome*; or as the Apocry-
"phal Author mentions of *Habakkuk*, that was taken by the hair of the
"head, and carried by the Angel into another countrey, to bring *Daniel*
"a mess of portage? If God must by a physical apprehension take hold
"of them that he makes Churchmembers, we shall be at a loss for our
"proof of their Churchmembership. But I cannot imagine that this is
"your sence. But what is it then? Is it a physical action though a mo-
"ral causation of some physical effect? That it cannot be: For it is a
"political or moral effect that we enquire after. It necessarily remains
"therefore that this be a political moral taking that you here speak
"of. And if so, then the transeunt fact you speak of must needs be a
"civil or political action. And what that can be, which is no Law, Pro-
"mise, or Covenant in this case, I pray you bestow some more diligence
"to inform us, and not put us off with the raw name of a transeunt fact
"opposed to these. Certainly, if it be a civil or legal action, the pro-
"duct or effect of it is *jus* or *debitum*, some due or right: And that
"is either 1. a dueness of somewhat from us, (which is either some-
"what to be done, or somewhat to be given;) 2. or a dueness of some-
"thing to us, which is either of good or evil: If good, it is either by

"con

" contract or donation (whether by a Teſtament præmiant Law, or " the like:) if evil, it is either by ſome penal Law, or voluntary agree- " ment: Now which of theſe is it that your tranſeunt *fact* produceth? " To be a member of the Church, is to be a member of a ſociety taking " God in Chriſt to be their God, and taken by him for his ſpecial peo- " ple. The *act* which makes each member, is of the ſame nature with that " which makes the ſociety. The relation then eſſentially containeth 1. " a right to the great benefits of Gods ſoveraignty over men, Chriſts " headſhip, and that favour, protection, proviſion, and other bleſſings, " which are due from ſuch a powerfull and gracious Soveraign to ſuch " Subjects, and from ſuch a Head to his Members: As alſo a right to " to my ſtation in the Body, and to the inſeparable benefits thereof. " 2. It containeth my debt of obedience to God in Chriſt, acknowled- " ged and promiſed actually or virtually, really or reputatively. Now " for the firſt, how can God be related to me as my God, or Chriſt as " my Saviour, and I to him as one that have ſuch right to him and his " bleſſings, by any other way then his own free gift? This gift muſt " be ſome ſignification of his will: For his ſecret will is not a gift, but " a purpoſe of giving. This way of giving therefore is by a civil or mo- " ral action, which is a ſignifying of the Donors will; and can be by no " way, but either pure donation, contract, teſtament, or law. In our caſe " it muſt needs partake of the nature all theſe. It is not from one in any " equality, nor capable of any obliging compenſation or retribution " from us. Being therefore from an abſolute diſengaged Benefactor, it " muſt needs be by pure donation, or it cannot be ours. Yet as he is " pleaſed as it were to oblige himſelf by promiſe, or by his word, and " alſo to call us to a voluntary acceptance, and engagement to certain " fidelity, gratitude and duty, and ſo is the ſtipulator, and we the pro- " miſers in the latter part of the action: it is therefore juſtly called a " contract or Covenant, though indeed the word [Covenant] frequent- " ly ſignifieth Gods own promiſe alone. As it proceedeth from the death " of the teſtator (in natural moral-reputative being,) ſo it is called a " teſtament. And as it is an *act* of a ruling Benefactor giving this be- " nefit to the governed, to promote the ends of government, and obli- " ging to duty thereby, ſo it partaketh of the nature of a law. The com- " moneſt Scripture name for this *act*, is Gods Covenant or Promiſe, " and ſometimes his Gift; which all ſignifie the ſame thing here. It " follows therefore, that either by Gods [taking *Iſrael* to be his peo- " ple] you mean ſome civil political action, as a Covenant, promiſe, or " the like collation of the benefit, (and then you aſſert the thing which " you deny,) or elſe you know not what you mean, nor can make " another know it, without the diſcovery of the groſſeſt abſurdity. And " as for the other thing which is contained in Churchmemberſhip, the " profeſſed duty of man to God, it is moſt certain 1. That Gods " law obligeth us to that duty: 2. And obligeth all according to their " capacities to conſent to the obligation, and ſo to re-engage themſelves: " 3. That this actual conſent profeſſed doth therefore double the obliga- " tion. And thus by a mutual contract, Covenant or conſent (whereof

" our

" our part is first required by a law,) is the relation of Churchmem-
" bership contracted. Now to lay by and deny all this, and give us the
" general naked name of [taking for Gods people,] is meerly delu-
" sory, seeing that [taking] means this which you exclude, or it means
" nothing that's true and reasonable. And therefore tell us better what
" it means.

Answ. All before being but a velitation or light skirmish, I looked here for some great battel: But I find it nothing but a rallying together the forces scattered before, there being not one thing I know of in this passage, but what was set down before, and is answered. I have distinctly shewed how moral and physical *acts* concur to the visible Churchmembership of the people, of which infants are a part, and natural to that visible Churchmembership which the Jews infants had, and what they were, both in my Letter, and in this answer. What M. *B.* replies, is vain. 1. It is not true that *the effect in question is a moral*, it is at least in infants meerly a physical effect; their Churchmembership is not by any act which reacheth not to the effect. 2. The taking is of individual persons existent. 3. By many particular *acts*, yet in a good sence before given, summed up into one transeunt *fact*. 4. The physical *acts* are none of those M. *B.* frivolously imagines, but such as are mentioned in the Scripture, and declared in my Letter. 5. It is not true that a meer physical taking cannot produce a moral effect: For supposing the Spirit should inspire faith immediately without any preaching, the effect would be moral, though produced by a meer physical taking or *act*. 6. The transeunt *fact* I set down doth not exclude, but did expresly include in my Letter both Covenants single and mutual, and laws, and precepts; yet (as I have said before) it doth exclude that promise of Mr. *Bs.* of Gods being a God to believers and their seed, and a precept of believing or accepting this for their children, which confer the benefit of visible Churchmembership. Yea, it is fully proved before, that if there were such a promise and precept, yet these would not actually make infants visible Churchmembers. 7. It is not true that *the relation of visible Churchmembership essentially containeth a right to the great benefit of Gods soveraignty over men, Christs headship, and that favour, protection, provision, and other blessings, which are due from such a powerful and gracious Soveraign to such subjects, and from such a head to his members.* For (to omit the unfitness of the expression of [right to the great benefits of Gods soveraignty over men] which contains these two fond conceits. 1. That great benefits are included in *Gods* soveraignty over men, whereas the soveraignty of God includes not any benefit but his own greatness, he is soveraign over the reprobate men and Angels as well as the elect, and yet they have no benefit, yea his soveraignty is shewed in their reprobation as well as the election of the other. 2. That visible Churchmembers have a right to the great benefit of Gods soveraignty over men, whereas what benefit soever it be yet right is not to us by visible Churchmembership) it is most false that that relation either *constitutive* or *consecutive*, doth essentially contain that right. For neither doth the term formally import any right at all, but a manner of being or state

with

with relation as I have before distinctly declared; nor doth that right inseparably accrue to such visible Churchmembers. There are and may be visible Churchmembers, who have not that right; and there are who have that right, and are not visible Churchmembers. 8. Nor is it true that the relation essentially includeth a right to the members station, and to the inseparable benefits thereof. For though the station in the body be included, yet not a right to it, yea the actual station is oft times without right, which I think is sufficiently proved by Mr. *B.* himself in his dispute against Mr. *Blake* Sect. 39. asserting *a dogmatical faith entitling to baptism.* 9. That though visible membership bee by Gods gift, and this is to be by signification of Gods will, yet it is not necessary it should be by any promise or declaration which may be termed moral or political, sith the event it self is a signification of Gods will and of his gift. 10. That if Churchmembership be contracted by a mutual consent and covenant as Mr. *B.* sets down, 1. onely the elect can be visible Churchmembers, for to them onely God hath covenanted to be their God, or Christ their Saviour. 2. Infants are not visible Churchmembers, for they neither Covenant, nor by any intimation in Scripture is it shewed or can bee, that the parents or others obedience to God in Christ acknowledged or promised, is virtually or reputatively by any law of God taken for the infants Covenant or consent. Lastly, this law which Mr. *B.* here sets down concerning the duty of the parents, is not that law or ordinance of infants visible Churchmembership, which Mr. *B.* asserts to be unrepealed. For the law and ordinance of infants visible Churchmembership is not a precept of what another shall do, but what they shall have, not of what in duty a person is bound to, but of what God doth give and grant. And therefore all this tedious discourse of Mr. *B.* is but delusory, sith instead of a law and ordinance determining that infants shall be visible Churchmembers, he assignes another thing a precept of a duty, and thinks if I prove not it repealed I prove not the law and ordinance of another thing repealed.

Mr. *B.* adds. *As for the texts you cite,* Deut. 4. 34. & Levit. 20, 24, 26. 1 King. 8. 53. Isai. 43. 1. *In* Deut. 4. *is mentioned not the moral act of God by which he made them his people or took them for his own, and founded the relation: but the natural actions whereby he rescued them from the Egyptian bondage and took them to himself or for his use, service, and honour out of that land. But I think sure they were his people, and all their infants were Churchmembers before that taking by vertue of a former Covenant taking.*

Answ. The text expresseth that act of God whereby hee took the Jews for his people, and consequently whereby he founded the relation of Churchmembers, and if this act were a natural act, then it follows (contrary to Mr. *Bs* conceits) that a natural act may be it by which God takes a people to him, which is the Scripture phrase whereby is signified his making them his Church. If they were his people before, and all their infants Churchmembers, yet they might be made his people by repeated, continued, or new acts making or taking, noting a beginning or continuance or completing of the estate they had formerly. If they

were by vertue of a former Covenant-taking, yet I think Mr. B. cannot shew before that time a mutual Covenant-taking, such as he said before the relation of Churchmembership is contracted by.

He adds. *As to* Levit. 20. *God did perform a twofold work of separation for* Israel. 1. *By his Covenant and their entring Covenant with him.* 2. *By local separation of their bodies from others. It was the first that made them his people, and Churchmembers, and not the last: the last was onely a favourable dealing with them as his beloved. The same I say to the other two texts. Sure you cannot think that corporal separation makes a Churchmember. what if an Egyptian that had no part in the Covenant had past out with the Israelites, and got with them through the Red Sea, do you think he had been therefore a Churchmember? Suppose God had made no promise or Covenant with* Abraham *or his seed, but onely taken them out of Chaldea into Canaan, and thence into Egypt, and thence into the wilderneß, and thence into Canaan again: Do you think this much had made them Churchmembers? Then if the Turks conquer Greece, or the Tartarians conquer China, they are become Churchmembers, because this seems as great a temporal prosperity at least. And I think it s past doubt, that Lot was a Churchmember in the midst of Sodom, and the Israelites in Egypt before they were brought out, as truly as after.*

Answ. I grant that they were, though not so complered, when they had not liberty to sacrifice to God, nor to keep any feast, and perform other worship to God as when they were brought out, unto which the texts refer the severing of the *Israelites* from other people that they should be Gods, although I did not in my Letter restrain it to that local separation (which yet the Scripture with me chiefly refers it to) but also to the bringing them into the bond of the Covenant at Mount *Sinai*, giving them Laws, setling their Priesthood, Tabernacle, Army, Government, inheritance. If the *Turks* or *Tartars* had such a local separation as I describe, they had been Churchmembers. The *Egyptians* that came out of *Egypt* with the *Israelites*, were Churchmembers with the *Israelites* they becomming Proselytes. If God had made no promise or Covenant with *Abraham* or his seed, but onely taken them out of *Chaldea* into *Canaan*, and withall made known his will concerning his grace in Christ, given them Lawes, and set up his worship among them, they had been Churchmembers. According to Mr. *Bs.* own arguings, the promise or Covenant with *Abraham* and his seed made them not Churchmembers, for they were Churchmembers before. The Covenant *Gen.* 17. was not a mutual Covenant, which is that by which according to Mr. *B.* visible Churchmembership is contracted. The texts that I allege, do sufficiently prove the people of *Israel* were taken to be Gods people by such a transeunt fact as I describe, and consequently the infants visible Churchmembers, as part of that people, without the promise to believers and their seed to bee their God, on condition of the parents accepting the mercy offered, and re-engaging them to God, which Mr. B. makes the sole efficient of their holiness or visible Churchmembership, as is shewed before. He proceeds.

As to Gen. 12. 1. Acts 7. 2. Nehem. 9. 7. *which you also cite, as*

there

there is not one of them that gives the least intimation that Infant-Church-membership then began, so I shall further enquire anon, whether they contain any Covenant or promise.

Answ. They do each of them plainly shew the beginning of the taking of the *Hebrews* for Gods people, by severing them from Idolaters, and forming them into a Church, and consequently of the Churchmembership which infants had in that people or nation. For the texts do all expressly tell how God severed *Abram* from the Chaldees, how he made his house his Church, promising to encrease and to settle it, and neither *Moses*, nor the *Levites*, nor *Stephan*, do go higher in the narration of Gods calling of the *Hebrews* to be his people And I think it safest to go no higher then the Scripture. What Mr. *B.* adds after, shall have answer in its place.

He adds. *So* Exod. 19. 4, 5. *hath no word that gives the least intimation that God by that act of taking them out of Egypt, did make Israel a Church, or the infants or any others, members of it: But onely that by fulfilling a former promise in the deliverance of a people formerly his own, he layeth further obligations to duty on them by redoubling his mercies. The same I say of* Levit. 11. 45. Nehem. 1. 10. *I will not believe yet, but that you believe your self, that the Israelites and their infants were as truly Churchmembers before, as after their deliverance out of Egypt. And mee thinks the texts you cite might put it out of doubt. What if God say,* Hos. 11. 1. [*when Israel was a childe I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt.*] *Is it easie hence to prove, that calling him out of Egypt did make him his son that was none before: or to prove that Israel was Gods son before he called him out of Ægypt. If you should maintain the former, I might expect that you should say the like of Christ himself, to whom the Evangelist applieth this text; and so you may prove as fairly, That Christ was none of Gods son till he was called out of Egypt, but was made his son by that call. Certainly the Text termeth him Gods son that was called, as being so before that call. By this time I am well content that any waking man do compare your doctrine and mine, and try whether it be a Transeunt fact, or a Law and Covenant, that made infants and all others Churchmembers: and if they do not admire, that ever a learned man should harbour such a conceit as yours, and that ever a godly man should build such a weight on it, and go so far on such a ground, yea and that ever ordinary godly people should be so blinded with such palpable non sense or absurdities, then let them still follow you in the dark; for I expect not that reason should recover them.*

Answ. My conceits were and are still, that infants were onely visible Churchmembers in the Church of the *Hebrews* or Congregation of *Israel*, and that they were such not apart by themselves, but as they were a part of that people which God took for his Church, which made a peculiar Commonwealth and Church to God consisting of the same persons. This God did not by a promise to be God to the faithful and their seed as the sole efficient, and a precept of the parents to accept of this offered mercy, and to dedicate them, and re-engage them to God, as Mr. *B.* conceives, but by a transeunt fact containing many acts of Gods providence whereby they were severed from other people, and

appropriate to God. The prime act of Gods providence whereby God brought this to pass, was Gods calling of *Abram* out of *Ur*, whereby he severed them from idolaters, and by degrees established his worship in *Abrahams* house, upon which followed a long tract of providences, which I mentioned as tending to the same end: And this calling of *Abram* I refer the beginning of that people and Church to, and I think I follow therein the Scriptures. The other chief act of providence was Gods calling of *Israel* out of *Egypt*, wherein I comprehend all the acts mentioned by me in my Letter which followed, by which I said it was completed, and to that end I alleged many (as I conceive) express texts, not to prove that they then began to be Gods people (as Mr. *B.* contrary to my plain words insinuates) but to prove that then they were completed, that is, completely severed from other people, and formed into a Church or Commonwealth, with Lawes, distribution of Offices, order, and other things requisite thereunto, which they had not before. And thus I interpret *their bringing to God*, Exod. 19. 4. *the bringing them up out of the land of Egypt to bee their God* Levit. 11. 45. their *redeeming to bee his people* Nehem. 1. 10. their *calling out of Egypt Hos.* 11. 1. That is, from a miserable state among idolatrous oppressors, to be a people of themselves in a complete state of liberty under Gods rule, which I conceive described by *Ezech. ch.* 16. under the similitude of a childe cast out, relieved and educated. If Mr. *B.* can shew any non-sense, or absurdity herein, it is surely that which the plain Scripture affords, or else I am in a dream; and if Mr. *B.* bee awake, I think hee may espie non-sense and absurdity manifold in his conceit of visible Churchmembership as a right to a benefit, of such a Covenant, and Condition, and Precept, which hee imagines to confer it. I am willing Mr. *Bs.* Doctrine and mine bee compared, though I lay so little weight on this point, that I think if I bee mistaken, neither is Mr. *Bs.* cause gained, nor mine lost. I would have none follow me in the dark, nor would I have men befooled by Mr. *Bs.* misrepresentations of me, and others, much less by his frivolous Rhetorick, in which hee discovers a great deal of prejudice, rashness, confidence, and intemperate zeal, with which I think him so drunken, that I doubt whether reason will recover him, till some providence of God bring him to see his folly; which I think will much appear in that which followes, on which nevertheless I conceive hee builds the main or whole of his Cause of Infants visible Churchmembership.

SECT. LVII.

Mr. B's. Law of Infants visible Churchmembership unrepealed, is not proved from Gen. 1. 26, 27, 28. *or* Gen. 3. 15.

I Come now, saith Mr. *B.* to the 8th. Qu. that is to speak to the point which you propounded. You urge me to cite to you the particular texts that contain this Law, Ordinance, Precept or Covenant. To which I answer thus. 1. There are two sorts of Laws; one which first make a duty; the other which suppose it so made, and do only call for obedience and excite thereto, or prescribe somewhat as a means in order thereunto. If I could shew you no written law or promise as first constituting the duty, or granting the priviledg of Church membership, it were not the least disparagement to my cause, as long as I can shew you those following laws which presuppose this. You know the Church of God did live about 2000. years without any written law that we know of: where then was Gods will manifested about such things as this, but in tradition and nature? If Moses then at the end of this 2000. years did find this tradition and find all the infants of Church-members in possession of this benefit, then what need he make a new law about it? or why should God promise it as a new thing? I confess if I should find by any new law or promise that it did begin but in Moses dys, I should think it some abatement of the strength of my cause (though yet I think there would enough remain.) 2. There are (yet higher) two sorts of laws: the one for the constitution of the Commonwealth it self, the other for the administration or government of it when it is so constituted. The former are called by some, Fundamental Laws as laying the frame and form of the Commonwealth, and the quality of the materials, &c. I think indeed, that as constitutive of the form of the Commonwealth, these are scarce properly called Laws; though as they look forward, obliging to duty, and prohibiting alteration, they may. But if they be not laws, they are somewhat higher, and lay the ground of all laws and obedience, and so are laws eminenter & virtualiter, though not actually and formally: And in our case, as this constitution did subject us to God, making it our duty ever after to obey him; so doth it oblige us to acknowledge that subjection. And the very constitution of the Church is an act of high beneficence, and performed by the fundamental grant or Covenant. Now if this Covenant and constitution could not expresly be shewed in writing, it were no diminution of the authority of it, seeing among men Fundamentals are seldome written and when they are, it is onely as laws obliging the subject to maintain and adhere to the first constitution. As long therefore as we can prove that it is Gods will that successively infants should be Churchmembers, it no whit invalidates the cause if we could not shew the original constitution in writing. Yet somewhat we shall attempt. 3. We have full proof of infants Churchmembership by laws and Covenants concerning it, ever since the time that there was a written word of God: and that is sufficient, if

we

we could fetch it no higher. Having premised this, I come nearer to the Question.

Answ. Had Mr. *B.* meant fairly, and not either to prepossess the Reader with prejudice against me, or weary him afore he should come to the point, he had begun with this question: In the entrance to which he tediously sets down some *postulata*, which do shew, that we are not to expect any plain Scripture proof of a Law or Ordinance of Infants visible Churchmembership unrepealed, which he so cracks of as to intitle his Book as if he would bring such. But I shall let pass his *postulata*, and attend to his proofs.

"The first institution, *saith Mr.* B. of infants Churchmembership *de jure* upon supposition of their existence, was in Gods first constitution of the Republick of the World, when he became mans governour, and determined of his subjects, and members of the Commonwealth: Which Republick being sacred, and devoted to Gods worship and service, was truly a Church of which God was head. This was performed by the first Law and Covenant made either in or upon mans creation, That such a Covenant or promise of felicity was made by God to innocent man, almost all Divines agree: But because it is rather implied then expressed in *Moses* brief History, some few cavillers do therefore contradict us. But 1. the threatning of death for sin, seems to imply a promise of life if he sinned not. 2. And the New Testament affordeth us divers passages that yet plainlier prove it, which to you I need not recite. But whether this promise of life were natural (as the threatning of death was,) or onely positive and more arbitrary, Divines are not agreed among themselves, Those that say it was free and positive, give this reason, That God could not naturally be obliged to bless or felicitate the most innocent or perfect creature, nor any creature merit of God. Those that think it natural as the threatning was, say, It's true that God could not be properly be obliged, because he is under no law, no more is he obliged to punish, but onely man obliged to suffer if he inflict it: And it's true that man cannot strictly merit of God. But yet, say they, as man may have a natural aptitude for such felicity, so God hath a natural propensity to do good according to the capacity of the subject, and his works do oblige him (improperly) in point of fidelity and immutability as well as his word. So that their reasons are these following. 1. Because God is as naturally prone to do good to the good, as to do evil to the evil, that is, to reward as to punishment, as his name proclaimed to *Moses*, *Exod.* 34. shews. 2. Because God making man capable of a higher felicity, and principling him with inclinations thereto, and giving him desires, love, and other affections for that blessed end, even the everlasting fruition of God, therefore they say, God did in this frame of his nature give him ground to expect such a felicity; if he sinned not. For else all these inclinations and affections should have been in vain: But God made not so noble a creature with vain inclinations and affections to act fallaciously and falsly. Also Gods works would not be harmonical: So that as Gods

"promise

" promise is but a sign of his will obliging him improperly in point of " fidelity and immutability, so, say they, the nature of man was a sign " of Gods will so far engaging him: So that as he could not let sin go " unpunished without some breach in the harmony of his sapiential " frame of administration, no more could he deny to perfect man the ob- " ject of those desires which he formed in him. So that although he " might have made man such a creature as should not necessary be pu- " nished for evil, or rewarded for good, that is, he might have made " him not a man; yet having so made him, it is necessary that he be " governed as a man in regard of felicity as well as penalty. 3. Our " Philosophers and Divines do commonly prove the immortality of the " soul from it's natural inclinations to God and eternal felicity. And " if the immortality may be so proved from it's nature, then also it's fe- " licity in case of righteousness. I interpose not my self as a Judge in " this controversie of Divines, but I have mentioned it to the end which " I shall now express. 1. It is most certain, whether the reward or " promise be natural or positive, that such a state of felicity man was ei- " ther in or in the way to, or in part and the way to more. And it's " most certain, that man was made holy, devoted to God, and fit for his " service, and that in this estate according to the law of his creation, he " was to increase and multiply: It's most certain therefore, that accor- " to the first law of nature, infants should have been Churchmembers. " 2. But if their opinion hold, that make the reward grounded on the " law of nature, and not on a meer positive law, (and you see the rea- " sons are not contemptible,) then the argument would be yet more ad- " vantagious. 3. But how ever it be of the title to glory or eternity, " it's most certain, that according to the very law of nature infants were " to have been Churchmembers if man had stood. The first text there- " fore that I cite for infants Churchmembership, as expressing its origi- " nal *de jure*, is *Gen.* 1. 26, 27, 28. [*So God created man in his own* " *image* —— *And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitfull,* " *and multiply, and replenish the earth.*] Here you see by the law of na- " ture infants were to have been born in Gods image and in innocen- " cy, and so Churchmembers. And note, that the first blessing that " God pronounceth on mankind, is, that they propagate children " in their owne estate, to bee as the parents were, even in Gods " image.

Answ. 1. If this prove their Churchmembership, it proves not their visible Churchmembership, of which onely is the question. 2. If it prove a law or ordinance, yet it proves not such a law or ordinance as is in question, which is not a law or ordinance *de jure*, but *de eventu*, that so it shall be, or they shall be so accounted. For such a law or ordinance of their visible Churchmembership onely can infer their admission as visible Churchmembers, they being to be actually visible Churchmembers afore admission, according to Mr. *B*. own dictates, and therefore not *de jure* onely such. 3. If it did prove such a law or ordinance, yet it proves it not to be by such a promise and precept as Mr. *B*. asserts. 4. If it did, yet it onely proves it of the Church by nature,

which

which hath a great difference from the Church by grace, this being onely by election and calling, not by birth. 5. If this law or ordinance be unrepealed, then it is in force, and according to the law of nature invariable that man be born without sin. For man is born according to the law of procreation, *Gen.* 1.28. and if this *were the law of nature, that the first blessing that God pronounceth on mankind, is, that they propagate children in their own estate to be as the parents were, even in Gods image*; then still the law of nature continues, and so there is no original sin; or it is repealed, and so it is not such a law as Mr. *B.* asserts. 6. The words [*God created, blessed,*] do note onely a transeunt fact; and therefore, what ever Divines imagine about Gods Covenant with man, this passage onely tells what God did, but mentions no such law or ordinance by promise or precept as Mr. *B.* conceives, and therefore it is manifestly impertinent to his purpose. Let's view the next and main Text.

"The next institution, *saith Mr.* B. of infants Churchmember-"ship, was at the first proclamation of grace to faln man, or in the "first promise of redemption to sinners, in *Gen* 3.15. [*And I will put* "*enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed:* "*it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.*] I will prove that "this fundamental Covenant of grace or promise doth declare it to be "the will of God that infants should be Churchmembers: And to this "end, let us first consider what the words expresly contain, and then "what light may be fetcht from other Texts to illustrate them. It be-"ing a known rule, that an Expositor must not turn universals into "singulars or particulars, nor restrain and limit the Scripture gene-"rals, where the word it self or the nature of the subject doth not li-"mit them. I may well conclude that these things following are com-"prehended in this fundamental promise. 1. That the Devil having "played the enemy to mankind, and brought them into this sin and mi-"sery, God would not leave them remedilesse, nor to that total volun-"tary subjection to him as he might have done: But in grace or unde-"served mercy would engage them in a war against him, in which they "that conquered should bruise his head. 2. That in this war the Lord "Jesus Christ, the principal seed, is promised to be our General, whose "perfect nature should contain, and his perfect life express a perfect "enmity against Satan, and who should make a perfect conquest over "him. 3. The Lord Jesus is promised to do this work as the womans "seed, and so as conceived of her, and born by her, and so as an infant "first, before he comes to ripeness of age. So that here an infant of the "woman is promised to be the General of this Army, and Head of the "Church. This is most evident: By which God doth sanctifie the hu-"mane birth, and the infant state, and assure us that he doth not ex-"clude now that age from the redeemed Church, which he admitted into "the Church by the laws of creation. For the first promise is of an "infant born of the woman to be the Head of the Church, and growing "up to maturity, to do the works of a Head. Had God excluded the "infant state from the visible Church, he would not have made the

"Head

" Head first an infant. Where note, 1. That Christ is the great ex-
" emplar of his Church; and in things which he was capable of, he did
" that first in his own body, which he would after do in theirs. 2. That
" the Head is a Member, even the principal Member, one of the two parts
" which constitute the whole. As the *pars imperans* and *pars subdita* do
" constitute each Commonwealth. So that if an infant must be a mem-
" ber eminently so called, then infants are not excluded from member-
" ship, but are hereby clearly warranted to be members of a lower na-
" ture. If an infant may be Sovereign, no doubt he may be a Subject.
" If an infant may be the chief Prophet of the Church, then no doubt
" but infants may be Disciples. If you still harp on the old string, and
" say, They are no Disciples that learn not; you may as well say, He
" is no Prophet that teacheth not. And if you will openly deny Christ
" in infancy to have been the Prophet of the Church, I will undertake to
" prove the falshood and vileness of that opinion, as soon as I know you
" own it. The promise then of an Infant Head, doth declare Gods mind
" that he will have infants members, because the head is the principal
" member.

Answ. The thing to be proved by Mr. B. is that there is a law or ordinance of God unrepealed, that not onely in the Church Jewish, but in the Christian properly so called, the infants of believers, by vertue of Gods promise to be the God of the faithfull and their seed, and a precept to parents to accept of the mercy offered and re-engage them to God, should be, and be taken to be visible members. But that he takes upon him to prove, is, that *it is the will of God that infants should be Churchmembers, that he doth not exclude now that age from the redeemed Church, that he excluded not the infant state from the visible Church, that it is his mind that he will have infant members*; all which we might grant, and yet Mr. *Bs.* law and ordinance not thereby proved. For infants may be Churchmembers of the redeemed Church, and yet not of the visible Church; and the infant state may be not excluded from the visible Church, and yet there may be no law or ordinance for the inclusion of them; yea, there may be a law or ordinance for inclusion of them, and yet none for including them in the visible Church Christian. Nor is his proof of any validity: For the consequence holds not, Christ was by Gods promise Head of the Church in infancy, therefore infants were by Gods will to be Churchmembers, or the infant state is not excluded from the visible Church. It must rest upon some such positions as these: *In what age God promised Christ to bee Head of the Church, in that age his will was that persons should be visible Churchmembers; the ordering of Christs age is an exemplar to the Church, or rather rule for the being and accounting of visible Churchmembers.* Which are manifestly false, 1. Because there is no such thing declared in Scripture, and therefore it is to be taken as a meer fancy. 2. Because if these positions were true, 1. then an infant in the mothers womb should be a visible Churchmember, because then Christ was head of the Church, and as Mr. *B.* saith, *The Lord Jesus is promised to do this work as the womans seed, and so as conceived of her*: 2. Then an old man should not be a

member of the visible Church, because Christ in the days of his flesh was not an old man; which are both absurd. And for the antecedent of Mr. *Bs.* enthymeme, though I deny not that Christ in infancy was Head of the Church, nor that he was the Prophet of his Church in infancy, understanding it of his being the Prophet habitually and by designation, nor that he in some respect, to wit, of rule and protection, the Head of the visible Church, even of that part which is not elect: Yet 1. I deny that in respect of that union which makes any members of his body in the Scripture acception, which is by his spirit, he is head of that part of the visibl: Church which is not elect; nor can he be said in this respect and after the Scripture speech to be Head of the visible Church as visible, but onely in respect of that part which is invisible, to wit, the true believers or elect persons, who alone are univocally members of Christ the Head, as the Doctrine of Protestant writers avoweth. *Dr. Rainold, thes.* 4. §. 26. *Mali nulla corporis Christi pars sunt. Dr. Field, of the Church, book* 1. *ch* 2. *The wicked are neither parts nor members of the mystical body of Christ. Bellarmin* himself *de Eccl. milit. c.* 9. makes them *members not living, nor true according to the essence of members, but dead, and as ill humours in the body, and in respect of some outward use Christ makes of them.* 2. Nor do I well know how to make a construction of this speech of Mr. *B.* [*that the Lord Jesus is promised, Gen* 3.15. *to do this work of bruising the Serpents head, or conquering the Devil as the womans seed, and so as conceived of her, and born by her, and so as an infant first before he comes to ripeness of age*;] according to which it may be true. For though I grant the man Christ *Jesus* who did this work to have been an infant first, yet I do not think it true that he did it *as the womans seed*, according to humane nature onely, but also according to his Divine, *Heb* 9.14. nor what he did was done in infancy, but at ripe age: For he bruised the Serpents head and conquered the Devil by his death, *Heb.* 2.14 which was not in infancy, but at ripe age. 3. Nor do I understand how it is true that [*by Christs birth and infancy God doth sanctifie the humane birth and the infant state*:] For though I grant children born and infants are sanctified by God through Christ, who was born and an infant; yet that the humane birth and the infant state should be sanctified thereby, seems not true; for then humane birth and infancy should be holy in any infants or persons born, and so the birth of a bastard should be holy, and his infancy holy, which I need not shew how absurd it is. 4. Nor do I conceive any truth, but gross falshood in that speech, [*Had God excluded the infant state from the visible Church, he would not have made the head first an infant*:] For this doth suppose, that either this was the onely end or chief end without which God had not made Christ an infant, and consequently this was more in Gods eye then the saving of sinners for which Christ came into the world, or the fulfilling of his promise, that a child should be born, a son should be given to us; and would infer, that they which hold infants not visible Churchmembers, must deny Christ to have been an infant. 5. Nor do I know that to be true, [*that in things which Christ was capable of, he did that first in his own body, which he would after*

ter do in the bodies of his Church:] For he would and did innumerable things in the bodies of his Church, as to marry, beget children, &c. which he did not in his own body first, though he was capable of them. 6. I deny that Christ as man was in infancy the Prophet of his Church visibly, and in *actu exercito*. Let Mr. B. when he will assault it, there will appear in his contradiction vileness and manifold falshood, none in this opinion. And for his inference, if an infant may be the chief Prophet of the Church then no doubt but infants may be Disciples, I grant both, and yet deny that Christ was visibly, audibly, *in actu exercito* in his infancy in his humane nature the Prophet of his Church, or that any infants are actually Disciples visibly, till they hear the Gospel and profess the faith; nor am I ashamed to aver, that he is no Prophet that propheseth not, that they are no Disciples that learn not. But Mr. B. proceeds.

4. *Saith he*, "As the war is here proclaimed, and the General or "chief Commander constituted, so next here is a natural enmity put "into the whole seed of the woman, or humane race, against the whole "seed of the serpent that then was, or the Diabolical nature. This is "plain both in the text, and in the experience of the fulfilling of it. As "in the instrumental serpent, it is the whole serpentine nature, that hath "an enmity to the humane nature, and the whole humane nature to the "serpentine nature; they being venemous to us, and wee abhorring "them as venemous, and as such as our lives are in danger of: so is it "the whole humane nature that is at enmity to the Diabolical nature. "*Vide Muscul. Calvin. Luther. in locum.* All men have naturally as "great an abhorrence of the Devil, as of a serpent, they apprehend "him to be their enemy, they abhor the very name and remembrance "of him: If they do but dream of him it terrifieth them, they are a-"fraid of seeing him in any apparition. If they know any temptation to "be from him, so far they dislike it and abhor it, though for the thing "presented they may cherish it. This is not special saving grace, but this "is a great advantage to the work of special grace, and to our more ef-"fectual resisting of temptations, and entertaining the help that is of-"fered us against them, when our very natures have an enmity to the "diabolical nature: we now look on him as having the power of death "as Gods executioner and our destroyer and malicious adversary. And "if there be any Witch or other wicked person that hath contracted such "familiarity & amity with him, as that this natural enmity is thereby o-"vercome, that proveth not that it was not naturally there, but that they "by greater wickedness are grown so far unnatural. 5. As this enmity "is established in the nature of mankinde against the diabolical nature, "so is there a further enmity legally proclaimed against the diabolical "pravity, malignity, and works. *Vide Paræum in locum.* God will put an "enmity by his Laws (both natural and positive) making it the duty of "mankinde to take Satan for their enemy; to resist, and use him as an "enemy, and fight against him and abhor his works, and so to list them-"selves under the General that fighteth against him, to take his colours, "and to be of his Army: And this being spoken of the common world

" of mankinde, and not onely of the elect (for it is not they onely that
" are obliged to this hostility and warfare) belongeth to each one ac-
" cording to their capacities: and therefore infants being at the parents
" dispose, it is they that are to list them in this army against the enemy of
" mankinde, of which more anon. 6. A third and higher enmity is
" yet here comprehended, and that is an habitual or dispositive enmity
" against the diabolical malignity pravity and works, which may bee cal-
" led [natural] as it is the bent or bias of our new nature. This God
" giveth onely to his chosen, and not to all. And it containeth not one-
" ly their consent to list themselves in his army against Satan, but speci-
" ally and properly a hatred to him as the Prince of unrighteousnes, and
" a cordial resolution to fight against him and his works universally, to
" the death, with a complacency in God and his service and souldiers.
" Here take a short prospect of the mysterious blessed Trinity. As God
" is one in three, and in his entity hath unity, verity, and goodnes, and
" in his blessed nature hath *posse, scire, velle*, power, wisdome, and love,
" so as from these is he related both to his created and redeemed ratio-
" nal creatures, as absolute proprietary, as soveraign ruler, and as
" most gracious benefactour: As Lord of our nature he hath put the
" foresaid enmity between the humane nature and the Diabolical: As
" soveraign Ruler, he hath by legislation imposed on us a further enmity
" as our duty, that we should be listed in his army, profess open hosti-
" lity against Satan, and fight against him to the death. As Benefactor,
" he giveth special grace to do this, to his chosen. As he is Lord of all,
" so the first is done on the natures of all: As he is Rector of all, but
" not by the same Laws (as to positives) so he obligeth all to this hosti-
" lity, but not all as he doth those that hear the Gospel. As he is Bene-
" factor he doth with his own as he list, and makes a difference. If any
" say that it is the same enmity that is here said to bee put in all, and
" therefore the same persons in which it is put. I answer 1. there's no
" proof of either. A general command or promise to a community,
" may signifie a difference of duties or gifts to that community, though
" that difference be not expressed: For the nature of the subject may
" prove it. And 2. experience of the fulfilling of this promise or cove-
" nant, proves the difference before mentioned. And it's well known,
" 1. That *Moses* is so concise in the History of these matters. 2. And
" that the mystery of grace was to bee opened by degrees, and so but
" darkly at the first, that it is no wonder if we find the whole sum of the
" Gospel here couched up in so narrow a room, and if each particular be
" not largely laid open before our eyes. 7. That wee may certainly
" know that this promise speaks not onely of the enmity that Christ
" himself should have to Satan, and doth not engage a General with-
" out an army, God doth here expresly mention the woman her self, say-
" ing [*I will put enmity between thee and the woman*] so that as shee
" stood in a threefold respect; she is here her self possessed with this three-
" fold enmity. 1. As she is the root of humane nature, from whence all
" mankinde must spring, she is possest with the natural enmity to the
" diabolical nature, and this to bee naturally conveyed or propagated.

" 2. As

"3. As she was the root of the great Republick of the world, or that ra-
"tional society which God as Rector would sapientially govern, and her
"self with her husband (who no doubt was also included in the pro-
"mise) were the whole then existent race of mankinde, so did she re-
"ceive a legal enmity of obligation, which she was traditionally to de-
"liver down to all her posterity, being her self hereby obliged to list
"her self and all her infant progeny in the Redeemers army, against the
"proclaimed enemy, and to teach her posterity to do the like: For
"thus obligatory precepts must be brought down. 3. As she was one of
"the chosen favourites of God, she received the habitual enmity of san-
"ctification: And this is not in her power to propagate, though shee
"may use some means that are appointed thereto, and whether a pro-
"mise of any such thing be made to her seed on the use of such means,
"I will not now stand to discuss. 8. It is not all that are possessed
"with the natural enmity against the Divel himself that are the Church
"of Christ; For this is but a common preparative which is in all; Nor is
"it all that are obliged to the further enmity against the works of sa-
"tan: But all that on that obligation are duely listed in Christs army
"against satan (by the obliged person) are visible members; and all
"that are by sanctification at a hearty enmity (habitual or actual) with
"the Kingdome of satan, are members of the Church called mystical
"or invisible. This I put as granted. 9. Those that violate this funda-
"mental obligation, and to their natural pravity shall add a fighting a-
"gainst Christ and his Kingdome for Satan and his Kingdome, are be-
"come themselves the seed of the Serpent. And though they had the
"natural enmity with the rest of mankind in general against Satan,
"yet have they therewithal the habitual enmity against Christ. This
"much I suppose as out of controversie. But whether also the first ori-
"ginal corrupted nature it selfe (before any sin against recover-
"ing grace) did contain an habitual enmity against the Kingdome of
"the Redeemer? or whether the sins of later parents may propaga e
"this as an additional corruption in our nature, I will not now stand
"to discuss. Onely as to our present business, it's certain that the ge-
"neral natural enmity to Satan, may consist with an habitual friendship
"to his ways and cause. And though as men they may have the first
"common advantage of nature, and as subjects *de jure* may be under the
"common obligation, yea, and as listed in Christs Army may have man of
"its priviledges; yet for the enmity of disposition to Christ, they may be
"under a greater curse. 10. As it is certain, that it is not onely Christ
"himself that is here made the object of this promise, and is here cal-
"led [*the seed of the woman,*] (as is before proved, and may be more,
"and is commonly granted;) so it is to be noted, that those others
"in whom this enmity are put, are called here [*the seed of the wo-
"man,*] and not the seed of Christ (though the chief of them are his
"seed.) And so though the promise is made to none but the the wo-
"mans seed, and no exception put in against infants, or any age of
"all her seed: Till you can prove that infants are none of her seed,
"we must take this fundamental promise to extend to infants, and

that:

"that very plainly, without using any violence with the Text.

Answ. This tedious discourse of Mr. *B.* is indeed serpentine with winding in and out, wrigling and wresting the Text; one while it is a promise, another while a precept; sometimes meant of one sort of enmity, sometimes of another; sometimes the woman under one consideration, sometimes under another; sometimes the seed of the woman comprehend all the natural seed, sometime onely one kind: with so many ambiguous speeches, and unproved dictates, and inconsequent inferences, that I know not what better to term it then *the way of a serpent on a rock*, which the Wiseman said was *too wonderfull for him, and one of the things he knew not*, *Prov.* 30. 18, 21. And sure when I seek to acknowledge this discourse as a convincing proof of the law and ordinance of infants visible Churchmembership unrepealed, which Mr. *B.* asserts, I shall deliver my self as a Pupil to him, take him for an infallible Oracle, and profess blind obedience. But let me see what I can make of this Riddle. The sum of it, so far as I can collect, is this: Here is an enmity proclaimed legally, against the Devils pravity, malignity, and works; hereby all the seed natural of the woman are obliged to list themselves in Christs Army, or the woman as a believer is to list all her infant progeny in the Redeemers Army; infants being part of her seed, and no exception put in against infants, or any age of all her seed, this fundamental promise extends to them, and all duly listed are visible Churchmembers: *Ergo*, here is the fundamental law or ordinance for infants visible Churchmembership by promise and precept unrepealed. To discern how silly and insipid these arguings are (if I may use Mr. *Fs.* own phrase) let us grant him here is a promise and precept implied, and inquire what listing is here enjoyned, of whom, by whom, and how far this makes the listed visible Church members. The listing is not here expresst, but in his book of Baptism, *p.* 14. he saith, *They are first made Disciples, and then solemnly admitted, entred, or listed by baptism.* P. 24 *As every one that must be admitted solemnly into the Army, must be admitted by listing, as the solemn engaging signe; so every one that hath right to be solemly admitted into the visible Church, must ordinarily bee admitted by baptism, Christs listing engaging signe.* The persons to be listed, are according to Mr. *B. mankinde, the woman and her seed, even infants, no exception being put in against infants, or any age of her seed.* The persons that are to list are each man, for he saith, *It is the duty of mankinde to list themselves, infants being at the parents disposal it is they that are to list them in Christs army*, and this listing (which he counts duely done) makes infants visible Churchmembers. Concerning which, I grant that God doth proclaim here an enmity against the Diabolical pravity, malignity and works, and that it is the duty of mankinde to fight against Satan, to joyn with Christ: For this is no more but that God forbids sin, and it's our duty to resist it, and to believe and follow Christ, and here is a fundamental promise, that they who do so shall bruise the serpents head, or prevail against Satan. Nor do I deny that it is the duty of parents, yea of all men to do what lies in them to engage persons, even infants to this war, provided they do it by wayes allowed and appointed, as by their

prayers

prayers, vowes to God, or the like. But it is utterly false, 1. that there is any precept of listing by baptism here, for baptism is a mere positive rite of the New Testament, not enjoyned here. 2. That it is the duty of all mankinde to list themselves For then it is their duty to baptise themselves. 3. That it is the duty of the woman to list her self and all her seed, For then she had been bound to baptise her self, and the children of unbelievers as well as believers, *Cains* seed as well as *Abels*, and if it were supposed that she had lived to this day, she had been bound to list all the infants at least of the professed Infidels at this day; For if it were a precept unrepealed, it must have bound her still. 4. That such a listing as Mr. *B*'s words import, is either duly done, or that the listed in that manner are all visible Churchmembers. 5. That here is any fundamental promise made to persons so listed. 6. That as listed in Christs army in the manner Mr. *B* conceives, infants have the priviledge of Christs soldiers. None of these things denied by me, have a word of proof in all this prolix discourse, nor do I imagine any proof for them can be from this text, and therefore conceive his discourse without proof, and like the dream of a sick man, or the dotage of a phantastick. He adds.

11. *Some learned men do use contemptible arguments to prove further, That the sanctifying enmity is here promised to the seed of the woman as her seed (I mean those that go the way of Dr.* Ward, *Mr.* Bedford, *&c.) that is, that as the two former sorts of enmity are put into all the seed of the woman (as is explained) so the spiritual holy enmity promised to her seed as she is a believer.* 12. *And some learned men do accordingly conclude, That the impiety of parents may do much to hinder their children from that blessing more then by original sin they were hindered, and therefore their faith may further them. Of which though much may be said, I shall say no more, because I will not stand on things so much questioned.*

Answ. I might then well have omitted this as of no validity, but to shew the multiplicity of Pædobaptists errours.

He goes on thus. *I come next to prove from other parts of Scripture, That the fundamental promise of Grace is thus to be interpreted as including infants.* 1. *If the same Covenant of grace when it is more fully and clearly opened, do expresly comprehend infants as to be Churchmembers, then is this fundamental promise so to be understood (or then doth this also comprehend them.) But the antecedent is certain, therefore so is the consequent. The antecedent I prove from the Covenant of grace made to* Abraham *the father of the faithful, which comprehended infants for Churchmembers: The Covenant made with* Abraham *comprehending infants, was the same with this in* Gen. 3. *but in some things clearlier opened. which is proved thus: Both these were the Covenant of grace and free justification by faith in the Redeemer, therefore they were the same. For there is but one such. If* Abraham *had some special promises additional to the main Covenant, that makes not the Covenant of free justification by faith to be divers. That this in* Gen. 3. *is the promise or Covenant of grace and free justification is not denied, that I know of. That the promise to* Abraham *was the same, is evident from* Rom. 4.10,11,12,13,14. 1. *It is there expresly manifest, that the*

the Covenant whereof Circumcision was to Abraham *the seal, was the Covenant of free justification by faith; Circumcision it self being a seal of the righteousness of Faith which* Abraham *had, yet being uncircumcised, that he might be the Father of believers,* &c. 2. *Yea the promise that he should be heir of the world was not made to* Abraham *or to his seed through the Law, but through the righteousness of faith. Now it's certain that this Covenant sealed by Circumcision and made to* Abraham *and his seed, did comprehend infants. The consequence of the major then is evident, that the same promise expressed more concisely, is to bee expounded by the same expressed more fully: And it's acknowledged that the Gospel light and grace was to be manifest by certain degrees.*

Answ. That the fundamental promise of grace, *Gen.*3.15. did include infants, was never denied by me, and therefore Mr. *B.* doth but waste paper, and abuse me and his Readers by going about to prove it. This I deny, that it includes all infants, or all infants of believers, and that any infant is made a visible Churchmember by that promise as the next cause, or *the sole efficient*, which is Mr. *Bs.* term; neither of these is proved by him. I grant that the Covenant to *Abraham* was the Covenant of Evangelical grace, though mixt, as I have often shewed, and that it did include infants, and that they were Churchmembers, to wit, of the invisible Church of the elect, I mean so many as the Covenant of Evangelical grace was made to. I grant also that *Abrahams* infants in his house were visible Churchmembers, but not by vertue of the Covenant barely as Evangelical, but by vertue of the transeunt fact before asserted by me; and if in any respect by vertue of the Covenant, it was by it as containing houshold or civil promises, rather then Evangelical. So that although I deny that from *Rom.*4.10,11,12,13,14. it is proved that *Circumcision was a seal of the Covenant, Gen* 17. and that *the promises, Gen.*17.4.5,6,8. *were additional to the main Covenant*, and not as well the main Covenant as *v.*7 yet I grant Mr. *Bs.* conclusions which he here infers, that *the promises, Gen.*3.15. & 17.7. *did comprehend infants, that there is but one Covenant of free justification by faith in both places, that the one may explain the other that infants were from the beginning Churchmembers*, that is, members of the invisible Church of the elect: But this I deny, that this is true of all, or perhaps onely of the infants of believers, or that because they are of the invisible therefore they are members of the visible Church, there being more required to make visible Churchmembers, then election, the Covenant of grace, and parents faith. But Mr. *B.* adds.

2. *That the first fundamental promise is thus to be interpreted, I further prove by Gods constant administration in the performance of it. Concerning which I do make this challenge to you (with modesty and submission,) to prove if you can, that there was ever one Churchmember that had infants born to him while he was in that estate, from the beginning of the world to this day, whose infants also were not Churchmembers? Except onely the Anabaptists, who refuse or deny the mercy, and so refuse to dedicate their infants in Baptism unto Christ. And whether their infants be Churchmembers*

bers, I will not determine affirmatively or negatively at this time. I do again urge you to it, that you may not forget it; to prove to me, that ever there was one infant of a Churchmember in the world, since the creation to this day, that was not a Churchmember, (except the Anabaptists that refuse the mercy or deny it.)

Answ. Mr. *B.* undertakes to prove Gods constant administration, but instead of proving sends me a challenge, and hotly urgeth me to answer it; which course indeed is ridiculous to the intelligent, yet subdolous, as taking much with shallow heads who know not the laws of Dispute, as if he got the better of me if I did not answer it. But let such know, 1 That it is Mr. *Bs.* part now to prove, mine onely to answer. 2. That if I could not answer, either through defect of reading, memory, histories in such matters, or such like cause; yet this is no proof of Mr. *Bs.* assertion. 3. That I have no reason to answer Mr. *Bs.* questions and challenges, but his arguments: 1. Because I find a meer captious spirit in him, seeking advantage to himself from my words (which he very seldome doth rightly represent to the Reader) when he wants proof of his assertions; as appears most evidently in this his answer to my Letter, in which he hath gathered almost half his answer (besides the business propounded) from my writing to him. 2. That the understandings of men, even of Schollers and Learned men are so superficial, or so partial, that without ever examining, yea or reading my writings, upon Mr. *Bs.* exclamations, and vile suggestions of me and mine answers, they do most unrighteously, and like men that seek not the truth, conclude on his side, scorn and speak evil of me and the cause I assert (which is indeed the cause of Christ) of which I have much experience. 4. Nevertheless I answer his challenge categorically thus. 1. No infant born of a Churchmember was a visible Churchmember in the Christian Church, or any other besides that of the Nation of the *Hebrews*, as I have proved before: And if we must needs take up a fashion of disputing by challenges, I challenge Mr. *B.* to shew me one infant who was a visible Churchmember out of the Nation of the *Hebrews*. 2. I conceive from *Acts.* 16. 1. 2 *Tim.* 1. 5. that *Timothy* was born of a Churchmember, yet no Churchmember visible in infancy. Anabaptists refuse not the mercy of visible Churchmembership, if God had offered it to their infants; nor would they refuse to dedicate their infants in Baptism, if God had commanded it: But they dare not challenge what God hath not granted, nor profane the Ordinance of Christ, by their altering it into that which he hath not appointed. Mr. *B.* goes on thus,

SECT. LVIII.

Infants visible Churchmembership is not proved by the Law of Nature.

BEfore I proceed to any more Texts of Scripture, I will a little enquire into the light or Law of Nature it self, and see what that saith to the point in hand. And first we shall consider of the duty of dedicating infants to God in Christ, and next of Gods acceptance of them, and entertaining them into that estate. And the first is most evidently contained in the Law of Nature it self (at least upon supposition that there be any hopes of Gods entertaining them;) which I prove thus. 1. The law of Nature bindeth us to give to every one his own due: But infants are Gods own due; Ergo, the law of Nature bindeth parents to give them up to God. By [giving] here I mean not an alienation of propriety, to make that to be Gods that was not so before; but an acknowledgement of his right, with a free resignation and dedication of the infant to God, as his own; for his use and service, when he is capable thereof. If you say, infants being not capable of doing service, should not be devoted to it till they can do it; I answer, they are capable at present of a legal obligation to future duty, and also of the relation which followeth that obligation, together with the honour of a Churchmember (as the child of a Noble man is of his honours and title to his inheritance) and many other mercies of the Covenant. And though Christ according to his humanity was not capable of doing the works of a Mediatour or head of the Church in his infancy, yet for all that he must be head of the Church then, and not (according to this arguing) stay till he were capable of doing those works. And so is it with his members.

Answ. It is a bold attempt to undertake to prove a law or ordinance of infants visible Churchmembership unrepealed from the law of Nature, when Churches are onely instituted, not by any law of Nature, and consequently there can be no direction in the law of Nature who shall be visible Churchmembers, who not. Nor could both those things Mr. *B.* considers be proved, to wit, *the duty of dedicating infants to God in Christ, and Gods acceptance of them, and entertaining of them into that estate*, i. e. of dedicated persons, prove them visible Churchmembers: there's more required thereto, to wit, something discernable by sense, by which they may be said to be part of Gods people. Yet I shall examine his proofs The conclusion may be understood of giving up, devoting, dedicating to God by prayer or vow; or else by an outward sign, such as Circumcision or Baptism. This latter is not of the law of nature, being meer instituted worship; the former may be granted, without any hurt to my cause. Nevertheless I shall say something to the argument: Which hath at least four terms, and so is faulty in the form; and for the matter of it, the *major* is not true without limitation. For the law of nature doth not bind every man to give to every one his own

own due, except it be that due which is due from the giver, or it belongs to him to give. A private man is bound to pay his own debt, not to pay every other mans debt to him to whom it is due Now infants may be said to be Gods due, either in respect of their persons, or their service. Infants in infancy can do no service, nor doth God require any service of them, and therefore there is none due, and therefore no parents do or are bound by any act of theirs for their infants service to give God his due of their infants service. And for their persons, they are Gods due in that he may of right dispose of them as he will, in life and death, health or sickness; and in this respect parents have no way of giving God his due, but by acknowledging his Soveraignty, and submitting to his will. Dedication to God for the future is no giving of God his due from infants; it is neither the giving of God the due of their persons, or their service: they are bound themselves when they come to understanding to do it by themselves; and if they do it not, the parents dedication cannot do it. I object not, that infants should not be devoted to to God till they can do service; but that whatever it be, it is not the giving God his own due from infants, nor doth make them visible Church makers.

Mr. *B.* adds. 2. *The law of nature bindeth all parents to do their best to secure Gods right, and their childrens good, and to prevent their sin and misery: But to engage them betimes to God by such a dedication, doth tend to secure Gods right, and their childrens good, and to prevent their sin and misery: For they are under a double obligation, which they may be minded of betimes, and which may hold them the more strongly to their duty, and disadvantage the tempter that would draw them off from God.*

Answ. To dedicate them by prayer, and thanksgiving, and vows to God, may tend to these ends: But to do it by Baptism not required of God, secures not Gods right, but abuseth his name; nor doth it tend to the childrens good, or prevent their sin and misery. For neither is there promise of God that the parents dedicating the child by Baptism shall have these effects, nor do these effects follow *ex opere operato*, nor is there any obligation real put by infant-baptism on the person, though there may be a putative obligation thereby: But really infant-baptism is a disadvantage, 1. In that it is the occasion whereby they take themselves to be Christians afore they know what Christianity is, by which means they are kept in vain presumption of their safe condition; and this constant experience, and the acknowledgement of observing men doth witness. 2. They are kept back thereby from the true Baptism of Christ, which hath had, and would have a strong tie on mens consciences, if it were solemnly and in a right manner performed as it should be. Surely a mans own engagement by himself, in all probability must have a stronger operation then an engagement by another for him, notwithstanding the fond conceits of Mr. *Simon Ford*, and Mr. *John Goodwin*, of edification by infant baptism. He is a very rare bird that makes any fruitfull use of infant baptism, which neither hath institution from God, nor promise of blessing, and was never known by the infant, nor perhaps any person living can tell him there was any such thing. Nor is

there in this respect the same reason of it and Circumcision, for Circumcision makes such an impression on the body as keeps the memory of it, but by Baptism there is no print on the body by which it and the obligation by it may be remembred.

3. Saith he, *The law of nature bindeth parents in love to their children to enter them into the most honourable and profitable society, if they have but leave so to do: But here parents have leave to enter them into the Church, which is the most honourable and profitable society.* Ergo. *That they have leave, is proved,* 1. *God never forbad any man in the world to do this sincerely, (the wicked and unbelievers cannot do it sincerely,) and a not forbidding is to be interpreted a leave in case of such participation of benefits: As all laws of men in doubtfull cases are to be interpreted* κατ' ἐυμενειαν, *in the most favourable sence. So hath Christ taught us to interpret his own: when they speak of duty to God, they must be interpreted in the strictest sence: when they speak of benefits to man, they must be interpreted in the most favourable sence that they will bear.*

Answ. Entering into the Church invisible is Gods onely work: Entering into the Church visible Christian is by Baptism, *Plain Scripture proof*, &c. *pag.* 24. *we have neither precept nor example in Scripture, since Christ ordained Baptism, of any other way of admitting visible members, but onely by Baptism.* Mr. *Bs. minor* then here is this, that parents have leave to enter (which is all one with admission) their children into the visible Church by Baptism, that is, to baptize them. But this is false. For God hath forbidden parents to bring their infants to baptism, in that he hath not appointed baptism for them (as is proved at large in the 2d. part of this *Review*) much more to baptize them in their own persons, according to Mr. *Bs.* hypotheses, *plain Scrip proof*, &c. *pag.* 211. except they be Ministers. A not forbidding is not to be interpreted as leave in this case: but a not commanding is a plain forbidding. Mr. *Collings, provoc. prov. ch.* 5. *Nothing is lawfull in the worship of God, but what we have precept or president for; which who so denies, opens a door to all Idolatry, and superstition, and will-worship in the world.* If the law of nature bind parents to enter their children into the Church, then it is a law that speaks of duty to God, not of benefit to man; for such laws contain grants of something from God, not of what man is to do: Now if it be a law of duty, it must according to Mr. *Bs.* own rule be *interpreted in the strictest sence*, which is the right sence; they are bound to it as God appoints, and no otherwise. So Mr. *B.* against Mr. *Bl.* *pag.* 80. *I take Gods precept to be the ground of Baptism, as it is officium, a duty, both as to the baptizer, and the baptized.* Mr. *Ball reply about nine positions*, p. 68. *The Sacraments are of God, and we must learn of God for what end and use they were ordained. But by the institution of Baptism recorded in Scripture, we have learned it belongeth to the faithfull, to Disciples, to them that are called.* Mr. *B.* mistakes when he conceives of baptism as a benefit to which a man hath right by promise or Covenant grant: For though a benefit do follow to them that rightly do it, yet it self is onely a duty, and such a one as is onely by institution, not by the law of nature, nor belongs to parents for

children,

children, but to each person for himself. But Mr. B. goes on.

2. "It is the more evident, that a not forbidding in such cases is "to be taken for leave, because God hath put the principle of self pre- "servation, and desiring our own welfare, and the welfare of our chil- "dren so deeply in humane nature, that he can no more lay it by then "he can cease to be a reasonable creature. And therefore he may law- "fully actuate or exercise this natural necessary principle of seeking "his own or childrens real happiness, where-ever God doth not restrain "or prohibit him. We need no positive command to seek our own or "childrens happiness, but what is in the law of nature it self, and to use "this where God forbiddeth not, if good be then to be found, cannot be "unlawfull.

Answ. 1. Infant baptism tends not to the preservation, good, welfare, real happiness of them; but to their hurt. 2. It requires a positive command, sith it is not of the law of nature. 3. It is forbidden, in that it is not commanded. 4. There can be expected no blessing of God on it, sith he hath promised none to it.

3. Saith he, "It is evident from what is said before (and elsewhere) that it is more then a silent leave of infants Churchmembership "that God hath vouchsafed us. For in the forementioned fundamental "promise, explained more fully in after times, God signified his will "that so it should be. It cannot be denied, but there is some hope at "least given to them in the first promise, and that in the general pro- "mise to the seed of the woman they are not excluded, there be no "excluding term. Upon so much encouragement and hope then it is "the duty of parents by the law of nature to enter their infants into the "Covenant, and into that society that partake of these hopes, and to list "them into the Army of Christ.

Answ. The point to be proved was, that parents have leave to enter their children into the Church; but a leave of infants Churchmembership vouchsafed of God (if there be good sense in the expression) is another thing. Infants Churchmembership is the infants state, not the parents act, and leave of it intimates a willingness in the infant to be a Churchmember, to which God vouchsafes leave. But whether there be sense or not in the expression, it is not true that *in the forementioned fundamental promise, explained more fully in after times, God signified his will that infants should be visible Churchmembers*; nor is it true, that *upon hope given in the first promise that they are not excluded, is it the duty of parents* (without a positive command) *by the law of nature to enter their infants into the Covenant, and into that society that partake of these hopes, and to list them* (by baptism) *into the Army of Christ*. Hopes of what may be, is not a sufficient reason of baptizing a person. Nor by these hopes is any more duty put on the parent, then an other, who hath the same hopes and may do it, as *viz.* a Midwife: Yea, by this argument Midwives should be bound to baptize not only believers infants, but also all infants, if it be so much for their good, welfare, preservation, real happiness, and the law of nature ties them as well as parents to do what lies in them to do them good upon such hopes and encouragement;

ment; and ſith they are in their power as well as parents, yea before them, and they may liſt them into Chriſts army, enter them into Covenant and the Church, they are bound to do it. Yea, conſidering that Mr. *B.* of *Baptiſm* part 2. ch 8. holds, that by Chriſts commiſſion, *Mat.* 28.19. Diſciples ſhould immediately without delay be baptized as ſoon as they are Diſciples, and believers infants are Diſciples as ſoon as they are born, and none can do it ſo ſoon as Midwives, they ought to do it, according to Mr *Bs. hypotheſes*, immediately upon their birth. Which will go very far in juſtifying the Papiſts about their haſty baptiſm by Midwives.

Yet again ſaith Mr. *B.* 4. *It is the duty of Parents by the Law of Nature, to accept of any allowed or offered benefit for their children. But the relation of a member of Chriſts Church or Army, is an allowed or offered benefit to them*, Ergo, *&c For the* major, *theſe principles in the law of nature do contain it.* 1. *That the infant is not* ſui juris, *but is at his parents diſpoſe in all things that are for his good. That the parents have power to oblige their children to any future duty or ſuffering, that is certainly to their own good: and ſo may enter them into covenants accordingly: And ſo far the will of the Father is as it were the will of the childe.* 2. *That it is unnaturally ſinful for a parent to refuſe to do ſuch a thing, when it is to the great benefit of his own childe. As if a Prince would offer Honours, and Lordſhips, and Immunities to him and his heirs: if he will not accept this for his heirs, but onely for himſelf it is unnatural. Yea, if he will not oblige his heirs to ſome ſmall and reaſonable conditions for the enjoying ſuch benefits. For the* minor, *that this relation is an allowed or offered benefit to infants is manifeſted already, and more ſhall be.*

Anſw. If meant of viſible members in the Chriſtian Church properly ſo called, this laſt ſpeech is denied.

He goes on thus. "And this leads me up to the ſecond point, which "I propounded to conſider of; whether by the light or law of nature "we can prove that infants ſhould have the benefit of being Church-"members, ſuppoſing it firſt known by ſupernatural revelation, that "parents are of that ſociety, and how general the promiſe is, and "how gracious God is. And 1. it is certain to us by nature that in-"fants are capable of this benefit, if God deny it not, but will give it "them as well as the aged. 2. It is certain that they are actually mem-"bers of all the Commonwealths in the world (*perfectè ſed imperfectè "membra*) being ſecured from violence by the lawes, and capable of "honors and right to inheritances, and of being real ſubjects under ob-"ligations to future duties, if they ſurvive. And this ſhews that they "are alſo capable of being Churchmembers, and that nature revealeth "to us, that the infants caſe much followeth the caſe of the parents, e-"ſpecially in benefits. 3. Nature hath actually taught moſt people on "earth, ſo far as I can learn, to repute their infants in the ſame reli-"gious ſociety with themſelves, as well as in the ſame civil ſociety. "4. Under the Covenant of works (commonly ſo called) or the perfect "rigorous law that God made with man in his pure nature, the infants "ſhould have been in the Church, and a people holy to God, if the pa-

"rents

"rents had so continued themselves. And consider 1. that holiness and "righteousness were then the same things as now, and that in the esta-"blishing of the way of propagation, God was no more obliged to "order it so, that the children of righteous parents should have been "born with all the perfections of their parents and enjoyed the same "priviledges, then he was obliged in making the Covenant of grace "to grant that infants should be of the same society with their parents, "and have the immunities of that society. 2. We have no reason when "the designe of redemption is the magnifying of love and grace, to "think that love and grace are so much less under the Gospel to the "members of Christ, then under the Law to the members or seed of "*Adam*, as that then all the seed should have partaked with the same "blessings with the righteous parents, and now they shall all be turned "out of the society, whereof the parents were members. 5. God gives "us himself the reasons of his gracious dealing with the children of the "just from his gracious nature, proclaiming even pardoning mercy to "flow thence, *Exod.* 34. and in the 2d. *Com.* 6. God doth yet shew "us that in many great and weighty respects he dealeth well or ill with "children for their parents sakes: as many texts of Scripture shew (and "I have lately proved at large in one of our private disputes, that the "sins of nearer parents are imputed as part of our original or natural "guilt.) So much of that.

Answ. 1. All these considerations, if they were yeelded to be true, would as well prove that by the light of Nature infants should be invisible Churchmembers as visible (which would contradict the Scripture, *Rom* 9. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.) yea rather, sith the 4th. consideration upon which the inference rests chiefly, is from the state in which persons were put by creation and redemption, which is into the invisible rather then the visible. Now then if these considerations are not sufficient to assure parents who are in the invisible Church that their infants are in the same society, neither are they sufficient to assure them they are visible Churchmembers. 2. It is a calumny of Mr. *B.* which is insinuated as if I held that all the seed of believers shall be turned out of the society whereof the parents were members. 3. It is a gross conceit, and contrary to the plain doctrine of the Scripture, concerning election and reprobation of *Jacob* and *Esau*, which is intimated, as if the designe of redemption under the Gospel to the members of Christ should be, that as the members or seed of *Adam*, so all the seed should partake of the same blessings with the righteous parents. 4. What hee saith he hath largely proved in one of the private disputes at *Kederminster* among the associate Ministers in *Worcestershire* (as I conjecture) I do not contradict peremptorily, as not knowing how he stated the question, nor what his proofs were. Yet it seems to mee to be an errour, nor am I very apt to give assent to Mr. *Bs.* determinations, however the associate Ministers may perhaps take him for a *Pythagoras*, whose *ipse dixit* must not be gainsaid.

Once more saith he. "Yet before I cite any more particular texts, "I will add this one argument from the tenour of the Covenant of "grace,

"grace as expreſſed in many texts of Scripture. According to the te-
"nour of the Covenant of grace, God will not refuſe to be their God
"and take them for his people, that are (in a natural or law ſenſe) wil-
"ling to be his people, and to take him for their God. But the infants
"of believing parents are thus willing, *Ergo*. The *major* is unqueſtion-
"able. The *minor* is proved from the very law of nature before expreſſed.
"Infants cannot be actually willing themſelves in natural ſence, *ergo*,
"the reaſon and will of another muſt be theirs in law ſence, and that is
"of the parents, who have the full diſpoſe of them, and are warranted
"by the law of nature to chooſe for them (for their good) till they
"come to uſe of reaſon themſelves. The parents therefore by the light
"and law of nature chooſing the better part for their children, and
"offering and devoting them to God, by the obligation of his own na-
"tural law, he cannot in conſiſtency with the free grace revealed in the
"Goſpel, refuſe thoſe that are ſo offered. And thoſe that thus come to
"him in the way that nature it ſelf preſcribeth, he will in no wiſe caſt
"out, *Joh*. . . . And he will be offended with thoſe that would keep
"them from him, that are offered by thoſe that have the power to do it,
"though they cannot offer themſelves. For legally this act is taken
"for their own. Thus I have ſhewed you ſome of the fundamental title
"that infants of believers have to Churchmemberſhip, and our obligati-
"on to dedicate them to God.

Anſw. They are (as I conceive Mr. *B*.) willing to be Gods people in a natural ſence, who do in their own perſons actually will this; in a law ſence, who having not uſe of reaſon themſelves, do will by another who hath the diſpoſe of them, as *v. g.* a parent. That ſome acts of a parent are legally taken for the childs, it's not denied. But in this argument of Mr. *B*. I deny the *major*. And whereas Mr. *B*. ſaith, *it is unqueſtionable*, I ſay, it is manifeſtly falſe, there is no ſuch thing in the tenour of the Covenant of grace; yea, God did refuſe *Iſhmael*, and *Eſau*, though *Abraham* and *Iſaac* prayed for them, and dedicated them (in Mr. *Bs*. ſenſe) to God. What Mr. *B*. dictates by way of proof, whether of the *major* or *minor* (which I think he did not well heed) is not true. *Infants cannot will of themſelves, therefore the reaſon and will of another muſt be theirs in law ſence*. For it follows not, unleſs the Law-giver do ordain it ſo. Nor doth it follow, that if the infants cannot will, and anothers will muſt be theirs in law ſence, it muſt in Church matters be the will of the natural parents. For in ſuch things it may be as well conceived that the will of the mother the Church (as it is termed,) the Church-governours, or as ſome will the Goſſips ſhould be their will in the law ſence, and that they have the power to diſpoſe of them, and are warranted by the law of nature to chooſe for them (for their good) as the natural parents. The ſpeeches [*the parents by the light and law of nature chooſing the better part for their children, and offering them, and devoting them to God by the obligation of his own natural law, he cannot in conſiſtency with the free grace revealed in the Goſpel, refuſe thoſe that are ſo offered*,] is falſe, the Goſpel no where aſſuring grace to thoſe that are offered by anothers will, but to thoſe who repent

and

and believe themselves. The speech [*And those that thus come to him in the way that nature it self prescribeth, he will in no wise cast out, Joh. . .*] is false, it being certain God hath cast out many so coming, as *Esau*, *Ishmael*, &c. and hath a tincture of *Pelagianism*; and the Text, *Joh.*6.37. to which Mr. *B.* alludes, is grosly abused by him, sith it speaks onely of those that come to Christ by their own faith, and of not casting out from the invisible Church, and everlasting life, as *v.*39,40. shew, not meerly from the visible Church. And the speech [*and he will be offended with those that would keep them from him that are offered by those who have the power to do it, though they cannot offer themselves,*] being meant of not baptizing them, is also false; and the contrary is true, that he will be offended with those who baptize infants which he never appointed, but profane the ordinance, being appointed onely for them who are themselves disciples and believers. And thus Mr. *Bs. fundamental title* to infants visible Churchmembership is blown up.

Mr. *B.* adds. *You must now in reason expect, that infants Churchmembership being thus established, partly in the law of nature, and partly in the fundamental promise, what is after this spoken of it should not be any new establishment, but confirmations and intimations of what was before done, rather giving in the proof that such a law and promise there is that did so establish it, then being such first establishing laws or promises themselves. And from hence I may well add this further argument. If there be certain proof in Scripture of infants Churchmembership, but none except this before alledged that makes any mention of the beginning of it, but all speaking of it as no new thing, then we have great reason upon the forementioned evidence, to assign this beginning which from* Gen. 3. *we have expresse. But the former is true, ergo the later. You confess that infants were Churchmembers once. You onely conceive it began when* Abraham *was called out of Ur. Your conceit hath not a word to support it in the Text. The right to such a blessing was then new to* Abrahams *seed, when* Abraham *first believed: But when it began to belong to infants of believers in general, no Text except this before cited doth mention. Nor doth that promise to* Abraham *intimate any inception then as to the Churchmembership of infants, but onely an application of a priviledge to him that in the general was no new thing.*

Answ. Mr. *B.* mistakes in conceiving visible Churchmembership to belong to infants of believers in general, and therefore it must be derived from *Gen.* 3.15. I retort his argument. If there be certain proof in Scripture of infants Churchmembership, but none except in the nation of the *Hebrews*, and that had its beginning at the call of *Abraham* out of *Ur*, and ended at the rejection of the *Jews*, then infants visible Churchmembership began with *Abrahams* call, and now ceaseth. But the antecedent is true. Ergo, also the consequent. The consequence is in effect Mr. *Bs.* In the *minor* the first and third propositions are proved by the dispute before: For the second [that the nation of the *Hebrews* began with *Abraham*,] besides the allegation before of *Nehem* 9.6. *Acts* 7.2. where he is called *their Father*, and the story of the *Hebrews*

begun from *Abrahams* call, the words of the Prophet, *Isa.* 51. 1, 2. are expres to this purpose; calling *Abraham and Sarah the rock whence they were hewen, and the hole of the pit whence they were digged, Abraham their father and Sarah that bare them*, and mentioning Gods *calling him alone, blessing him and increasing him as the cause* of it (which doth prove that it was by the transeunt fact which I described, not by Mr. *Bs.* promise and precept that they were Churchmembers) and this as a new thing, God having chosen no other people of the earth as he did the Jews. *Deut.* 7. 6. And therefore I deny Mr. *Bs. minor*, and conclude, that visible Churchmembership of infants was onely in the nation of the *Hebrews*; not by a promise to be a God to believers and their seed, and a precept to parents to dedicate them to God, and list them in Christs Army; but by the transeunt fact of calling *Abraham, blessing, multiplying him, bringing them out of Egypt to himself*, which was to be demonstrated. Let's yet view Mr. *Bs.* confirmations, whether they be any better then his primitive establishments.

SECT. LIX.

The sayings of Adam, Eve, Noah, *concerning* Cain, Seth, Shem, *the term* sons of God, *Gen.* 6. 1. *prove not Mr. Bs. law of infants visible Churchmembership unrepealed.*

NOw for the Texts, saith he, *that further intimate such a foregoing establishment.* 1. *There seems to be some believing intimation of this in* Adams *naming his wife the mother of the living: For it is to be noted what Bp.* Usher *saith*, Annal vol. 1. p. 2. Unde tum primum (post semen promissum) mulieri Evæ nomen a marito est impositum, *Gen.* 3. 20. quod mater esset omnium viventium non naturalem tantum vitam, sed illud quoque quod est per fidem in semen ipsius, Messiam promissum: quomodo & post eam Sara fidelium mater est habita, 1 *Pet.* 3. 6. *Gal.* 4. 31.] *He put that name on her after the promise, because she was to be the mother of all the living, not onely that live the life of nature, but that which is by faith in the Messiah her seed. So that as she was the root of our nature, we are her natural seed; and as she was a believer, and we the seed of her a believer, so is she the mother of a holy seed, and we that are her seed are holy, as a people visibly dedicated to God.*

Answ. Though the exposition were allowed, and the inference thereon, that *we that are her seed*, that is by faith in the Messiah, *are holy*, yet it follows not that we are so *as a people visibly dedicated to God*, much less that our infants are so without their own faith by vertue of their parents dedication: And therefore this Text, according to Mr. *Bs.* exposition (which yet may be questioned) yeelds no confirmation of infants visible Churchmembership unrepealed.

2. Saith he, "When *Cain* was born, his mother called him [possession] because she had obtained a man of the Lord, that is, faith

" *Ainſworth*, [with his favour, and of his good will,] and ſo a ſon of " promiſe, and of the Church. And therefore it is to be noted, that " when *Cain* had ſinned by killing his brother, God did curſe him, and " caſt him out of his preſence, *Gen.*4.14,16. So that he was excommu- " nicate and ſeparated from the Church of God, ſaith *Ainſworth*, [that " is, from the place of Gods word and worſhip which in likelihood was " held by *Adam* the father, who being a prophet, had taught his chil- " dren how to ſacrifice and ſerve the Lord. So on the contrary, to come " into Gods preſence or before him, 1 *Chron.*16.29. is explained in " *Pſal.*96 8. to be the comming into his Courts.] Very many learned " men give the ſame expoſition of it. Now if *Cain* were now excom- " municate, then was he before of the Church: nay it's certain by his " ſacrificing, and other proof, however this Text be interpreted: But no " man can give the leaſt reaſon from Scripture to make it ſo probable " that he entred into the Church at any other time, as we give of his " entrance at his nativity.

Anſw. *Eve* doth not ſay, that ſhe poſſeſſed a ſon of God, member of the Church from the Lord, but *a man*, by vertue of the power given to the parents for procreation, *Gen.*1.28. notwithſtanding the curſe, *Gen.*3.16. which was from the Lord, *Pſal* 127.3. *Gen.*30.2. that is, by his providence, and in ſome reſpect with his favour and good will, conſidering her deſert, and danger it was that ſhe poſſeſſed him when both their lives were in ſo great hazard. That *Cain* was a Churchmember viſible from his infancy hath no probability, there being no hint of it in that Text, or any other. The proofs that infant viſible Churchmembership was onely in the *Hebrew* Nation, have beene ſhewed before.

" Alſo, *ſaith Mr.* B. When *Eve* bare *Seth*, ſhe ſo named him as a " ſon of mercy in faith, as appointed her by the Lord to be in *Abels* " room, faithfull as *Abel*, and the father of our Lord afte the fleſh, as " *Ainſworth* on *Gen.*4.25. And is there no intimation in this that *Seth* " was an infant member of the viſible Church? I confeſs he that ſhall " excommunicate this appointed ſeed, or faith, that *Seth* was without " the Church in his infancy, doth ſpeak in my eares ſo improbably, and " ſo unlike the Scripture, that I am very confident I ſhall never be- " lieve him.

Anſw Nor ſhould I, meaning as Mr. *Ainſworth*, *ſeed*] *that is another ſon: that as* Abrahams *ſeed was called in* Iſaac (Iſhmael *being excluded*) *Gen.*21.12. *ſo* Eves *ſeed ſhould be in* Seth, that is the elect ſeed, and ſo he a member of the invisible Church in infancy; and yet there's no intimation that he was an infant member of the viſible Church, from which *Iſhmael* was not excluded. In which though I place not *Seth*, yet I do not thereby excommunicate *Seth*, or ſay that he was without the Church in his infancy.

Mr. *B.* adds. " Note alſo, that as God had thus caſt out *Cain*, and " ſupplied *Abels* room by *Seth* and had given each of them poſterity; ſo " we find him in a ſpecial manner regiſtring the ſucceſſors of the righ- " teous, and putting two titles on theſe two diſtinct generations, calling

"some the sons of God, and others the daughters of men, *Gen.* 6. 2. "Supposing that you reject the old conceits that these sons of God "were Angels that fell in love with women, the current ordinary ex- "position I think will stand, that these were the progeny of *Seth*, and "other members of the Church, who are called the sons of God; and "that it was the progeny of *Cain*, and other wicked ones, that are cal- "led the daughters of men. Where note that they are not themselves "denominated wicked, but the children of men, as being a generation "separated from the Church from the birth. And the other are not "themselves affirmed to be truly godly ones, but sons of God, as be- "ing the seed of the Saints not cast out, but members of the Church, "or the sons of those who were devoted to God, and so devoted to him "themselves: a separated generation belonging to God as his visible "Church. Where note, that these that are called the sons of God, "even the line of *Seth* and other godly parents, were yet so wicked that "God repented that he made them, and destroyed them in the flood, "sparing onely *Noah* and his family. So that it was not their own god- "liness that made them called the sons of God, but their relation, "Churchstate, and visible separation from open unchurched Idolaters. "Compare this phrase with the like, *Deut.* 14. 1. 2 *Cor.* 6. 18. In the "former it's said [*ye are the children of the Lord your God, ye shall not cut "your selves*, &c.] where the whole people, infants and all are called Gods "children, as being a people separated to him from the Idolatrous "world; and so in the next *v.* called *a holy people unto God, peculiar to "him*, &c. And 2 *Cor.* 6. 18. *Come out from among them, and be ye se- "perate*, &c. *and I will be a father to you, and you shall be my sons and "daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.*] So that Gods sons and daugh- "ters are that society that are separated from Idolaters unto the wor- "ship of God as the visible Church is. And then it appears that the "generation of the righteous, even from the womb, were ennumerated "to the rest, in that they are not mentioned as a people called out here "and there, and initiated at age (there's no mention of any such thing:) "but as a stock or generation opposed to the daughters of men, or of "the unchurched, who were such from their infancy as all will grant. "For it was not the same men that were the parents of those here called "the daughters of men and the sons of God (though some of the later "might be excommunicate when they fell:) But it plainly intimates, "that it was another sort of men that these were the daughters of, then "those that were parents to the sons of God. So *Ainsworth in loc.* [The "sons of God, *i. e.* the men of the Church of God, for so such *Moses* "saith, *Deut.* 14. 1. *&c.* 1 *Joh.* 3. 1. Daughters of men, meaning of *Cains* "posterity that were out of Gods Church, *Gen.* 4. 14.] So our Annota- "tions, and many more.

Answ. 1. There is not sufficient evidence in the text to prove it, that *the sons of God* were of *Seths*, and the *daughters of men* of *Cains* posterity: they might be some of *the daughters of men* of *Seths*, and some of *the sons of God* of *Cains* progeny, notwithstanding what is in the text. And there is this reason against it, that 6th *Gen.* 4. 16. it is said, that

Cain

Cain went out from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land of Nod on the East of Eden, and that *he built a City called Enoch,* that the posterity of *Cain* and *Seth* dwelt so far one from another, that they had not occasion to see one another so as to fall in love with their beauty. And whereas it is clear that *Adam after he begat Seth begat sons and daughters Gen.* 5 4. *living* 800 *years,* and that the great change in religion was about the time of *Enos* birth *Gen.* 4. 26. *the sons of God* and *daughters of men* might be of other races then *Cain* and *Seth.* But I shall not contend about this. 2. Nor is it manifest that either sort of persons are called so from their descent, or Church-state by birth. For the one are not called the sons of God from their birth, but practise or profession, διὰ τὸ μιμεῖσθαι μέχρι ἐκείνου τοὺς προγόνους τὴν εὐσέβειαν, saith *Chrysostom hom* 22. on *Genes. Because until then they did imitate their progenitors vertue, Piscat. analys. Gen.* 6. *Per filios Dei intelligendi sunt ii qui religionem puram profitebantur, præsertim ex Sethi & Enoshi posteris. Gatak. adv. Pfochen.* c. 13. *Apud quos religionis veræ professio hactenus perstiterat. Ussher Annal. Vol.* 1. *p.* 3. *ad an. M.* 235. *Sethus annos* 105 *natus filium genuit cui Enoshi nomen imposuit: quod conditionis humanæ deplorandam denotat miseriam, Tunc enim a Cainitis cultus Divinus miserè corruptus fuit: unde ea inter homines distinctio facta; ut qui in verò Dei cultu permanserunt filii Dei; qui autem ab eo desciverunt filii hominum sint appellati. Gen.* 4. 26. *cum* 6. 1, 2. *Christoph. Cartwright annot. ad Gen.* 6. 2. *At ex textu apparet hosce Dei filios professione potius quàm reipsa sanctos fuisse. The new Annot. on Gen.* 6. 2. *Sons of God*] *rational creatures and of humane kinde; yet in this place distinguished from the daughters of men, not onely by their sex, but by their qualities or relations; by their qualities, as persons of some eminent endowments or estimation above others as* (*what is excellent is in the Scripture phrase especially entituled unto God, as the Garden of Eden,* Ezek. 28. 13. *& ch.* 31. *v.* 8, 9. *the hill of God, Ps.* 68. 15.) *or by their relations, as such as descending from Seth and Enosh professed the true worship of the true God, and so became capable of the title of the sons of God, Deut.* 14. 1. 2 *Cor.* 6. 18. Whence I infer, that in the judgement of these Authors they are termed *the sons of God* not from their Churchmembership by birth, but their profession and practise. On the other side, the parents of the daughters are termed *men* not from their discent by birth, or exclusion out of the Church by birth, but as the term [*man*] is taken for corrupt *unregenerate men as Ainsworth,* so *Paul* 1 *Cor.* 3. 3. *Piscat. sch. in Gen.* 6. 2. *Nisi potius est ut nomine* אדם *Adam hîc intelligatur primus ille generis humani parens: ut significetur illas gessisse imaginem illam secundùm quam Adamus genuit liberos, non autem fuisse regeneratos spiritu Dei.* Which exposition is very likely that they are termed daughters of *Adam,* not daughters of men, because they were corrupt as *Adam,* as *Gen.* 5. 3. *Adam* is said *to beget a son in his own image corruptus corruptum, as Pisc. sch. in locum,* in opposition to Gods image. *v.* 1. So *Hos.* 6. 7. and then *daughters of Adam* doth not note their discent but qualities and practise, as *daughters of Sara* 1 *Pet.* 3. 7. that is, that they revolted from the true worship of God, as *Adam* from God. Which things premised, I deny 1. that it is true that

the

the women are not themselves denominated wicked, but the children of men, as being a generation separated from the Church from the birth. For there is nothing in the text that proves *the men* were the posterity of *Cain*, nor that all the posterity of *Cain* were out of the Church, nor that these men were out of the Church, though they were corrupt persons or degenerate members, and therefore nothing to prove they were excluded from the Church from the birth, by reason of their discent. And it may bee well conceived that the term [*daughters of Adam*] doth note their wickedness as treacherously departing from God as he did 2. I deny they are termed [*sons of God*] who chose the daughters of *Adam* for their beauty, *as being the seed of the Saints*, &c. but as being at least in appearance holy and true worshippers and chosen by God, they are so denominated not from their discent from the godly, for then they had been called the sons of the Saints rather then of God, but from their profession and practise, if the interpretation of *Aben Ezra* that they were *the sons Elohim of the Judges or mighty*, or that other that they were *eminent persons*, hold not. 3. I deny that it can be proved that these sons of God were not truly *godly*, or that *that they were so wicked that God repented that he made them, and destroyed them in the flood.* For neither doth their love of women prove they were not truly godly, *Solomon* is judged truly godly *Nehem.* 13.26. though hee fell perhaps more deeply into the same sin. *Sampson* was a believer *Heb.* 11. 32. yet sinned this way. Nor doth that which is said *Gen.* 6. 11, 12, 13. prove it, for that is rather to be understood of the *Nephilim* or *Giants*, or the posterity of the *the sons of God* mentioned *v.* 4. rather then of *the sons of God* themselves, *v.* 2. And therefore it is not proved that *it was not their own godliness that made them called the sons of God, but their Church state.* Nor is there any thing *Deut.* 14.1. that proves *the sons of God Gen.* 6.2. were such from their infancy as borne of Churchmembers. For they are *the sons of Gods* there either by profession or special choice *v.* 2. not from their parentage. Much less is there any thing 2 *Cor.* 6. 18. to that purpose, for the promise of son-ship there is not from birth but obedience *v.* 17. And as *Gen.* 6. 2. their being made sons of God is not expresst to be by calling, so neither is it said to be by humane generation, nor doth it follow if *the daughters of men* were such from their birth, the sons of God must be so from their birth, no not though *sons of God* noted a generation or stock, as it doth not follow that because *that which is born of the flesh is flesh* from the birth, that *that which is born of the spirit is spirit* from the birth, *Joh.* 3. 6.

"Also, *saith Mr. B.* an intimation of this priviledge, and that they "were sons of mercy and of the promise, appeareth in the very names "of many of the children of the righteous, both before and after the "flood, which I will not stand on particularly.

Answ. This is granted, but proves not their visible Churchmembership from their birth.

He adds. "And when all the world had so defiled themselves, that "God was resolved to cut them off, he spared *Noah* and his family or "sons. Though *Cham* was to be cursed, yet was hee of the Church

"which

"which worshipped the true God, and spared as a son of *Noah*, and "one of that society. And if God so far spared him then for his fathers "sake as to house him in the Ark (the type of the Church) bee sure "took him to be of the same society in his infancy, and then bare him "the same favour on the same account.

Answ That the Ark was a type of the Church is not said in Scripture, it is rather made a type of Baptism 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. But let it bee granted the Ark was a type of the Church, and that *Cham* was in the Ark for his fathers sake and a member of the Church, yet it followes not he was so in infancy, he might be so as a worshipper of the true God, though himself in other things corrupt.

Again saith Mr. *B.* "As soon as *Noah* came out of the Ark God "blessed himself in his issue, as he did *Adam*, with an [increase and mul-"tiply] and made a Covenant with him and his seed after him. Which "Covenant though the expressed part of it be that the earth should bee "drowned no more, and so it was made with the wickedst of *Noahs* seed, "and even with the beasts of the field, yet doth it import a special fa-"vour to *Noah* and his seed, as one whom God would shew a more "special respect to, as he had done in his deliverance, and upon this "special favour to him the creatures fare the better. For though the "word [Covenant] be the same to man and beast, yet the diversity of "the promissary and his capacity may put a different sense on the same "word, as applied to each. And indeed it should seem but a sad bless-"sing to *Noah* to hear an [increase and multiply] if all his infant po-"sterity must be cast or left out of the visible Church, and so left as "common or unclean. This were to encrease and multiply the King-"dome of the Devil. If he that was so mercifully housed in the Ark "with all his children, must now bee so blest as to have all their issue "to be out of the Church, it were a strange change in God, and a strange "blessing on *Noah*! And an uncomfortable stablishing of a Covenant "with his seed, if all that seed must bee so thrust from God and dealt "with as the seed of cursed *Cain*.

Answ. Though the Covenant *Gen.* 9. 9. should import a special favour to *Noah* and his seed more then to the beasts (which yet the text expresseth not) yet that this should be infants visible Churchmembership followes not, nor is it likely, such then all the infant posterity yea all the seed of *Noah*, and consequently all the men of the world since then should be visible Churchmembers. Nor was *the blessing of multiplying said to Noah*, reduced to such a paucity, though his infant posterity were not of the visible Church, nor were they any more *common and uncleen* thereby, then they should have been if so taken, nor had this been to *increase and multiply the Kingdome of the Devil*, they that are not visible Churchmembers may be of the Kingdome of Christ and not of the Kingdome of the Devil. I say not *all Noahs issue was out of the Church*, yet the leaving out infants from the visible Church, shewed *no change in God* from what hee was to them when he housed the sons of *Noah* in the Ark, nor doth it any whit lessen the blessing expressed *Gen.* 9. 1. nor doth it infer that *all that seed must be thrust from God and dealt*

with as the seed of cursed Cain. These are but frivolous inferences fit onely to scare weak heads.

" Moreover, *saith he*, it is certain that *Noah* did propheticially, or " at least truly pronounce the blessing on *Sem* and *Japhet*. And in *Shems* " blessing he blesseth the Lord his God, shewing that God was his God " and so in Covenant with him. And it is plain that it is not onely the " persons, but the posterities of his three sons that *Noah* here intended. " It was not *Cham* himself so much as *Canaan* and his succeeding poste- " rity that were to be servants to *Shem* and *Japhet*, that is to their poste- " rity. And the blessing must be to the issue of *Shem*, as well as the " curse to the issue of *Cham*. And indeed a Hebrew Doctor would take " it ill at that Expositor or Divine whatsoever that should presume to ex- " clude the infant seed of them out of Gods Church. And wel they may, " if in the blessing God be pronounced to be their God. Saith *Ainsworth* " *in loc.* [under this *Sem* also himself receiveth a blessing: for blessed " is the people, whose God *Jehovah* is, *Psal.* 144. 15. and eternal life " is implied herein, for God hath prepared for them a City of whom he " is not ashamed to be called their God, *Heb.* 11. 16. and *Sem* is the " first man in Scripture that hath expressly this honour.

Answ I grant that not onely the person of *Shem*, but his posterity were blessed; nor do I deny God was their God, nor that their infant seed was in Gods Church: But this doth not prove their visible Churchmembership in infancy, but rather their invisible Churchmembership, for that is imported by the phrase of being their God, as Mr. *Ainsworths* exposition intimates. God was God to *Jacob* in his mothers womb, yet he was not then a visible, but an invisible Churchmember.

" Moreover (*saith Mr.* B.) in *Gen.* 9. 27. in *Japhets* blessing there " is much, though in few words, to this purpose intimated. First, note " that the Jewish Church is called [the tents of *Sem.*] From whence " it appeareth, that the Church priviledges of that people begun not " with or from *Abraham*, but were before: And that it is the same " Church that was of *Shem* and of *Abraham*, and after all the additional " promises to *Abraham*, the Jewish Church is still denominated [the " tents of *Sem*:] now they were the tents of *Sem* before *Abrahams* " days. And therefore it is clear, that it being the same Church, must " be supposed to have the same sort of members or materials: and " therefore infants must be members before *Abrahams* days as well as " after. That Church which was *Sems* tents had infant Churchmem- " bers (for the Jewes Church is so called, into which *Japhet* was to " pass:) But the Church both before and after *Abraham* was *Sems* " tents, *Ergo.*

Answ. That *the tents of Sem* note the *Jewish* people, is not improbable: But then it is as certain that they are so called, not from what they were in *Sems* days, at least not what they were when *Noah* prophesied, but what they were to be afterwards when they were formed to be a peculiar people; and they are *Sems tents*, because they descended from him. And this is clear even from what Mr. *B.* and all grant, that what

is

is here said was accompliſhed in the poſterity of *Sem*, *Japhet* and *Cham*. And therefore it followes not that if the Jewiſh people had infants Churchmembers viſible, it muſt be ſo in *Sems* dayes, becauſe they are termed *Sems tents*, ſith they are ſo termed from their diſcent, not from the ſtate of the Church in *Sems* time. Nevertheleſs if it bee granted that *Sems tents* are the Church of God in *Sems* family in his days, it will rather prove it to note the inviſible Church then the viſible. For the *dwelling in the tents of* Sem in Mr. *Bs.* and their ſenſe whom he follows, is by faith, and ſo *the tents of Sem* muſt note the inviſible Church of true believers, of whom God is God as he was of *Sem*, *the Iſrael of God*, as they are termed *Gal.* 6. 16. not the Jewiſh Church viſible, and they were joyned by perſwaſion, and therefore not infants, who were *to dwell in* Sems *tents*, and conſequently infants viſible Churchmembership is not hence proved. And to Mr. *Bs.* argument I anſwer by granting the concluſion, if by *Sems tents* be meant the inviſible Church, if the Jewiſh people, the *minor* is denied. He goes on thus.

" Yet further let it here bee noted, that it is into *Shems* tents that " *Japhet* muſt paſs. I ſuppoſe that the evidence is better here for that ex- " poſition that applieth the word [dwell] to *Japhet* then to God, and ſo " that this is ſpoken of the converſion of the Gentiles, as many Expoſi- " tors have cleered at large. And ſo, as *Ainſworth* ſaith, the ſenſe is " that *Japhet* ſhall be [united with the Churches of the Jews, the poſte- " rity of *Sem*, which was fulfilled when the Gentiles became joint heyrs, " and of the ſame body, and joint partakers of Gods promiſe in Chriſt, " the ſtop of the partition wall being broken down. *&c. Eph.* 3. 6. & " 2. 14, 19. Although it may further imply the graffing of *Japhets* chil- " dren into the ſtock of the Church, when *Sems* poſterity ſhould bee " cut off, *&c.*] *vid. ult.* Now if it be *Sems* tents even the ſame Church " that *Japhets* children muſt dwell in, then as *Sems* infants were Church- " members, ſo muſt *Japhets*, and not all his infant ſeed bee caſt or left " out. So that here is a promiſe of infant Churchmemberſhip unto the " Gentiles in theſe words.

Anſw. For my part, for ought I yet diſcern, Mr. *Nicholas Fuller* his expoſition in his 1d. Book of his *Miſcellanies Theological ch.* 4. ſeems more right then that which Mr. *B.* and many other Expoſitors follow, to wit thus, *God ſhall enlarge the coaſts of the poſterity of* Japhet *in Aſia, Europe, and America, and God ſhall dwell in the tents of* Sem, *that is, Chriſt or God manifeſted in the fleſh, ſhall dwell in the tents of* Sem; *that is among the* Jews, *being of their ſtock, as it is* John 1. 14. *and Canaan ſhall be ſervant to the Iſraelites, and the poſterity of* Japhet, *as the Canaanites, Egyptians, Carthaginians and other people of* Cham *have been, being conquered by* Joſhua, Alexander *the great, the* Romans, *and other people.* Nor do I ſee how Mr. *Bs.* interpretation can be right, ſith when *Japhet* was perſwaded to dwell in *Sems* tents, *Chams* poſterity alſo were perſwaded, and *Canaan* was no more a ſervant in a ſpiritual ſenſe, no nor ſo much as *Sems* tents the Jewiſh people; nor were the Gentiles perſwaded to dwell in *Sems* tents, that is, in the Jewiſh Church viſible; but it was quite diſſolved, and they a ſeparate Church from them. And

therefore it is moſt manifeſtly falſe, that the children of *Japhet* muſt dwell in *Sems* tents, that is, the ſame viſible Church Jewiſh, and therefore the inference is wrong, there are infant viſible members in the Gentile Church Chriſtian: yea ſith according to Mr. *Bs.* own expoſition, the Gentiles were by the perſwaſion of the Goſpel, as it is *Epheſ.* 3. 6. of the ſame body, none of the Gentiles were of the ſame body but thoſe who were perſwaded by the Goſpel, which cannot be ſaid of infants, and therefore the contrary follows from Mr. *Bs* own expoſition, that infants were not to be viſible Chriſtian Churchmembers.

SECT. LX.

Mr. Bs. Law of Infants viſible Churchmemberſhip unrepealed, is not proved from Gen. 12. *or* 17, *or* 22.

"WE come next, *ſaith Mr. B.* to the promiſe made to *Abraham*, "which I ſhall ſay the leſs to, becauſe you confeſs it. But again "note, that whereas your ſelf make the beginning of Gods taking the "Jews to be his people, and ſo of infants to be members of the Church, "to be at *Abrahams* call from *Ur*. 1. There is no one word of that in "the text. 2. *Lot* came out of *Ur* with *Abraham*, yea and from *Haran*, "and lived with him: were not *Lot* and his infants Churchmembers "then?

Anſw. 1. I confeſs a promiſe to *Abraham*, but not that *Abraham* or his infants were viſible Churchmembers by it, as the ſole or next efficient cauſe. 2. What word is in the text for the beginning of the Jewiſh people to be Gods Church at *Abrahams* call out of *Ur*, is ſhewed above, from *Iſai* 51. 1, 2. *Nehem.* 9. 7. *Acts* 7. 1, 2. 3. *Lot* came along with *Abram* to *Canaan*, but was there parted from him, and all along they were ſevered, and therefore *Lot* though a righteous man, yet was not of the ſame Church with *Abrams* houſe, nor his infants if he had any, viſible Churchmembers, becauſe God intended not to make his houſe and poſterity his Church viſible.

3. *Saith Mr. B.* "The chief note I intend is this, that there is "no more ſaid then to prove infants Churchmembers, then what wee "have ſhewed was ſaid long before, and is ſaid after the Gentiles in- "fants, no nor ſo much. If therefore the paſſage of *Abraham* out of *Ur*, "yea or the promiſe made to him in *Haran*, *Gen.* 12. 2, 3. will prove "infants Churchmemberſhip, then have we as good proof of it to the "Gentile Church as to the Jews.

Anſw. I neither make *Abrahams* paſſage out of *Ur*, nor the promiſe in *Haran* (or rather in *Ur* *Gen.* 12. 2, 3.) to be that which made infants viſible Churchmembers in the *Hebrew* nation, but Gods ſpecial call, or taking the houſe of *Abraham* entirely to bee his people, which Mr. *B* hath not nor can ſhew to have been done to any other people.

"And here, *ſaith he*, I note further, that in the beginning before

"the

" the command for Circumcision, you plainly yeild that infants Church-
" membership is a thing separable from Circumcision, and begun not
" with it, but before. And indeed I think I have evinced that to you in
" my Book of Baptism. *Abraham* himself was not made a member by
" Circumcision, but circumcised because a member of Christs Church
" by faith. *Ishmael* was a member before, and so was *Isaac*, and the in-
" fants born in *Abrahams* house.

Answ. I grant visible Churchmembership was before Circumcision in *Abrahams* house, but not that *Abraham* was circumcised under this formal consideration, as a member of Christs Church by faith, but as one to whom it was commanded by God.

Mr. *B.* goes on. " Whether there were any promise or precept of this
" (but a meer transeunt fact) let the text last mentioned, and the fol-
" lowing bear witness. *Gen.* 12. 2, 3. [In thee shall all families of the
" earth be blessed] and *Gen.* 17. 7, 9, 10. [And I will establish my
" Covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee — and I will
" be their God. And God said to *Abraham*: Thou shalt keep my Co-
" venant therefore, thou and thy seed after thee in their genera ions. This
" is my Covenant which you shall keep between me and you, *&c.*] to
" *vers.* 13. In all this let these things be noted. 1. That here is an ex-
" press promise or Covenant to *Abraham* and his seed after him. 2. That
" it is not onely *de præsenti*, but for the future, called an everlasting
" Covenant. 3. That this promise or Covenant doth manifestly im-
" ply and include infants Churchmembership (as you confess.) 4. That
" yet here is not the least word that intimates an institution of it *de novo*,
" but rather the contrary plainly intimated. The promises before *Gen.*
" 17. are mainly about the multiplication of *Abrahams* seed. What is
" that to Churchmembership? (except what intimates the promised
" seed, of which anon.) *Hagar* hath a promise also of the multiplica-
" tion of *Ishmaels* seed. And the very precept of Circumcision is onely
" one part of the infant members, *viz.* the males, and therefore it can-
" not be foundation of their Churchmembership, which leaves out half
" the members. 5. Note that the promise that God will be their God,
" doth expressly contain the Churchmembership of the seed. 6. Note
" that this is more then a transeunt fact, *Ergo* being an everlasting Co-
" venant. Had it been a natural transeunt fact, that had left no perma-
" nent title behind it in the obligation of the Covenant, then it had been
" null and void as soon as spoken: then the word of God is but a bare
" sound and of no further force. 7. Note that the Apostle (as is said) *Rom.*
" 4. 10, 11, 12, 13. doth fully manifest to us, that this promise was
" made to *Abraham* as a believer, and that Circumcision was a seal of the
" righteousness of faith which hee had, yet being uncircumcised: and
" therefore that the chief part of the Covenant of having God for our
" God, and his taking us as his peculiar people, belongs to the Gen-
" tiles as well as to the Jews. 8. And he oft sheweth that the faithful are
" *Abrahams* seed, and therefore the chief blessings of the promise belong
" to all the faithful. But one of the blessings was, that their infants
" shou'd be comprehended in the same Church and Covenant, *Ergo*, the

" infants of the faithful who are the heirs of the ſame promiſe, muſt be " comprehended in it too.

Anſw. 1. I deny not the promiſe *Gen.* 17.7. to include infants Church-memberſhip, but that I confeſs that it doth manifeſtly imply and include infants viſible Churchmemberſhip Mr. *B* cannot ſhew. 2. The promiſe that God will bee their God, doth not expreſſly contain the viſible Churchmemberſhip of infants. For *God* may be *God* to them who are not viſible Churchmembers, and he may not be *God* to them who are. 3. If in the promiſes *Gen.* 12. 2, 3. *Gen.* 17. 7. and the precept *Gen.* 17. 9, 10. there be no inſtitution *de novo*, nor foundation of infants Church-memberſhip, then infants Churchmemberſhip viſible (which was not before *Abrahams* dayes) hath not foundation in the promiſes and precept, but the tranſeunt fact I have mentioned. 4. Though I conceive that a tranſeunt fact may create a permanent title, as a gift, a delivery into our hands without a promiſe for future, may create a permanent title, nor do I deny that the Covenant *Gen.* 17. 7 did leave a permanent title behinde it; yet I deny that the viſible Churchmemberſhip of infants in *Abrahams* houſe was by a title to be legally claimed, or by the Covenant *Gen.* 17. 7. as the *cauſa procreans* of it, though it might bee the *cauſa conſervans* of it, in that it aſſured ſome of thoſe acts whereby it was continued. 5. I deny that the Apoſtle *Rom.* 4. 10, 11, 12, 13. doth at all, much leſs fully manifeſt to us, that the promiſe *Gen.* 17. 7. was made to *Abraham as a believer*, though I grant what Mr. *B.* infers from it in his 7th. note. The Apoſtle doth plainly manifeſt, that in the Goſpel ſenſe it was made to *Abraham a father of believers*. 6. It is denied as moſt certainly falſe, that *one of the bleſſings of the promiſe Gen.* 17. 7. *to the faithful Gentiles was, that their infants ſhould be comprehended in the ſame Church and Covenant*, yea the Apoſtle concludes, and proves *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. That all the poſterity of *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*, were not comprehended in that promiſe, and therefore the viſible Churchmemberſhip Chriſtian of infants of Gentile believers, can have no ſhew of proof from the promiſe *Gen.* 17.7. and precept *v.* 9. 10.

9. *Saith Mr. B.* " I think it is not to bee made light of as to this " matter, that in the great promiſe *Gen.* 12. 3. the bleſſing from Abra-" ham in Chriſt is promiſed to all the families or tribes on earth [all " the families of the earth ſhall be bleſſed] as the *Heb. Samar. Arabic.* " or [all the kindreds] as the vulgar *Lat.* and *Chald. paraph.* or [all " the tribes] as the *Sept.* πάσαι αἱ φυλαὶ. And doubtleſs it is by Chriſt " that this bleſſing is promiſed, and ſo a Goſpel bleſſing (*Ergo* the *Sy-*" *riac.* adds [and in thy ſeed] and the *Arab.* hath [by thee.]) And the " Apoſtle fully teſtifieth that. So that as tribes, kindreds, families, do " moſt certainly comprehend the infants, and as it was to ſuch families " that the promiſe was made before Chriſt as to the Jewiſh Church, ſo is " it expreſſly to ſuch families or tribes that the promiſe is made as to the Gentiles ſince Chriſt.

Anſw. The bleſſing *Gen.* 12. 3. is not viſible Churchmemberſhip (which may be without juſtification) but juſtification, as the Apoſtle expreſſly

expreſly expounds it, *Gal.* 3. 8. (which may be without viſible Churchmemberſhip:) Nations there doth not comprehend every member of a nation, nor every one of a tribe or kindred, as it is *Acts* 3. 25. but the elect, and believers of each nation, tribe, or kindred, as the Apoſtle doth both v. 7. & 9. ſhew, terming them that are bleſſed *thoſe that are of faith.* Therefore though the Scripture be not to be made light of, yet Mr. *Bs.* inference from thence is moſt vain, the promiſe being not of viſible Churchmemberſhip, nor to nations, families, kindreds entirely, nor to infants of unbelievers or believers as ſuch; but to ſo many of all nations, kindreds, and families, as are believers or elect. Whereby Mr. *B.* may ſee how infants can be excluded theſe families, and this promiſe, without apparent violence to the Text.

10. Saith he, *Note that as infant Churchmemberſhip is here clearly implied in infant Circumciſion, ſo they are two diſtinct things; and as the ſign is here commanded de novo, ſo the thing ſignified (I mean the duty of engaging and devoting to God as their God in Covenant) is commanded with it, though not* de novo, *as a thing now beginning as the ſign did. So that here is in Circumciſion not onely a command to do the circumciſing outward act, but alſo to do it as a ſign of the Covenant, and ſo withal for the parents to engage their children to God in Covenant as their God, and devote them to him as his ſeparated peculiar people. So that here are two diſtinct duties concurrent. The one external newly inſtituted, the other internal not newly inſtituted. And therefore the former may ceaſe, and yet the later ſtand: and it's no proof that the later (Covenant engagement of infants to God) is ceaſed, becauſe the ſign of Circumciſion is ceaſed; no more then it proves that ſuch Covenant engagement did then begin when Circumciſion did begin; or that women were not Churchmembers ſeparated, engaged, dedicated to God in infancy, becauſe they were not circumciſed. And no more then you can prove that all Iſrael was unchurched in the wilderneſs when they were uncircumciſed for 40 years. So that here you have a a command for entring infants as Churchmembers. And ſo you ſee both promiſe and precept in* Gen. 12. 3. & Gen. 17.

Anſw. I do indeed, but not ſuch as Mr. *B.* ſhould produce, a promiſe of infants viſible Churchmemberſhip, and a precept of their entring unrepealed; there being no ſuch promiſe of believers infants viſible Churchmemberſhip, or precept of admiſſion as viſible Churchmembers beſides Circumciſion, which Mr. *B.* will not ſure ſay is unrepealed. As for his diſcourſe of a duty of engaging, ſeparating to God, and dedicating, which is internal, and not inſtituted *de novo*, it is neither in *Gen.* 12. nor *Gen.* 17. nor if it were, is it any thing to the purpoſe. For neither doth ſuch an internal duty make or admit or enter an infant into the viſible Church, either Jewiſh or Chriſtian. According to Mr. *B.* himſelf, infants are viſible Churchmembers afore it, yea without it; nor is the admiſſion or entering into the Church viſible by it, but by an outward ſign, as he himſelf determines, *part* 1. *ch.* 4. of *Baptiſm*: And this ſure is now Baptiſm, which Mr. *B.* I preſume will not now allow to parents, for then they ſhould be Miniſters of the Seals, which he counts one of my ſix errours. I never denied an internal duty of faith, prayers,

er, vowing, &c. for the engaging and dedicating infants to God, prayer for them is practised by me in publick, but I deny that this makes them visible Churchmembers, or admissable by Baptism.

He adds. *And when I consider the parents, breeding, and manners of* Rebeckah, *I think it far more probable that she was a Churchmember from her infancy, then that she was entred afterwards at age, or that she was a heathen or infidel when* Isaac *married her.*

Answ. What in the parents, breeding, and manners of *Rebeckah* Mr. B. observes, which should make it in any degree probable that she was a Churchmember from her infancy, I know not: There are such things related *Gen* 31. of *Laban* her brother, and *Rachel* his daughters Idols, as me thinks should move Mr. *B.* to conceive, that either in that house there was no Church of God, or at best a very impure one, though it is likely their idolatry and wickedness was not so great as that of the the Canaanites, which made them more desirable and eligible wives for *Isaac* and *Jacob*, then the daughters of the *Canaanites*, whom *Esau* chose.

Mr. B. adds. *And as before we are before mentioned standing Covenants, so it is to be noted how God intimateth the extent of the main blessing of them to be further then to* Abrahams *natural seed, not onely in the express promise of the blessing to all the nations or families on earth (of which before) but in the assigned reason of the blessing which is common to* Abraham *with other true believers. For* Gen. 22. 16, 17, 18. *it's thus alledged [because thou hast done this thing, &c. And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, because thou hast obeyed my voice.] And* Gen. 26. 3, 4, 5. *the Covenant is renewed with* Isaac, *and the same reason assigned, [because that* Abraham *obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes and my laws.] How mans obedience is said to be a cause of Gods blessing, I am not determining; but taking the words as I find them in general, I may conclude, that they are here given as a cause or reason of it some way or other. And though a special mercy may be given on a common ground or reason, yet where there is no apparent proof of the restriction, we are to judge the blessing common where the reason is common: At least, if a special blessing be superadded to* Abrahams *seed (upon the freeness of Gods grace or the eminency of* Abrahams *obedience,) yet there goes with it a mercy common to all where the reason of the mercy is found. It being therefore the case of every true believer to be faithfull and obedient, yea, to prefer that before his own life, and not a few onely, it may be hence gathered, that God who blessed* Abrahams *seed on that account, will bless theirs on the same, with the same blessings in the main (as to his favour and acceptance of them) though not with the same in the variable superadditionals or overplus of external things.*

Answ. Mr. *B.* like another *Procrustes* (though in vain) would fain rack the Texts *Gen* 22. 16, 17, 18. & 26. 3, 4, 5. to his purpose. Though I deny not but a common mercy may be granted on a special reason, and a special mercy on a common reason, God being a free agent; yet in this business, the reason of *Abrahams* mercy and the mercy it self are both so special and proper, that it is extream violence to

the

the Texts, to apply *Abrahams* singular obedience in offering his son, so signally eminent, *Heb* 11.17. *Jam.*2.21. to every believers obedience; and the blessing granted to his seed, that it *should be as the stars of heaven, as the sand on the sea shore*, that *in it all nations should bless themselves or be blessed*, to every believers natural seed, and their visible Churchmembership. This kind of arguing is too ridiculous to deserve a serious refutation. Yet he hath not done.

In Exod. 12.48. saith he, *there is a law for the circumcising of all the males of strangers that sojourn in the land, that will kee, the passover: which comprehendeth their Churchmembership, as is shewed.*

Answ. I grant there is, but not a law unrepealed.

SECT. LXI.

Covenants, promises, and speeches in the Old Testament, of Israel, the righteous, prove not Mr. Bs. law of infants visible Churchmembership unrepealed.

"THe promise (*saith Mr. B.*) to the whole people of *Israel*, infants "and all, that they should be [a peculiar people, a Kingdome of "Priests, and a holy Nation,] *Exod.*19.5,6. you cannot deny. This "is a promise, and not a transeunt fact which made no promise. And "the people are called to keep Gods Covenant, that they might have "this promise fulfilled to them. Yea, if you had said, that it was a meer "transeunt Covenant or promise, reaching but to the persons then ex-"istent, and dying with them, though you had spoken more sence, yet "no more truth then when you denied the law and promise, and sub-"stituted a transeunt fact. For 1, it is expressly a promise *de futuro* to "a nation. 2. Yea, and the Apostle *Peter* giveth the same titles to be-"lievers under the Gospel, intimating the fulfilling of the promise "even to them, as the promise to *Abraham* was to the faithfull who "were his uncircumcised seed. However, here is a Covenant granting "by way of confirmation the blessing of Churchmembership to infants "with the rest of *Israel*: For certainly, this peculiarity, and holiness, "and priesthood here mentioned, containeth their Churchmember-"ship: It is undeniable therefore, that such Churchmembership is "here granted by promise or Covenant, not as a thing then beginning, "but by way of confirmation of the like former grants. And it's to "be noted, that though this promise is made to all *Israel*, yet not to be "fulfilled to any of them, but on condition that they [obey Gods voice, "and keep his Covenant,] *ver.*5. on which conditions also any other "might have then enjoyed the same blessing, and therefore so may "do now,

Answ. I never denied promises to be to the whole people of *Israel*; but deny that they were by a promise, as the sole efficient cause, Gods visible Church, and their infants members. The promise *Exod.*

19.

19.5,6. presupposed their Churchmembership, and promiseth continuance of it in an eminent manner. The Israelites were Churchmembers without the condition of obedience before the Law was given; yea, *Ahaz*, *Manasseh*, &c. were visible Churchmembers though they were Idolaters, but they lost that peculiarity, holiness, priesthood, upon their disobedience, which was there promised; and so did the people, they lost the dominion, temple, priesthood, *Urim*, and *Thummim*, and other priviledges which are meant thereby, and should have been continued if they had not broken Gods Covenant by Idolatry. Yet no other nation could have had that state though they had been obedient and kept the Laws, God having given those laws peculiarly to that nation, and confined that honour to that people till the *Messiah* came. And though *Peter*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 5, 9. apply these to believers, yet not in the same manner as they are meant *Exod.* 19. 5, 6. nor is any infant now of a believer a visible Churchmember by vertue of that promise.

"In *Deut.* 14. 1, 2. The infants (*saith Mr.* B.) with the rest are "called the children of God, and a holy and peculiar people to the Lord "their God.

Answ. Be it so, yet this is not ascribed to a promise or precept, but to Gods choise of them.

"And (*saith Mr.* B.) *Deut.* 26. 17, 18. the Covenant is expressed "[thou hast avouched the Lord this day to be thy God, and to walk "in his ways, and keep his statutes, and his commandments, and his "judgements, and to hearken to his voice. And the Lord hath avouched thee this day to be his peculiar people, as he hath promised thee, "*&c.* [and that thou mayest be an holy people. *&c.*] Is here no "promise when the promise is expresst? and is here no Covenant, "where the mutual Covenant is described? And I think you grant that "infants are included.

Answ. There is a promise of God to them, but that did not make their infants visible Churchmembers, though I deny not their avouching the Lord for their God (which was a transeunt fact) did shew them to be visible Churchmembers, nor do I any where deny that our Covenant or promise to God doth make us visible Churchmembers, but Gods Covenant or promise to infants upon the parents faith, as Mr. B. asserts.

Mr. B. adds. "So *Deut.* 28. 4, 9. where the promise to the nation "is, that if they hearken to *Gods* voice and observe his Commande"ments, they shall be blessed in the fruit of their bodies, and the Lord "will establish them a holy people to himself, as hee had sworn unto "them.] Here is not only a Covenant and promise for the future, but also an oath confirming it, as annexed to the same before. Is this establishing Covenant or promise but a transeunt fact? or doth not this confirm their right to the benefit promised, which was received before by "the same means?

Answ. It doth, but the benefit promised v. 4. is not infants visible Churchmembership, but encrease, health, strength, such a blessing as they

they had in their cattel as well as their children, as *Psal.* 127. 3, 4, 5. & 144. 12, 13, 14, 15. and many more places is expressed. And *v.* 9. though their Churchmembership was established according to Gods Covenant and oath, yet the establishing was not the Covenant, oath, or promise of God, but a transeunt fact of providence in preserving, teaching them, continuing his worship among them, and such like acts.

And, saith Mr. *B. Ezra* 9. 2. *They are called the holy seed.*

Answ. Not all the seed of Israel are called the holy seed, but those onely who were legitimate, that is, begotten by lawfull marriage according to *Moses* law: the rest were termed *the mixed multitude*, *Neh.* 13. 3. whom they separated from the rest, *Ezra* 10. 3. as being no Churchmembers, that is, part of the congregation of *Israel* according to the law, *Neh.* 13. 1. *Deut.* 23. 3. & 7. 3. *Exod.* 23. 32. of which more is to be seen in the first Part of this *Review*, sect. 25. So that those *Ezr.* 9. 2. are termed *the holy seed*, not barely by Covenant upon the parents faith, nor as all *visible professors*, as Dr. *Hammond*, in his *Defence of Infant Baptism*, pag. 78. but as begotten by an *Israelite* on an allowed wife by the law of *Moses*.

Mr. *B.* proceeds. *Of that in* Deut. 29. *I have formerly spoke enough. It is called a Covenant. All Israel with their little ones did enter the Covenant and the oath with God, and which he made to them. It was a Covenant* [*to establish them for a people to himself, and that he may be to them a God, as he had before said and sworn.*] *It is a Covenant made even with them that stood not there, whether it be meant onely of the successive Israelites* (*and then it is not a transeunt Covenant*) *or of all people whoever that will accept of the same terms* (*and then it's not proper to Israel.*) *It's a Covenant not made to them as meer Israelites: but as obedient to the Covenant terms, and Covenant breaking would cut them off*, v. 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26. *Is not Churchmembership contained in* [*Gods being their God, and taking them for his people thus in Covenant?*] *Doth not the promise give them an established right in this blessing? Is all this then no promise, but a transeunt fact?*

Answ. What hath been spoken of *Deut.* 29. by Mr. *B.* in the Dispute at *Bewdley*, and in his Book of *Baptism*, *part* 1. *ch.* 14 & 17. and his *Corrective*, *sect.* 5. will be examined in that which follows. For present, 1. it is sufficient to shew the impertinency of this Text, to prove that there the Covenant or promise of God upon condition of parents faith is the sole efficient of infants visible Churchmembership, in that the Covenant being then put, even with the children unborn, *v.* 15. yea and the parents then believing, yet the children unborn could not be then visible Churchmembers, as Mr. *B.* himself grants *of Baptism*, pag. 250. *They that were not, could not be members visible or invisible.* For the sole efficient cause being actually put (as the Covenant and the parents believing are, *Deut.* 29. even according to Mr. *B.*) the effect must be in act: but it is not so in the unborn, therefore the Covenant and parents faith are not the sole efficient. 2. The Oath or Covenant of God is a distinct act from his establishing them for a people unto himself, and being a God to them, which are the consequent upon it, and

are by transeunt acts consequent upon the Covenant. So that though the Covenant give a right to a blessing, yet it doth not make actually visible Church-members without some other transeunt fact consequent upon it. The Covenant assures a future existence, but supposeth a present absence of the thing covenanted, and consequently without a further act consequent on it makes not any in present being visible Church-members. So that as yet I find no Text of Scripture setting down the law and ordinance of infants visible Church-membership by Gods promise upon parents faith or dedication commanded as the sole efficient unrepealed. Let's view the rest.

*Deut.*30.19. saith he, *there is a law and promise* [*choose life, that thou and thy seed may live.*] *This is the same Covenant which* Asa *caused the people to enter,* 2 Chron.15. *and if there had been no law for it, there would have been no penalty, and then he would not have made it death to withdraw. It is the same Covenant which* Josiah *caused the people to enter,* 2 Kin.23.2,3. 2 Chron.34.31,32. *Of* Levit.25.41,54,55. *I have spoken elsewhere, and of some other Texts.*

Answ. 1. There is a law and promise *Deut.*30 19. but not such as Mr. *B.* asserts as the sole efficient of infants visible Church-membership. The life there is not visible Church-membership, but a prosperous being in *Canaan,* v.20. And the distinction between [*thou and thy seed*] proves that *Deut.*29.12. [*thou*] notes *the Captains, Elders, Officers, men of Israel,* v.10. distinct from *the little ones, wives, strangers,* v.11. though represented by them, and that my speech so much exagitated by Mr. *B.* of *Baptism,* p.57,249, was justifiable. 2. The Covenants, 2 *Chron.*15. & 34.31,32. 2 *Kin.*23.2,3. of *Asa* and *Josiah* were Covenants of *Israel* to God, there's no mention of Gods promise or Covenant to them as then made, and therefore it is not that whereby infants are made visible Church-members according to Mr. *B.* and so is impertinent to the point in hand. 3. The futility of Mr. *Bs.* argument from *Levit.*25.41,54,55. is shewed in the 2d. *part* of this *Review,* sect 14. It follows in Mr. *B.*

The second Commandment, Exod.20.5,6. Deut.5.9,10. *I think is a law, and containeth a promise or præmiant part, wherein he promiseth to shew mercy to the generations or children of them that love him and keep his Commandments: of which I have also spoken elsewhere, to which I refer you. I see no reason to doubt but here is a standing promise, and discovery of Gods resolution, concerning the children of all that love him, whether Jews or Gentiles, to whom this Commandment belongs: nor to doubt whether this mercy imply Church-membership: And that this is fetcht from the very gracious nature of God, I find in his proclaiming his Name to* Moses, *Exod.*34.6,7.

Answ. If this mercy here imply Church-membership to the infants of them that love him to a thousand generations, then it implies it to all the infants in the world, which cannot be true without such limitations as take away the certainty of any infants Church-membership existent. But there is nothing to prove that this mercy must be Church-membership, or that it must be to all the children of them that love God

God, and are obedient, or that it must be to them in infancy, ſith it may be true of other mercies, as preſervation, proviſion, *&c.* to ſome onely, ſith the ſpeech is indefinite in a matter not neceſſary, and thoſe perſons at age, and loving God as their anceſtors, without which the promiſe is not made good; and therefore Mr. *B.* had occaſion enough to doubt whether this mercy implies viſible Churchmemberſhip of all infants of viſible profeſſors or true believers, yea, he had cauſe to aſſure himſelf that it doth not, ſith then it were not true in thouſands of *Noahs*, *Abrahams*, and other holy mens poſterity. Wherefore all things conſidered, I incline to conceive this a promiſe of temporal bleſſings, chiefly to the Iſraelites, to whom God intailed mercies more then to other people; and if it be extended to higher mercies, and to other people, yet with reſervation to himſelf of his free election, not without conditions and limitations as the event and other Scriptures make neceſſary to be included, which will make it unſerviceable for Mr. *Bs.* purpoſe.

He adds. *In* Pſal. 102. 28. *It is a general promiſe* [*the children of thy ſervants ſhall continue, and their ſeed ſhall be eſtabliſhed before thee.*] *Its uſual in the Old Teſtament to expreſs Gods favour by temporal bleſſings, more then in the Goſpel; but yet ſtill they ſecure us of his favour. As* [*I will not fail thee, nor forſake thee,*] *might ſecure* Joſhua *more then us of temporal ſucceſſes, and yet not more of Gods never failing favour.*

Anſw. The words are not a promiſe of God, for they are directed to God, as the expreſſions [*thy ſervants, before thee,*] beſides what is ſaid before, *v.* 24, 25, 26, 27. ſhew, and therefore are not of the ſame rank with Gods words to *Joſhua*, *Joſh.* 1. 5. yet they expreſs ſuch aſſurance as came either from a promiſe or a prophetical inſtinct. But whether the promiſe were general, or particular to ſome; whether of temporal, or eternal bleſſings, is uncertain. The occaſion ſeems to intimate this ſenſe, From thy continuance, though we be now very low, yet we aſſure our ſelves that thou wilt not utterly cut off our children, but that thou wilt raiſe them up, notwithſtanding our preſent deſolations and captivity, or thou wilt re-ingraff them (if meant of the converſion of the Jews to Chriſt, as hath been conceived) and they ſhall continue either here as thy people a long time, or be thine for ever upon their calling again. Either way, though they may intimate Gods favour, yet not general to all his ſervants children, but to the Jews; nor to them do they intimate infant viſible Churchmemberſhip, or to any other, but ſuch a ſtability of their poſterity in Gods favour, and their obedience as is quite different from meer infant viſible Churchmemberſhip, and may be without it.

Yet again ſaith Mr. *B.* *There is a ſtable promiſe to all Gods people in general that have children,* Pſal. 103. 17. [*But the mercy of the Lord is from everlaſting to everlaſting upon them that fear him, and his righteouſneſs unto childrens children.*] *And to be ſecured by promiſe of Gods mercy and righteouſneſs is the ſtate of none without the Church.*

Anſw. The promiſe muſt be underſtood of ſo many and ſuch mercy

and righteousness as that it may be true. But it is not true of all the children of them that fears God, that they are visible Churchmembers, surely not of abortives and still-born children; nor that they are partakers of saving mercy and righteousness, for *Ishmael*, *Esau*, &c. were not so: And therefore it must be understood of such temporal mercies, and so indefinitely as may agree to some out of the Church, to whom God often shews mercy and righteousness of performing promises of preservation, increase, &c. which he shews not to others for their parents sake.

And, saith Mr. B. *if they were all to be kept out of the Church, I scarce think that* [*children would be called an heritage of the Lord, and the fruit of the womb his reward,*] Psal. 127. 3. *nor the man happy that hath his quiver full of them. Nor would the sucking children be called as part of the solemn assembly to the humiliation*, Joel 2. 16. 2 Chron. 20. 13.

Answ. Children may be *an heritage of the Lord, and his reward*, though they be not visible Churchmembers, as the land of *Canaan* was *an heritage*, *Psal.* 135. 12. and he may be happy that hath many of them, with that happiness which is mentioned in the forepart of the 15th. *v.* of *Psal.* 144. though they be no Churchmembers: And yet the infants of the *Israelites* I acknowledge were members of that Church or people, and that the Psalmist speaks of them. And so do the Texts, *Joel* 2. 16. 2 *Chron.* 20. 13. though the assembling of them do no more prove them visible Churchmembers, then the cloathing of beasts with sackcloth, *Jonah* 3. 7, 8. doth prove the beasts Churchmembers, it being usual in such national fears and humiliations to have all whatsoever to be among the mourners, whether Churchmembers or not; as the men of *Tyre* were forced by *Nehemiah*, ch. 13. 19. to rest on the Sabbath.

Mr. B. adds. "There is a standing promise to all the just, *Prov.* "20. 7. [*The just man walketh in his integrity, his children are blessed af-* "*ter him.*] There is no sort of men without the Church that is pro- "nounced blessed in Scripture. A blessed people are Gods people, "and those are the Church separated from the cursed world. One "lower blessing will not denominate a man or society, a blessed man "or society.

Answ. It is a standing promise or observation: But that all his children are blessed, or that they are visible Churchmembers, much less that there is a promise or law that all visible Churchmembers infants should be visible Churchmembers cannot be thence inferred. That without the Church a person is pronounced blessed is apparent from *Ishmaels* blessing, *Gen.* 17. 20, 21. when he was excluded the Covenant and cast out.

Yet more saith Mr. B. "If it were a good argument then, *Deut.* "4. 37. [*because he loved thy fathers, therefore he chose their seed after* "*them,*] then it is good still as to favour in general. So *Deut.* 10. "15. *Psal.* 69. 36. *Prov.* 11. 21. *The seed of the righteous shall be de-* "*livered.*

Answ. It is no good argument, Because God loving the fathers of the *Israelites* chose their seed after them, therefore he chooseth the seed

of

of every righteous man to be his people, or that he sheweth favour to them. The contrary is manifest in *Lot*, *Job*, and others, whose posterity God shewed not favour as he did to the posterity of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, whereof the former is termed *Gods friend*, *James* 2.23. and it is certain from *Rom.* 9.4,5. & 11.28. that God did and will shew them that favour that he never did nor will shew to the posterity of any the most godly persons of other nations. What is said, *Psal.*69.36. is said onely of the obedient *Israelites*; and if it be extended to others, it can be meant onely of those that love the Name of God, and therefore makes nothing for the visible Churchmembership of infants of believers either by profession or real. Whether it be read, delivereth himself, as *Junius*, or shall be delivered, it is neither universally true, as is manifest in the posterity of *David*, *Josiah*, and others; nor is any whit to the point of infants visible Churchmembership, which may be without it, and that may be without it. Nor is Mr. *Bs.* inference good, *In Psal.*37.26. *there is a general promise to, or declaration of the righteous, that* [*his seed is blessed,*] *and then they are Churchmembers*: For the Text neither speaks generally of any righteous man, but of him that *is mercifull and lendeth*, and the *v.* before sheweth it plainly to be meant of outward blessing, as in freedome from extream want of bread, and the like, which must have its limitations that it may be true; there's not a word of their infant visible Churchmembership.

There's yet a reserve of Mr. *B.* which he thus marshals. "In *Isa.* "61.8,9. it is promised I think of Gospel times [*I will make an ever-* "*lasting Covenant with them, and their seed shall be known among the* "*Gentiles, and their off-spring among the people: all that see them shall ac-* "*knowledge them, that they are the seed which the Lord hath blessed.* And "cap.62.12. *They shall call them the holy people, the redeemed of the Lord:* "*and thou shalt be called, sought out, a city not forsaken.*] Gospel pro- "mises then extend to [people and cities,] whereof infants are a part. "*Isa.*65.23. [*they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their off-* "*spring with them.*] This is plain, and full, and durable.

Answ. Be it so, yet is it all impertinent to Mr. *Bs.* purpose. If *Isai* 61. 8, 9. be a promise of a thing to be fulfilled in Gospel times, yet it cannot be meant of infants, sith it is affirmed that *the seed shall be known among the Gentiles*, that is, saith Mr. *Gattaker* in his *Annot.* *They shall so grow and multiply, thrive and prosper, that they shall become very conspicuous*, Matth. 5. 14, 16. *and that it shall evidently appear to all that see them, that there goeth a blessing of God along with them*, Acts 5. 13. Which are spoken of the Apostles and their preaching, not of infants and their Churchmembership, *Isai* 62. 12. *is said of* Zion *and* Jerusalem, *v.* 1. 11. and is thus by Mr. *Gattaker* in his *Annot.* paraphrased. *And men shall call them* (*to wit* Sions *sons or those that belong to her, and shall now again people her*, vers. 5.) *The holy people, the redeemed of the Lord*] *Such as God by rescuing and delivering them out of the hands of so powerful adversaries, in so strange a manner, hath shewed that he owneth for his. Sought out*] *or, sought unto, or sought after, as one had in high estimation and regard; whom out of respect and regard men repair and resort unto.*

to. See *Psal.* 112. 2. *Contrary to that which was formerly said of thee in the time of thy low and dejected estate*, Jer. 30. 17. *A City not forsaken*] *as she seemed to be formerly in the time of her captivity. See v.* 4. Which shews these things are meant of the Jews safety and honour after their return from captivity, not of infants visible Churchmembership under the Gospel. Yet if it were a prophesie of the Gospel times, it followes not infants shall be visible Churchmembers because Cities comprehend infants. For in the Gospel sense, Nation, House, City, comprehend onely believers, and not infants of believers, as such, as appears from these and other texts. *Gal.* 6. 10. *Ephes.* 2. 18, 19. 1 *Pet.* 2. 5, 9. *Isa.* 65. 23. is a prophesie of the welfare of the Jews after their return from captivity, as *v.* 21, 22. before shew, and the meaning is as Mr. *Gataker*, *Diodati* and others expound it, they shall not bring forth children as formerly to be consumed by war, pestilence and such evils, because Gods blessing, which makes rich, healthy, safe, prosperous, is with them and their children: which sense is quite wide from Mr. *Bs.* conceit of a law of infants visible Churchmembership in the time of the Gospel.

He yet adds, *what is necessary to be said in answer to the common objections, as* [*that experience tels us all the seed of the righteous are not blessed*] *with the like, I suppose already done in my Book of Baptism. All the seed of the righteous are blessed, though not all with that blessing which cannot be lost and cast away by themselves when they come to age.*

Answ. What is said in his Book of Baptism, will be examined when I come to it. For present it is but Mr. *Bs.* dictate that all the seed of the righteous are blessed, the indefiniteness of the Scripture expressions the matter being contingent, experience and the Apostles exposition of the promise *Gen.* 17. 7. *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. are against it; yet if it were true, it followes not it must be visible Churchmembership, it might be some other blessing, of which God hath store, yea it is certain it cannot be visible Churchmembership, sith abortives and still born infants, though the seed of the righteous, are never so blessed, and the children of the *holy seed Ezra* 9. 2. begotten on prohibited women were to bee cast out of the Jewish Church.

Mr. *B.* adds, *If you say that the word* [*seed*] *doth not necessarily include infants. I answer, infants are part of the seed of the righteous, yea all their seed are first infants. If therefore God have made general promises as to age and person, who is he that dare limit it, without just proof that indeed God hath limited it? Doth God say, that the seed of the righteous are not blessed till they come to age? If he pronounce the seed blessed they must be blessed, when they are first such a seed: And if any one age might be more included then another, one would think it must bee that wherein they are so meerly the seed of such as that they stand not on any distinct account of their own actual faith or unbelief. For the seed of the righteous, as such, have a promised blessing: But the seed of the righteous turning themselves to unrighteousness, do turn from that blessing, and become accursed.*

Answ. Mr. *B.* not holding children in the womb unborn to be visible Churchmembers all this may be retorted, they are part of the seed of the righteous, all their seed are such, how dare then Mr. *B.* limit the general

general promises to infants born? The seed is blessed, and so must be visible Churchmembers when they are first such a seed, which is as soon as they are conceived in the womb, then they stand not on any distinct account of their own actual faith or unbelief. What Mr. B. replies to this will answer himself. However I deny that without just proof it is to be so limited I limit the promises, that if God pronounce the seed blessed, they must be blessed when they are first such a seed, for then if the blessing be justification, glorification, they must be justified, glorified, afore they believe, or are obedient, which Mr. B. condemns in Antinomians. And if infants stand not on any distinct account of their own actual faith, they are not Christian visible Churchmembers, for all such are in their own persons first believers. Nor is it true that the seed of the righteous as such (taking it reduplicatively) have a promised blessing. For then all and onely such should have it, and at all times, the contrary is manifest in *Cham*, *Esau*, &c. Mr. B. concludes.

I suppose I have already been more tedious then you expected: I will therefore add no more of these passages of Scripture, having said that which satisfieth me formerly to the same purpose, and having yet seen nothing that leaves me unsatisfied. And also because one text either containing such a Law or Covenant as you call for, or declaring to us that God did make such a Law or Covenant, is as good as a thousand in point of authority.

Answ. It is true Mr. B. hath been more tedious then was fit, considering the impertinencie of his allegations, yet not much more then I expected, knowing it to be his course especially in this controversie, to heap many texts impertinently. That he is satisfied with his former writings, especially after the answering of the chief parts by me and others, shews either his injudiciousness or his heedlesness, or unwillingness through prejudice to see his errour. That there is not one text for his purpose brought in his Letter to me, is made manifest by this answer, the rest shall be examined after the answer to the remainder of his Letter if God permit.

SECT. LXII.

Mr. Bs. 9th. *and* 10th. Qu. *about the repealableness and repeal of his imagined Law of infants visible Churchmembership, and his eight additionals are answered.*

"THe next Qu. *saith he*, that I should speak to is, whether these "Laws, or Covenants, or promises, are capible of a revocation, or "repeal? And I shall take this for a question that needs no further de- "bate, among men that know what a Law or Promise is. Gods immu- "tability and perfection may make some laws unrepealable, while "the subject remains: but otherwise the thing it selfe is capable of it. "Onely where a promise or law is but for a limited time, when the time "is expired it ceaseth, and the cessation is as to the nulling of it, equal

"to

"to a revocation or abrogation. I put in this queſtion, leſt you ſhould "hereafter change your minde and ſay, that indeed it is a law, or pro- "miſe, or covenant, by which the right of Churchmembership is con- "ferred, and infants dedicated to God: but it is but a tranſeunt law or "covenant.] *Anſw.* If ſo then it is either immediately or preſently "tranſeunt, or at a certain limited time onely, when it will ceaſe. The "former is certainly falſe and intollerable. For 1. they are promiſes "and laws for the future, and therefore ceaſe not immediately. 2. That "were to make God the moſt unfaithful promiſer and mutable Law- "maker in the world, if his promiſe and his lawes ceaſe as ſoon as they "are made. Nay it makes them to be no lawes or promiſes. 3. It was "one ſtanding law and promiſe that belonged to the Nation of the "Jewes ſucceſſively. And God did not make his promiſe anew to eve- "ry infant that was made a Churchmember, nor renew his law to eve- "ry parent to enter their Children into his Covenant by the ſigne of "Circumciſion. Were not the circumciſed *Iſraelites* in the Wilderneſs "made members by the efficacy of the former Covenant of God remain- "ing in force. And did former Laws oblige to Circumciſion till Chriſt? "Elſe there were but few members, nor but few that circumciſed war- "rantably, if the promiſe and precept did extend but to the perſon that "it was firſt delivered to, and every one elſe muſt likewiſe have a per- "ſonal promiſe and precept. The mother of Chriſt cannot then be pro- "ved to have been a Churchmember in infancy. If it be ſaid that theſe "promiſes were limited in the making of them, to a certain time when "they were to ceaſe, I ſay when that's proved we ſhall believe it, which "I have not yet ſeen done.

Anſw. The occaſion of this queſtion I conceive to have been the words in my ſecond Letter, [Wherefore I ſtill preſs you that you would ſhew me where that law, ordinance, ſtatute or decree of God is, that is repealable, that is, which may in congruous ſenſe be either by a later act ſaid to be repealed or elſe to be eſtabliſhed as a law for ever.] The reaſon of my ſpeech was, becauſe I perceived by his former Letter, Mr. *B.* made his law unrepealed to be by promiſe and precept. Now though I conceived a precept might in congruous ſenſe be ſaid to be repealed, yet I conceived a promiſe (which it ſeems is the law he means) not in congruous ſenſe repealable. For though a promiſe be a law to the promiſer, yet I know not how congruouſly it ſhould be repealed. 'Tis true, the act of promiſing being tranſeunt ceaſeth, but that cannot be repealed; that which is done, cannot be *infectum*, not done. The obligation of the promiſe may ceaſe, if it were limited to a certain time, and that expired; or if it were upon condition, and that fails; or to a perſon not exiſtent, or of a thing not feaſible, or unlawfull: The former is not by repeal, but by expiration, which Mr. *Cawdrey* doth diſtinguiſh from repeal and ſubſtitution, *Of the Sabbath, part* 1. *ch.* 2. & *part* 3. *ch.* 3. The later are not by repeal of the promiſe (for it ſtands in force as much as ever, (but by accident through intervenient impediments there is for preſent an intermiſſion of the obligation. Repeal properly is by an after declaration, which cannot be congruouſly ſaid

of

of God, that he did promiſe indeed ſuch a thing, but now he will not promiſe it, or will not ſtand to his promiſe, it were to make God fickle, and unfaithful. And therefore I expected a Law of Precept to make infants viſible Churchmembers, to bee aſſigned by Mr. *B.* for mee to prove repealed, and not a law of promiſe, which is not in congruous ſenſe repealable, and therefore a repeal properly ſo called not to be expected of me. Which being rightly conceived anſwers this queſtion, and ſaves me the reply to what he ſaith, to prevent an imaginary change of my minde and aſſertion not yet delivered.

He adds. "And it falls in with the laſt queſtion, which is, whether "theſe promiſes be indeed revoked and ceaſed, and theſe laws repealed "or ceaſed. And here it is that I have long expected your ſolid proof, "together with the ſatisfactory anſwer to my arguments to the contra-"ry. And ſo I ſhall leave this task in your hands. Sure I am that Chriſt "never came to caſt out of the Church, but to gather more in: much "leſs to caſt out all the infants, even all of that age in which himſelf "was head of that Church: But to gather together in one the children "of God that were ſcattered, *Joh* 11. 52. And therefore he would oft "have gathered all *Jeruſalem* and *Judæa*, even the national Church "that then was unto himſelf, as the true head, even as a hen gathereth "her chickens under her wings, and they would not. It was not becauſe "he would not (as intending a new frame, where infants could have no "place) but becauſe they would not, and ſo caſt out themſelves and "their infants. Certainly it is the joy of the formerly deſolate Gen-"tiles, that they ſhall have many more children then ſhe that had an "husband, and not fewer, *Gal.* 4. 25, 26, 27. And we as *Iſaac* are chil-"dren of the promiſe, even that promiſe which extended to the infants "with the parents. *Gal.* 4. 28.

Anſw. I have examined all that Mr. *B.* ſaith in his anſwer to the 8th. queſtion, and do profeſs that I finde no promiſe, no not in *Gen.* 3. 15. of infants viſible Churchmemberſhip, or any precept but that of circumciſion, *Gen.* 17. which Mr. *B.* confeſſeth to be repealed in reſpect of the outward act, and for the dedicating of a childe to God by prayer to God to ſanctifie it, or vow to bring it up for God if God give life, *&c.* or adjuration that they ſhould cleave to God left in writing, or any other way upon record, I ſtill allow it, and ſo need prove no repeal. So that in truth I ſee no reaſon Mr. *B.* ſhould expect that I ſhould perform his task, of proving a repeal of that which is not, but that he ſhould make good the task I impoſe on him to prove ſuch a law or ordinance of infants viſible Churchmemberſhip by promiſe or precept unrepealed, which I expect to be done at latter Lammas; And to his confident ſpeeches I reply. Sure I am from *Luk.* 2. 34. *Joh.* 9. 39. that *Jeſus Chriſt* came that many of the Jewiſh Church might be left or caſt out of his Church, from *Matth.* 28. 19. and other places before alledged, that he intended to leave all infants out of his viſible Church ſince his comming in the fleſh, though he were an infant head of the Church, that though he *died to gather together in one the children of God that were ſcattered abroad*, Joh. 11. 52. yet hee intended not to gather them into a viſible

Church national comprehending infants, that he preached not to any infants, nor by his Disciples baptised any of them, that it is false which Mr. *B.* saith, that *he would oft have gathered all Jerusalem and Judæa, even the national Church that then was, unto himself as the true head, as his visible Church*, from *Matth.* 28. 19. *Mark* 16. 15, 16. and the course he, *John Baptist*, and the Apostles followed, that he did intend a new frame of his Church visible, where infants could have no place, that *Hierusalem* which is above, the Covenant of the Gospel had more children in the Gentile Churches then the Covenant of the Law in the Jewish Church, though infants were not visible members in the Christian Church as they were in the Jewish; that the promise meant *Gal* 4. 28. is not a promise to a believer and his natural seed of visible Church-membership, much less to every visible professour and his seed, but *a promise of righteousness and blessing, and the spirit through the faith of Jesus Christ upon all them that believe*, as is plain from *Gal.* 3. 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16, 18, 21, 22, 29. But Mr. *B.* hath yet more work for me.

"Before I end, *saith he*, I shall be bold to put two or three que-
"stions to you out of your last Letter. *Qu* 1. *whether the circumcised servants of Israel sold away to another nation, and so separated from the Civil State of Israel, did* eo nomine *cease to be Churchmembers, though they forsook not God? And so of the infants if they were sold in infancy? If you affirm it, then prove it. If you deny it, then infants might bee Churchmembers that were not of the Commonwealth.*

Answ. Such servants and infants were members of the Jewish Commonwealth, as they were of the Church, in right undoubtedly, in fact if they owned the Jews God and *Moses* Laws, and submitted to the Senate of Elders, so far as they knew and could be permitted, if they did not, though they forsook not God, yet they were neither of the Jewish Church, nor Commonwealth, as *Cornelius*, *Acts* 10th, was not of the Jewish Church or policy. None was of right of the Jewish Church, who was not of the Commonwealth; even then when they were violently held under a forraign power (as when they were under the *Chaldean Persian, Greek* and *Roman* Empires) they did submit to both though with much reluctancy.

Qu. 2. *If (as you say) it was on the Jews rejection of Christ that they were broken off from being Gods people, were those thousands of Jews that believed in Christ so broken off, or not, who continued successively a famous Church at Hierusalem, which came to be a Patriarchal seat. Whether then were not the children of the Disciples and all believing Jewes Churchmembers in infancy? If no, then it was somewhat else then unbelief that broke them off.*

Answ. The believing Jews were not broken off from the people of God, but from the Jewish people or Church national which rejected Christ: these believing Jews continued a famous Church after some time of publishing the Gospel and the Jews prosecuting the faith, separated from the Jewish Church, not having infants Churchmembers, and they were broken off from the Jewish Church national not by unbelief, but by faith in Christ to which they did adhere, and could not bee con-

joyned to the Jewish Church without rejection of Christ. Mr. B. addes.

If yea, then Qu. 3. *whether it be credible that he who came not to cast out Jews, but to bring in Gentiles, breaking down the partition wall, and making of two one Church, would have such a Linsey woolsy Church of party colours, or several forms: so as that the Church at Hierusalem should have infant members, and the Church at Rome should have none. Jews infants should be members and not Gentiles.*

Answ. Christ came to cast out the unbelieving Jews, not from the Jewish Church national, they continued still in it, but from the invisible Church of true believers which was in that nation, to which was joyned the Gentile Church of true believers, which were all of one sort, whether at *Rome* or *Hierusalem*, to wit, all that had *one spirit, one faith, one baptism*; not one infant in the visible Church Christian either at *Rome* or *Hierusalem*.

Qu. 4. *If unbelief brake them, will not repentance graff them in? And so should every repenting believing Jews infants be Churchmembers?*

Answ. Faith and repentance will ingraff every penitent believer into the Church invisible, the profession thereof will ingraff them into the visible Church, but not their infants, though the believer bee a Jew.

Qu. 5. *was not Christs Church before his incarnation spiritual, and gathered in a spiritual way?*

Answ. The invisible was, the visible Jewish national was not.

Qu. 6. *How prove you that it was a blemish to the old frame, that infants were members? or that Christs Church then and now are of two frames in regard of the subjects age?*

Answ. I say not that it was a blemish, but that it was a more imperfect state of the Church then in that and other regards. The later question is answered Sect. 50, 51, 52. before.

Qu. 7. *In what regard is the new frame better'd by casting out infants which were in the old?*

Answ. By leaving out infants and taking in onely believers, the Church is more spiritual.

Qu. 8. *whether any Jew at age was a member of the old Church without professing faith (in the Articles necessary to salvation) repentance and obedience? And wherein the supposed new call and frame doth in this differ from the old; save onely that a more full and express revelation of Christ, requireth a more full express faith?*

Answ. The former question is somewhat difficult, it being hard to determine what Articles were necessary to salvation, which is a question so hard, that I should not be unwilling to learn of Mr. B. This I can onely say, that I know not what profession each Jew did make, or was to make. I find a confession injoyned *Deut.* 26. and imprecation *ch.* 27. I finde idolaters, blasphemers, and some others adjudged to death, yet I finde not in the times of mal-administration of *Moses* Laws, that idolaters, and such great sinners were cast out of the Church, but were members of it. The later is answered before often enough.

Mr. B. tels me. *You may see the words near the end of your Letter that occasion the 7. last questions, and towards the middle that occasioneth the first. As for your motion of my fully describing the priviledges of Churchmembers, I shall add no more at this time to what is already elsewhere said of it.*

Answ. I knew Mr. B. so well, that I expected I should have questions enow, though I desired onely a few Texts, its his vain to multiply questions which might be omitted, and serve to weary the reader and respondent, and for advantage to himself to insult on his antagonist, though without cause. But how ill he deals with me in writing so many sheets about questions taken from my words, when I desired onely a line or two about his texts, and how ill he deals with me and the reader, who will not distinctly shew me the priviledges of his visible Churchmembership, the denial of which he makes so hainous, and from which he argues so much, I leave to the considerable Reader to judge. But Mr. B. is yet more severe to me, after all my work in answering him, I must be corrected ere I be dismissed.

SECT. LXIII.

Mr. Bs. ten Calumniatory questions, and Conclusion of his Letter, are answered.

"AND now (*saith he*) I have gone thus far with you, in an enquiry "into the truth, *I* entreat you be not too much offended with me, "if *I* conclude with a few applicatory questions to your self. Q. 1. Is it "not an undertaking as palpably absurd as most ever any learned sober "Divine in the world was guilty of, to maintain that [infants were vi- "sible Churchmembers not by any promise or precept, but by a tran- "seunt fact, and that there was no law or ordinance determining it "should be so, but onely a fact of God, which is a transeunt thing not "repealable?]

Answ. I am resolved not to be angry with Mr. *Bs.* interrogatories he ministers to me, imagining he doth it like an Ordinary *in salutem animæ*, though *I* pitty him that takes so much on him as thus magisterially to censure what he does not, or will not understand, presuming perhaps he may take on him to determine as an irrefragable Doctor, after so much magnifying of his writings by learned and unlearned ones. But to his question *I* answer negatively, and return it back to him: is it not an undertaking palpably absurd, to make visible Churchmembership to be a right to a benefit by Gods promise as the sole efficient, and anothers faith as the condition?

"But, *saith he*, either by this fact you mean Legislation and Cove- "nant making, or not: if you do: what a saying is it that infants were "made Churchmembers not by Covenant, but by a Covenant-making, "not by a Law, but by a Law-making. If not; either you must say, that

"God

"God makes duty without any law, and gives right to the benefit with-
"out any promise, or Covenant-grant as the cause; or else, that it is no
"benefit to have right to Churchmembership, and no duty to enter in-
"to that relation, and to accept of that benefit, and to bee devoted to
"God. Which ever of these wayes you chuse (and one you must chuse,
"or change your opinion) hath the world heard of any more unreaso-
"nable and ridiculous, or else more unbeseeming a Divine, from a lear-
"ned sober man of that profession? Pardon the high charge: Let the
"indifferent ju. ge.

Answ. That *I* need chuse none of the wayes hee mentions, nor change my opinion, is amply shewed Sect. 55. this high charge would have been left out had he more sobriety and humility. I look upon it and overlook it as ridiculous and contemptible, and go on.

Qu. 2. *Is it not a great disgrace to all your followers, that they will be led so far into such ways of Schism, and be so confident that they are righter and wiser then others, and that by such unreasonable arguings and shifts as these, which one would think any man should laugh at that knows what a law, promise, or Covenant is? And do you not prove, that it is not because of the evidence of truth, but by your meer interest or confident words, these people are changed and held to your opinion? Do they know what* [*a transeunt fact is, that without law or Covenant makes Churchmembers?*] *I say, do they know this? which no man that ever breathed till now, nor ever man will know again? And do you not proclaim them men of distempered consciences, that dare go on in such a Schism, on the encouragement of such fancies as were hatcht so long after their perversion, and never waking man I think did before so solemnly maintain.*]

Answ, Ne sævi magne sacerdos. The followers of me in the point of Baptism are not led by shifts, but the plain word of God, *Matth.* 28.19. *Mark* 16.16. *Acts* 2.38. & 8.37. from which Mr. *Bs.* dream of a law or ordinance of infants visible Churchmembership unrepealed, his conceit of infants discipleship mediate by the faith of the parent, is too silly a conceit to draw an intelligent man that will examine it, specially when they have so plain Scripture proof for their warrant, as the institution of Christ and practise of the Apostles, which they follow without Schism, endeavouring a reformation of that great corruption of infant Baptism, which hath been very pernicious to the Church of God. If any Schism have been, a great cause hath been in Mr. *Bs.* virulent charges of the truth, as if it were a damnable errour accursed of God, and his followers violent opposition (of which *Bewdley* hath had sad experience) of men for doing their duty in being baptized after profession of faith, and breaking bread together, though convinced by Mr. *Bs.* own arguing in his Book *of Baptism*, pag. 342. that it should be so. And if in this point they conceive themselves righter and wiser then others, they are not to be blamed, having the plain word of God as interpreted even by Pædobaptists themselves, yea almost all Commentaries, for their warrant. And truly though I delight not in recriminations, yet I may justly retort Mr. *Bs.* words. Is it not a great disgrace to all Mr. *Bs.* followers, that they will be led so far into such ways

of

of Schism as Mr. *B.* leads them into, who would have none to have pastoral charge with publick pay, that will not admit to the Lords Supper the baby sprinkled, that inveighs against Baptism of believers now used as if it were murther and adultery, that represents them that deny infant Baptism in the most odious way he can to the world, and is so confident that he is wiser and righter then others, and that by such unreasonable arguings and shifts as these, a law and ordinance of infants visible Churchmembership by promise and precept unrepealed no where extant, a discipleship by the parents faith mediately without any learning of their own, which one would think any man should laugh at that knows what visible Churchmembership, or Discipleship is? And doth he not prove, that it is not because of the evidence of truth, but by his meer interest or confident word, the people of *Kederminster*, *Bewdley*, and elsewhere, are changed from the truth of the Scripture made known to them, and held to his opinion? Do they know what an ordinance or law of infants visible Churchmembership and mediate Discipleship is, which I find not any man vented afore Mr. *B* And doth he not proclaim them men of distempered consciences, that dare go on in such a Schism as Mr. *B.* and with him many persons are brought into by him from me, and the baptized in *Bewdley* and elsewhere, on the encouragement of such fancies as were hatcht so lately, and never waking man I think did before Mr. *B.* so solemnly maintain?

Qu. 3. *Is it not a desperate undertaking, and dare you adventure on it, to justifie all the world before Christs incarnation except the Jews, from the guilt of not dedicating their children to God, to take him to be their God, and themselves to be his people? Yea, to justifie all Jews against this charge, that should neglect or refuse to engage their children to God in Covenant as members of his Church? And doth not he that saith there is no law, say there is no transgression?*

Answ. He doth: But Mr. *B.* should remember there is a law against bearing false witness against his neighbour, which he much urgeth against Mr. *Eyre* and others; but himself is deeply guilty of it in his high charges, and particularly in this, that I justifie all Jews neglecting to engage their children to God in covenant as members of his Church, and all the world not dedicating their children to God. Let him prove either, if he can; if not, let him tremble at his desperate undertaking to uphold his lie of infant Churchmembership and Baptism by such lies as these, and fear the fate of liars. What I hold, may be seen in that which goes before.

Qu. 4 *Dare you yet justifie also at the Bar of God, all the world since Christs incarnation from the guilt of sin, in not dedicating their children to Christ and entering them into his Covenant as members of his Church? Dare you maintain that all the world is sinless in this respect?*

Answ. I dare justifie the non-baptizing them, and am assured Mr. *B.* cannot justifie the baptizing of infant children.

Qu. 5. *Have you well considered of the fruit of your way apparent in England and Ireland at this day? Or have you not seen enough to make*

you

you suspect and fear whether indeed God own your way or not? And is it any wonder if posterity be left in controversie about the History of former times, when you can venture, even in these times when the persons are living in our company, to tell me that [you think I am misinformed that they are Anabaptists, and you think that there are very few of them that were ever baptized,] when of many that we know, and multitudes that we hear of, there are so few that were not before against infant Baptism, and the Seekers first such, and when the Quakers themselves commonly cry down infant Baptism; and it is one of the questions that they send to me, and others to answer, [how we can prove it by expreſs Scripture without consequences, or else confeſs ourselves false Prophets.

Answ. My ways in opposing infant Baptism, and endeavouring to restore believers Baptism, are such (setting aside my infirmities) as upon consideration I find cause not to be ashamed of, but to rejoyce in, and conceive by many evidences that God owns them. What fruit of them in *England* and *Ireland* they have had, I do not very well know; if they that are termed Anabaptists do hold unjustifiable positions or practises, they are not the fruit of my ways, any more then the *Nicolaitans*, *Gnosticks*, and others ways, were the fruits of the Apostles preaching. My conscience beareth me witness, and so will the people where I have taught, the brethren with whom I have walked yea, I think some of my Antagonists, with whom I have acted in the publick imployment of approving Preachers, and perhaps the most eminent persons in *England*, that I have opposed the errours risen, and have sought reformation without separation, have joyned upon all occasions in the common cause with dissenters; insomuch that I had hoped impudence it self would never have dared so to belie me, as to make Schism, Quakerism, and such like evils the fruit of my ways. If many rents and errours have sprung up by accident after my writings, they are no more to be charged on me, then Antinomianism, Swenckfieldianism, *&c.* were to be charged on *Luther*; or Brownism, Familism, *&c.* on the Antiprelatists. What I wrote to Mr. *B.* I think still, yea, Mr. *Bs.* own relations confirm me, they are not Anabaptists, though they be against infant baptism. Those very persons, or some of that society which sent to Mr. *B.* (if my intelligence do not deceive) though they they were against infant baptism, yet neglected baptism when convinced of it as their duty, and they might have been baptized; and as it was foretold them they were likely to be without the opportunity, so it came to pass, for they were after carried away with the deluſion of the *quakers*. It is not my observation alone, but it is the Authors conceit who wrote the book against them termed *The quakers blazing star*, who was carried away once by them, that the living above ordinances and as *Seekers* hath been one of the chief ways which hath brought it in, God justly leaving them to be deluded by Satan who would not submit to the way of Gods ordinances; and he adviseth persons, as to labour to be well grounded in faith and repentance, so to joyn in Church communion (of which he takes the Churches of the baptized to be most right, and accordingly hath himself been joyned by Baptism to them) as the best preservative against

againſt it. For my part, I think Mr. *Bs.* and other Miniſters maintaining infant Baptiſm do give moſt advantage and encouragement to them, both to inveigh againſt them as men that will not yeeld to truth, but teach a manifeſt errour, and therefore not to be heard; and then Mr. *Saltmarſh* and others deluſions about water baptiſm as now ceaſed, living in the ſpirit, expectation of it, no true Miniſtry now without the ſpirit as the Apoſtles had, and ſuch like conceits driving them off from the Churches of the baptized, they are caught by thoſe emiſſaries from *Rome*, and other agents of Satan, with that Diveliſh deluſion, God juſtly ſuffering Satan to delude them with lies, *becauſe they received not the love of the truth that they might be ſaved*, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 10. So that I have as much cauſe to think *quakeriſm* the fruit of Mr. *Bs.* ways as of mine own. Nor will it be any wonder if poſterity be left in controverſie about the Hiſtory of former times, when ſuch a one as Mr. *B.* ſhall continue to load me with falſe accuſations, with which I have many wayes ſhewed my ſelf not chargeable; and not onely he, but alſo Mr. *Robert Baillee* in his *Diſſuaſives*, Mr. *Edwards* in his *Gangrena's*, and others ſhall in Engliſh and Latine heap ſo many untruths on godly perſons becauſe diſſenters, while they lived to ſhew the falſity of them.

Qu 6. "Have you felt the guilt which we too ſtrongly fear you "have incurred of the perverting of ſo many ſouls, opening them ſuch "a gap to ſchiſm, contempt of the Miniſtry and Apoſtacy, deſtroying "a hopefull reformation that coſt ſo dear: or weakening our hands in "the work, and filling the adverſaries mouths with ſcorn, enticing the "Jeſuites and Friars to ſeem your proſelytes, and liſt themſelves among "you, as the hopefull party to befriend their cauſe, hardning thou-"ſands both of the Papiſts and profane, and ſetling them again on "their dregs, when many once began to ſhake! O what a Church "might we have had, and were likely to have had? had it not been "for the Separatiſts and you? And what a lamentable confuſion "are we now brought into by theſe? Have theſe things toucht your "heart.

Anſw. How far theſe things have toucht my heart, I muſt give an account to God my Judge, and not to Mr. *B.* who with his fraternity I perceive would paſs a heavy doom on mee, and ſcarce award me a place in earth or heaven: And no marvel, if I were ſo pernicious an inſtrument as he deſcribes me. But may I not require Mr. *B.* to ſhew me by what actions I have done any of theſe things? Is Mr. *B.* allowed to accuſe in generals, and not to inſtance in particulars? may he without control accuſe and not prove? May he have liberty, as in a Chancery bill hath been wont, to put in all he can imagine, whether true or falſe? Is not this the manner of *quakers* and ſcolds? Are my anſwers often made of no avail to clear my ſelf, but that Mr, *B.* will ſtill be imputing that to me, which my writings and courſes do abſolve me from? No marvel Dr. *Owen* ſaid of him, *Appendix* to his *Vindic. Evang.* pag. 5. *A man that doth not know him as I do, would by his writings take him to be* immitis & immiſericors, *a very* Achilles, *that will not pardon a man in his*

grave;

grave, but will take him up and cut him in a thousand pieces. I tell Mr. *B.* plainly, it is not my doctrine but Mr. *Bs.* which perverts souls, I mean his doctrine of Baptism and Churchmembership, besides his other errours; that neither my doctrine nor practise open a gap to Schism, but tend to the contrary, unity of Baptism being one of the bonds of Christians, *Ephes.* 4. 4. the restoring of which is the regular way to union: Mr. *B.* by his violent opposing it and the assertors of it, doth really open a gap to Schism, I open no gap to contempt of the Ministry, but they themselves do it by opposing truth, and other wayes, Apostacy from Christ or godliness is no fruit of my doing, but is rather caused by those that urge persons to renounce the right Baptism and Communion of the baptised, of which I fear Mr. *B.* is guilty. A right reformation according to Gods word, cannot be while infant Baptism continues, in seeking to destroy it I promote reformation, Mr. *B.* by maintaining it destroyes reformation, and by proposals shews his inclination to persecution, which if I hinder I rejoyce. I weaken not Mr. *Bs.* hands in preaching the Gospel, but strengthen them, if I enervate his errour I am glad; he hath most unbrotherlike endeavoured to weaken my hands, and to stop my mouth. I fill not adversaries mouths with scorn of him, but he hath thrown as much dirt as hee could on me, in his writings. I entice not Jesuites and Friers, and if they creep in among those of our judgement, is it any more then *Jude v.* 4. speaks of in his time? Can Mr. *B.* say they are not among his party? I harden no Papists, but shew their bottome errour, nor prophane persons, but take the right way to undeceive them; they that maintain their infant Baptism, settle them on their dregs, I mean their carnal presumption, by which they take themselves to bee Christians without knowledge of Christ. The Church that was likely to have been Mr. *Bs.* way, may be discerned by the Elders, by the *Scottish Church*, Mr. *Bs.* Church at *Kederminster*, the associated Ministers in *Worcestershire* and their Churches. Confusion is too great, for want of restoring Christs order, more would be if Mr. *Bs.* way were imposed, and no small oppression on tender consciences and dissenting brethren. I may say, oh what a Church might wee have had, if it had not been for Mr. *B.* and other such violent Pædobaptists as he is, opposing Christs way.

Qu. 7. *Is* [*a transeunt fact, making infants Churchmembers without Law, promise, or Covenant*] *a sufficient* medium *to encourage you to venture on all these horrid things, and run such hazards as you have done? or is it possible that an humble sober man, and a tender conscience, durst make all this havock, and stand out in it, so many years considerately as you have done, and this upon such a palpably unreasonable pretence: when you should prove to us the revocation of infants Churchmembership, to tell us that they had it onely by a transeunt fact? Is this a safe ground to build so great a weight on? Sir, my conscience witnesseth, that it is not your reproach that is the end of speaking these unpleasing words to you, but some compassion on you (do not scorn it) and more on your poor followers; and most on the Church of God which you have so much injured and troubled.*

Answ. I venture on no such horrid things, nor run such hazards as

Mr. *B.* imagines, not is the transeunt fact that I build on, but Christs institution *Matth.* 28. 19. though that transeunt fact I assigne is sufficient for the purpose I alledge it, and I cross interrogate Mr. *B.* Is it possible that an humble sober man, and a tender conscience, should make such foul work as he hath done by his writings, upon such a palpably unreasonable pretence, as a Law of infants visible Churchmembership, by promise and precept unrepealed, no where extant, and a mediate Discipleship hatch't in his brain? My reproach is a small matter, did it not tend to darken the truth *I* should neglect it, nor should *I* have answered these questions so fully, had not these things been imparted to the Preacher and others at *Bewdley*, ere they came to my hands. Though my reproach were not *finis operantis*, yet must it needs be *finis operis*. *I* thank Mr. *B.* for his compassion on me and my followers, *I* have the like on him and his followers. *I* do not scorn his compassion, but pitty his prejudice and pertinacy. If *I* have injured and troubled the Church my Antagonists have compelled me, the Lord knowes *I* had not a resolution to print, till the Assembly neglected the matter, and determined against me and the truth unheard. That *I* have injured the Church by printing I believe not, It is certain Mr. *B.* hath extreamly injured me and the truth, and troubled the Church of God, by printing his Book of *Baptism*. I should not have peace in my conscience did *I* not endeavour to detect his and other Pædobaptists fallacies, which *I* crave liberty to do, and shall easily pass by personal reproaches.

Qu. 8. *Can you prove that ever there was one age, or Church (particular) on earth since* Adam *till about* 200. *years ago, that the Anabaptists rose, wherein infants were not* de facto *taken for members of the Church? If you can do it: Let's hear your proof.*

Answ. I can, and for proof look back to Sect. 50, 51, 52, 57. besides *Constantin*, *Augustin*, mentioned by Mr. *B.* p. 329. *Nazianzen*, *Hierom*, &c., unbaptized though of Christian parents till adult.

Qu. 9. *Can you bring us proof of any one infant of true Churchmembers, that was not rightfully a Churchmember himself from the creation till Christs dayes? or from the creation till this day? except the Anabaptists, who reject the benefit; whose case (as I said before) I will not presume to determine?*

Answ. I can, for proof look back to Sect. 50, 51, 52, 57.

Qu. 10. *Seing that infants have been* de facto *Churchmembers from the creation to this day (as far as any records can lead us) is it likely that the Lord, and head and all-sufficient Governour of his Church, would have permitted his Church till now to be actually made up of such subjects, as in regard of age he disallowed? and suffer his Church to be wrong framed till now? Or is it a reasonable, modest and lawful undertaking, to go about now in the end of the world to make God a new framed Church, as to the age of the subjects? And is it not more modest and safe, to live quietly in a Church of that frame as all the Saints in heaven lived in, till the other day, as a few Anabaptists with vile and sinful means, and miserable success, did attempt an alteration?*

Answ. This question ariseth from these suppositions, 1. that infants have

have been *de facto* Churchmembers from the creation to this day. 2. That all the Saints in heaven lived in a Church that had infants visible Churchmembers till less then 200. years ago. 3. That the Anabaptists in *Germany* in less then 200. years attempted the alteration first of of leaving infants out of the visible Church. 4. That they did it with vile and sinful meanes and miserable success. The first of these is not true, as is shewed in the fore-going Sections, chiefly those in which the 8th. question of this Letter of Mr. *B.* is answered, the second is shewed to be false Sect. 52. wherein it is proved the Apostles lived in a Church that had not infants. The third is false, for both Christ altered it, and when the corruption of infant Baptism had overspread the Western Churches, many besides the late Anabaptists, as *Petrus de Bruis* and many other Saints in heaven did alter it. The fourth is in part false, For *I* think the Anabaptists so called, did not alter infant visible Churchmembership with vile and sinful means, but some of them (not all) did by vile and sinful means seek to set up a temporal dominion of the Saints (as *I* fear some now called *Quinto-monarchians* do) which is not to be imputed to all that are of the same way in point of discipline and ordinances, and that though this thing of erecting a temporal dominion had miserable success, yet the restoring of Baptism hath had success as other reformations, as of the *Waldenses*, *Hussites*, *Non conformists* and others, who though by clamours of Preachers, and violence of Princes, they have been for a time suppressed, yet a remnant have been preserved, who have in time revived, and we hope notwithstanding all the clamours, accusations, and practises, used to corrupt & suppress them, will spread & grow up through the blesing of God. And to Mr. *Bs.* questions I answer, my aim is not to erect a new framed Church to God, but to reduce it to the frame Christ and his Apostles left it in, though it were after some ages altered by the corruption of infant Baptism, which had its original from the gross errour that by it Gods grace was given, and otherwise the infants should perish. And though in that Church, who were for infant Baptism many were Saints now in heaven, yet it is not safe to continue that errour, any more then to continue the errour of infant Communion now by Papists and Protestants rejected, though it were many hundreds of yeares practised in the same Churches. And sure *I* wonder if he condemn mee for seeking reformation of infant Baptism, how Mr. *B.* could justifie himself for not living quietly in the Church of *England*, as it was under the Prelates, though there were among them in that Church Saints now living in heaven, but seeking the reformation of discipline and ceremonies of humane invention, though greater troubles followed thereon, then I think hath followed this reformation *I* endeavour, and then *I* hope ever will. Surely if the way I take, and propound, and prosecute were followed, the reformation would be easie and safe, and that it is not followed, will be laid to the charge of Mr. *B.* and other Pædobaptists as their sin, nor can all his or their wit bee able to cleer them from it, nor from the guilt of breaking their solemn Covenant to endeavour the reformation of these Churches according to Gods word. Hee concludes,

Sir pardon the weakneſs, and bear with the plainneſs and freeneſs of Your faithful Brother (though not as is meet) Rich. Baxter. May 14. 1655.

Anſw. I pray the Lord to pardon Mr. *Bs.* violent and clamourous, though *I* hope not wilful oppoſing of the truth, and I love him not the worſe for his plain dealing, yet cannot patiently bear his falſhoods, wherein he accuſeth the truth and ſervants of the living God, and by ſhewing him his errours, and evil dealing, have endeavoured to acquit my ſelf as his faithful brother, as was meet, however he hath been, or ſhall be towards me affected.

He adds after, "Sir, if you have any thing of moment to ſay, in "reply to theſe, which you have not yet in your writings brought "forth, I ſhall bee willing to conſider of it: But if you have not, "I pray you tell me ſo in two words, and ſpare the reſt of your pains "(as for me) and trouble mee no more with matters of this nature. "For truly *I* have no ſufficient vacancy from greater works. Yea, *I* am "conſtrained to forbear much greater then theſe. *R. B.* After this, he "tels me, That whereas I preached a Sermon at *Bewdley*, in which "I refuted by many arguments infants viſible Churchmemberſhip, *I* "muſt be either mutable or hypocritical, if *I* deny ſuch a law and or-"dinance which *I* took on me then to refute, and deſires a Copy "of that Sermon, that hee may ſhew the ſad miſtakes and vanity of "thoſe my arguments.

To which *I* anſwer, 1. *I* refuted Mr. *Bs.* law of infants viſible Churchmemberſhip, as a thing pretended, not as a thing real, and ſo am neither mutable nor hypocritical, in denying ſuch a law. 2. *I* have no delight in Mr. *Bs.* writings of this ſubject, unleſs there were more ingenuity and ſolidity in them, then *I* yet finde, and therefore am willing to gratifie him with no more of my manuſcripts in this kinde. 3. As for the Copy of my *Sermon* he hath the matter of it with enlargement in the 50, 51, and 52. Section of this Book, which when he anſwers, *fragili querens illidere dentem offendet ſolido.* 4. What *I* had more to ſay then *I* have printed, he may perceive by my Books, and however Mr. *B.* conceives, yet *I* conceive that the reformation or confirmation of infant Baptiſm, is a matter of as great moment as the things Mr. *B.* is intentive on. However, hee might have anſwered my Letter without any of this trouble hee hath put himſelf to: But ſith hee choſe this way, *I* have thought it neceſſary to make this reply, and ſo to go on to the examining the reſt of his Book, not yet examined by me at large, though there be little which is not anſwered in this and other parts before.

SECT. LXIIII.

My Answer in the Dispute and Sermon to the argument of Mr. B. *of Baptism, part* 1. *ch.* 6. *about the non-repeal of infants Churchmembership, because neither in justice nor mercy, is vindicated.*

PLain Scripture proof, &c. *part* 1. *ch.* 6. Mr B. speaks thus. "My first "argument is this. If God have repealed this ordinance, and revo- "ked this merciſull gift of infants Churchmembership, then it is either "in mercy, or in juſtice; either for their good, or for their hurt. But "he hath neither repealed it in mercy for their good, nor in juſtice for "their hurt: therefore he hath not at all repealed it. I will hide no- "thing from you that Mr. *T.* hath ſaid againſt this argument, either in "our publick Diſpute, or in his Sermon. The ſufficiency of the enu- "meration in the *major* propoſition, he never offered to deny: nor "indeed is there any ground to deny it. It muſt needs be for the good "or hurt of infants that they are put out; and ſo muſt needs be in "mercy or juſtice, For God maketh not ſuch great alterations in "his Church and Laws, to no end, and of no moment, but in meer in- "differency.

Anſw. In the Diſpute at *Bewdley, Jan.* 1. 1649. and the *Sermon* ſhortly after, I did not underſtand Mr. *Bs.* opinion as I do now; nor did afore the writing of his laſt Letter, conceive of his law and ordinance of viſible Churchmembership what it was, and where it was to be found; nor do I yet conceive clearly what the benefit and priviledge is to infants by their viſible Churchmembership which he aſſerts. And therefore if I gave not ſo clear an anſwer to this argument as were requiſite, it is to be imputed partly to the unacquaintedneſs with it at that time, partly to Mr. *Bs.* artifice, who carried himſelf cloſe in the Diſpute for indirect advantage, and ſtill is unwilling to ſhew his mind fully, though deſired by me in the Letter before ſet down. What is his opinion about the law unrepealed, is conſidered before; what he imagines are the priviledges and benefit of his infants viſible Churchmembers, ſeems to be intimated in theſe paſſages of his Letter in the 4th. *qu.* ſet down here, *ſect.* 55. when he ſaith, *I ſuppoſe you will not deny that it was a benefit to be the covenanted people of God, to have the Lord engaged to be their God, and to take them for his people, to be brought ſo near him, and to be ſeparated from the common and unclean, from the world, and from the ſtrangers to the Covenant of promiſes, that live as without God in the world, and without hope.* In another paſſage, ſet down Sect. 56. *To be a member of the Church, is to be a member of a ſociety taking God in Chriſt to be their God, and taken by him for his ſpecial people. The act which makes each member is of the ſame nature with that which makes the ſociety. The relation then eſſentially containeth* 1. *a right to the great benefits of Gods ſovereignty over men, Chriſts headſhip, and*

that

that favour, protection, provision, and other blessings which are due from such a powerfull and gracious a Soveraign to such subjects, and from such a head to his members: As also a right to my station in the body, and to the inseparable benefits thereof. Which how false they are, is in part shewed above. He likewise expresseth the leaving infants out of the visible Church Christian, as if it were a casting out, excommunicating, by a punitive execution of a curse or law on them, *ch.* 5 *part* 1. of *plain Scripture proof, &c.* wherein how he is mistaken is shewed above. These things being premised, I say, that if Mr. *B.* understand by [*mercy*] remunerative mercy, and by [*justice*] punitive justice (as he seems to do,) I deny the *major*. And to his reasons I answer; 1. Simply, and of it self, the non-visible Churchmembership of infants imports neither hurt nor good to them: But by accident, in that their visible Churchmembership in the Church of the Hebrews obliged them to Circumcision and the yoke of the Law, so it imports hurt to them. 2. If it did import hurt or good to them, yet it might be neither by an act of remunerative mercy, nor punitive justice, that they are left out of the Church; but by an act of meer Soveraignty, as it is in election and reprobation, and in the disposing of the Gospel where God pleaseth. 3. God hath his ends in this alteration, as to shew his freeness, his intent to have his visible Church more spiritual then the Jewish, *&c.* though not to shew his remunerative mercy or avenging justice. 4. It is not in meer indifferency, but of moment to these ends that hee doth so.

Mr. *B.* proceeds thus. *The minor I prove in both parts.* 1. *That God hath not repealed this to their hurt in justice, I prove thus: If God never revoke his mercies, nor repeal his ordinances in justice to the parties hurt, till they first break Covenant with him, and so procure it by their own desert; then he hath not in justice revoked this mercy to the hurt of those that never broke Covenant with him: But it is certain that God never revoketh a mercy in justice to the hurt of any that never broke Covenant with him, therefore to such he hath not so revoked it.*

Answ. Gods revoking mercies in justice to the parties hurt, is sometimes without the particular persons breaking Covenant with him, or his desert. Are not the infants of *Adam* deprived of life in justice to their hurt, without their breaking Covenant with God, or their personal desert? Are not many infants and others deprived of the preaching of the Gospel, who yet are descended from faithfull ancestors who never brake Covenant with God, onely for that the nation of which they are a part, are over-run by barbarous people, they carried away captive, they and their children made slaves? Do not these things happen to the most godly Saints? Doth not *Solomon* tell us, *Eccles.* 9. 2. *that all things come alike to all?* Doth not the Apostle tell us, *Rom.* 9. 11, 12. *For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to the election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth, it was said to Rebecca, the elder shall serve the younger; As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated:* whence *v.* 18. he infers, *therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy,*

mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth? And again, *Rom.* 11.33. after he had considered the various ways of Gods dealing with Jews and Gentiles, he thus concludes, *O the depth of the riches both of the wisdome and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgements, and his paths past finding out!* From whence, and from innumerable experiments of thousands of godly Greeks whose children are taken from them and made Turks, and others, I may safely deny the *minor* of Mr. *Bs.* argument, which he saith *is certain*, as being most certainly false, and like the arguing of the Disciples, *John* 9 2. which Christ refuted *v.* 3. concerning the man who was born blind.

But Mr. *B.* goes on to prove it thus. *That this is a mercy, and of the Covenant, is plain*, Deut. 29,10,11,12. *and frequently past denial.*

Answ. That the visible Churchmembership of infants in the Jewish national Church was a mercy, its not denied; but that it was such a mercy as Mr. *B.* makes it above, *to contain essentially a right to the great benefits of Gods soveraignty over men, Christs headship, and that favour, protection, provision, and other blessings, which are due from so powerfull and gracious a Soveraign to such subjects, and from such a head to his members*, is neither true, nor proved from *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12,13. where the being a God to them doth not necessarily include all these benefits; nor if it did, do it ascribe them to their visible Churchmembership, but to their obedience to his laws, implied in the phrase *that he may establish thee for a people to himself; that is*, saith *Piscator* in his *Scholie on the place, That he may require worship from thee by obedience towards his precepts, and so may bind thee to himself:* Which sense the rest of *Moses* his speech in that and the following chapter shew, and consequently they presuppose not onely their Covenant with God, and their visible Churchmembership, but also their keeping the law so far as the blessings were legal, and their belief and obedience to the Gospel so far as they are Evangelical.

2. Saith Mr. *B. That God doth not in justice revoke such to any but Covenant breakers, I prove briefly thus.* 1. *From the mercifull nature and constant dealings of God, who never casteth off those that cast not off him.*

Answ. 1. Mr. *B.* doth most vainly intimate them to be cast off by God who are not visible Churchmembers, which if true, it would prove that all infants dying in the womb are cast off by God, with many more, who are not visible Churchmembers, and yet are blessed persons. 2. For Gods mercifull nature, it doth not hinder but that God may cast off them who cast not off him, sith his mercifull nature doth not act as a natural agent, but as a free agent; and he hath resolved us, *Exod.* 33. 19. *Rom.* 9.15. *I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion*, even then when he proclaimed his Name to be gracious and mercifull. 3. It is false, as hath been before proved, that the constant dealings of God are such, as that he never casteth off those that cast not him off.

2. Saith Mr. *B. From his truth and faithfulness: For else we should make God the Covenant breaker, and not man; which is horrid blasphemy.*

Answ.

Answ. This argument indeed were good if God had made this Covenant with men, That whoever of them believe in Christ, their infant children should be Churchmembers visible in his Church Jewish or Catholick. But there was never such a Covenant made by God, and therefore though he alters the frame of the Church, so as to leave out infants of beleivers from being visible members, he breaks no Covenant.

3. Saith he, *From the immutability and constancy of God: His gifts and calling are without repentance.*

Answ. God is indeed immutable and constant in his being and promises, and his gifts of election, foreknowledge, effectual calling, meant *Rom.* 11. 29. as *v.* 28, 27, 26, 7, 5, 2, shew, are without repentance, *Rom.* 8. 30. *Rom.* 9. 6. But the gift of visible Churchmembership is not such, even according to Mr. *B. Cain* was a visible Churchmember, yet cast off, with many more. Many a believers child is in infancy taken from him and made a Mahometan, so as that he never is a visible Christian, and yet God is unchangeable, and his gifts meant *Rom.* 11. 29. without repentance.

4. Saith he, *Scripture frequently layeth all the cause of all evil of suffering upon mans sinning*, Mic. 1. 5. Hos. 13. 9.

Answ. 1. He supposeth, but proveth not, that the non-visible Churchmembership Christian of infants is an evil of suffering, which I deny. 2. It is false that the Scripture ever layeth all the cause of all the evil of suffering upon the mans sinning, who suffereth; the contrary is manifest in the death of infants by *Adams* sin, *Rom.* 5. 12. 3. Some sufferings our Lord Christ denies to be from the special sin of children or parents, *John* 9. 3, 4. The Texts alledged prove not Mr. *Bs.* proposition; the former proves onely the destruction of *Samaria* and *Jerusalem* to be for their Idolatry, the other proves the same to have been the fate of *Israel* for the same sin, but neither Mr. *Bs.* universal proposition. So that hitherto Mr. *B.* hath proved nothing.

He applies his unproved dictates thus. *Now you know there were many Jews that did believe, and did not forsake the Covenant of God, even most of the Apostles themselves, and many thousands more: Now how then can these or their infants be put out of the Church in justice to their hurt, who did not first break Covenant with God?*

Answ. 1. God may in justice do it, because he is a Soveraign Lord who is no debtor to any, *Rom.* 11. 34, 35, 36. 2. God may in justice do it for the parents sins some ages before, or the national sin of the Jews in rejecting Christ might be a just cause for God to break off all infants Churchmembership, being onely a consequent of the taking the *Hebrew* nation for his people, though some parents believed, in common punishments and changes the obedience of some few not exempting them and theirs from them; as in the *Babylonish* captivity, it happened for *Manasseh* his sin, notwithstanding *Josiahs* reformation, 2 *Kings* 23. 26.

Mr. *B.* goes on. "I am brief in this, because Mr. *T.* doth not deny it. But that which he answereth is, that [*It is in mercy for their good.*]

"good.] I prove the contrary plainly thus. It can be no mercy to take "away a mercy, except it be to give a greater in the ſtead of it: But "here is no greater mercy given to infants in the ſtead of Churchmem- "berſhip; therefore it can be no mercy to them that it be revoked. "The *major* Mr. *T.* doth not deny, and I will fully tell you all that he "ſaith to the *minor*. 1. In his Diſpute he anſwered, that Churchmem- "berſhip of infants was revoked in mercy for their good; and that they "had a greater mercy in ſtead of it: And what do you think is that "greater mercy? Why, it is Chriſt come in the fleſh. I confeſs it "amazeth me to ſee the power of errour, how it can both at once be- "reave the underſtanding of ordinary light, and the conſcience of ten- "derneſs, or one of theſe at leaſt. Is it poſſible that the judgement "of ſuch a man as Mr. *T.* can take this for a ſatisfactory anſwer, or "his conſcience give him leave to deny Churchmemberſhip to all "infants in the world, and to raiſe a Schiſme in a poor diſtreſſed "Church; and to charge their own bloud on the heads of his peo- "ple that yeeld not to him, and all upon ſuch lamentable grounds "as theſe?

Anſw. 1. I deny that now which I did not deny in the Diſpute, neither underſtanding whereto Mr. *Bs.* argument tended, nor what his opinion was in the matter of his argument, nor having competent time to conſider his words. 2. I was ſomewhat amazed at firſt reading at Mr. *Bs.* dealing with me, who had ſo good an opinion of his godlineſs and tenderneſs of conſciences, and his pretences of friendlineſs, that if a man had ſworn to me, before he printed, that he would have thus abu- ſed and accuſed me ſo falſly, I ſhould not have believed it. But I ſee no hopes of any juſtice from ſuch an intemperate Zelot for his opinion, nor any right underſtanding of me, or any thing I ſay or do, from one ſo prejudiced, ſuperficial, in his conſideration of things, yet peremp- tory, and raſh in his determinations, as Mr. *B.* is. Suppoſe I had an- ſwered them as weakly as Mr. *B.* imagines I did, yet a little experience might have told him, that it might have commen from other cauſes then the power of errour, bereaving at once my underſtanding of ordinary light, and my conſcience of tenderneſs. Such cenſures, if there were no more, ſhew Mr. *B.* was carried with intemperate heat in his wri- ting, a thing which certainly corrupts a mans judgement, and *male ve- rum examinat omnis corruptus Judex*. To his accuſations I anſwer, It is falſe that *I* deny Churchmemberſhip to all the infants in the world, that I raiſe a Schiſm in a poor diſtreſſed Church, that I threten thoſe that yeeld not to me and all upon the grounds he mentions, which yet are not lamentable any otherwiſe then becauſe they are no better heed- ed. But to the argument. The *major* I ſhall conſider anon; the *minor* is that which is under preſent conſideration, which I deny, and avow what I then anſwered, with this explication and amplification. Infants viſible Churchmemberſhip was onely in the *Hebrew* nation. The end of God was in taking that nation to be his viſible people, that there might be a fixed nation among whom and from whom Chriſt ſhould be born. To that end he would have them diſtinguiſhed from other peo-

ple by Circumcision, by laws, &c. He would have their Tribes distinguished, their inheritances fixed, their genealogie certain; this was the benefit of that nation, the honour and mercy to the infants and others, and God took it away after Christs comming as being useless, it being to usher it in, I mean the whole ordering of the *Hebrew* Churchmembership; and it was a greater mercy to the Church of God, and thereby to the infants, who had their Churchmembership onely a mercy before by consequence as a part of that people, without any feeling or enjoyment of it till they came to riper age: And this was a greater mercy then their former membership, 1. in that they were freed from the yoke of the Law; 2. Christ who was promised was a known person, and revealed and accomplished the will of God concerning the salvation of his people. Let's view Mr. *Bs.* refutation.

It Saith he. *Was it ever heard before from the mouth of man, that Christ succeeded churchmembership, as a thing that was to give place for him? Doth Christ cast any out of the Church, onely that he may succeed them? Can he prove that their churchmembership was a type of Christ, that must cease when he was come? why doth he not prove it then from some Scripture or reason? cannot we have a room in the body without being cast out at the comming of the head? Are the head and members at such odds, that one must give place, and be gone when the other comes? why then is not the churchmembership of men and women to give place to Christs comming in the flesh? Sure the nature of churchmembership is the same in both. why did the Apostles never speak of this among the types of Christ that did cease, that all infants are put out of the Church or family of God, that Christ may succeed as a greater mercy to them then their room in his Church and family? Is not here comfort (but by a silly comforter) to all the Jewes themselves? though they are broken off from the Church, yet Christ is a greater mercy to them in stead of it.*

Answ. Mr. *B.* keeps his wont of refuting me by frivolous questions and foolish scoffs, in stead of solid arguments. To them as they are, I return these answers. He himself *ch.* 30. saith, *The dedication of the first born was evidently a type of Christ and the Church under him*, and yet he can give no more Scripture or reason for it, then I can for this, that the Churchmembership of infants was but to endure till Christs comming in the flesh. To omit what I have already argued in the 50, 51, 52. *sections* before, in my apprehension the Apostle doth plainly teach, *Gal.* 3. 16. to the end, that the Churchmembership that was by the descent by natural birth from *Abraham*, continued onely till *faith came*, that is, till Christ was exhibited, and believed on as already come in the flesh, that now all are children of God, *Abrahams* seed by faith, that there is now no difference between Jew and Gentile, the Jews natural birth brings not him in the Church, nor the Gentiles uncircumcision excludes him; that so many as are admitted into the Church by Baptism do put on Christ, and consequently the Churchmembership by birth into the Jewish Church national now ceaseth, and there is no Churchmembership, but by faith in Christ. And this I might further confirm from *Gal.* 5. 6. *Col.* 2. 11, 12. & 3. 11. And to these Scriptures I add this reason,

ſon, The courſe that God took in ſevering the Jewiſh nation from other people, circumciſing the males, keeping the diſtinction of tribes, and the inheritances in the families, and the genealogies ſo exactly till Chriſt came, ordering the tax of *Auguſtus* at the time of Chriſts birth, and after his aſcenſion ſcattering the Jews out of their land, overturning their Commonwealth, confounding their pedigrees, taking to himſelf another Church in another way, by preaching the Goſpel, and baptizing believers, and none elſe; doth plainly evidence to me, that infants Churchmemberſhip was but an introduction, type, ſhadow, fore-runner to Chriſts manifeſtation in the fleſh, and to ceaſe as *John Baptiſts* office did when Chriſt was exhibited and fully manifeſted to the world. And accordingly Mr. *Bs.* queſtions are anſwered; the firſt, that it was heard of before, that upon the comming of Chriſt believers Churchmemberſhip was to ſucceed to birth-Churchmemberſhip: To the ſecond, that though Chriſt caſt not any out of the Church that he may ſucceed them, yet by his comming he alters Churchmemberſhip by birth into Churchmemberſhip by faith: The third and fourth are anſwered by ſetting down my apprehenſion, and the Scriptures and reaſon of it. The fifth I anſwer affirmatively, the ſixth negatively: The ſeventh, that men and women are not Churchmembers now by birth any more then infants, and in that reſpect the nature of Churchmemberſhip is the ſame in both: To the eighth, the Apoſtle did ſpeak of it, in the places before cited: To the ninth, *the ſilly comforter* knows no reaſon why the Jews broken off ſhould be comforted; but thinks it was matter of comfort to the believing Jews, that in ſtead of infants viſible Churchmemberſhip and their own ſtanding in the national Church Jewiſh, they had Chriſt manifeſted in the fleſh as a greater mercy, the body in ſtead of the ſhadow, the Sun riſen in ſtead of the Day-ſtar.

Mr. *B.* goes on thus. *But let us conſider a little what is the Church? Is it not the body of Chriſt? Even all the Church ſince* Adams *fall, and the making of a new Covenant is one body of Chriſt: Even the viſible Church is his viſible body, as* 1 Cor. 12. *and many Scriptures fully ſhew; therefore even the branches not bearing fruit are ſaid to be in him, that is, in his viſible body,* Joh. 14. 1, 2, 3. *Now doth Chriſt break off all infants from his body, that he may come in the fleſh to be a greater mercy to them? what's that, but to be a greater mercy then himſelf, who is the life, and welfare of the body?*

Anſw. The inviſible Church is all one body of Chriſt; the viſible hath had ſuch differences, that one part, to wit, thoſe *who feared God, and prayed continually, Acts* 10 2. yet had no communion with the other, but were counted unclean, and ſhunned becauſe uncircumciſed, *Acts* 11. 2, 3. The Church of the circumciſed, which was by natural birth, is now broken off upon Chriſts comming; and another Church by faith of all nations is raiſed; *Acts* 10. 34, 35. in which infants are not till they believe; who though they are of the inviſible Church or body of Chriſt by election, and inviſible operation of the ſpirit, yet are not of the viſible till they profeſs faith in Chriſt as already come in the fleſh, who was the great mercy promiſed to *Abraham, Joh.* 8. 56. in which he

rejoyced although a great part of his natural seed were broken off; and this was a greater mercy then was before exhibited, although then Christ was the life and welfare of the body.

Again, saith Mr. *B. it seems by this, Mr.* T. *thinks that excommunication is a great mercy: If all the Jews infants had been excommunicate or cast out of the Church by God himself, it were no more then Christ did in mercy, never bringing them into any other Church in stead.*

Answ. Nothing said by me gives any occasion to this imputation: Excommunication, if just, I count a curse; but the non taking of infants into the visible Church Christian hath nothing of a curse in it, it being onely an act of God according to his Soveraignty, who had liberty to appoint who should be of his Church, who not.

Against this strange fiction, saith Mr. *B. I argued thus: If ordinarily God shew not so great mercy to those out of the Church as to those in it, then it is not a greater mercy, or for the parties greater good to be put out, then to be in: But ordinarily God sheweth not so great mercy to those out of the Church as to those in it: Therefore it is not for their greater good, nor in greater mercy to be put out. To this Mr.* T. *answered nothing.*

Answ. What need I, when I grant the conclusion? Mr. *B.* makes a strange fiction of his own, as if I thought excommunication, to be cast out or put out of the Church, a great mercy; and held infants were excommunicated, cast or put out of the Church: Which is far from me, or any thing I say, who do not assert them put out by any judicial sentence, but by a free act of Gods soveraignty left out, for reasons best known to himself, but in part revealed to us.

Mr. *B.* adds. *I argued also thus: If those that are out of the Church since* Christ, *have no such promise or assurance of mercy from him, as those in the Church had before* Christ, *then it is not to them a great mercy to be out of the Church: But those out of the Church since* Christ, *have no such promise or assurance of mercy from him, as those in the Church had before* Christ: *therefore it cannot be to them a greater mercy. To this Mr.* T. *answered, that it is a greater mercy to infants since* Christ *to be out of the Church, then before to be in it; and that they have as much assurance of mercy from Christ now, as then, (he should say more.)*

Answ. This answer was right; infants now are in a better case, though not visible Christian churchmembers, then they were when in the Jewish Church, in which they were circumcised and obliged to *Moses* law; and they have as much assurance of mercy from Christ, to wit, righteousness and life as then; yea, more (though I need not say so in contradiction to Mr. *Bs. minor*) then before, sith Christs exhibition in the flesh is a greater assurance of saving mercy then was before.

To which, saith Mr. *B. I replied thus, If those infants which were in the Church before Christ, had God engaged in an oath and Covenant to be their God, and to take them for his peculiar people, and those infants out of the Church since Christ have no such thing; then they before Christ in the Church had more assurance of mercy then those out of the Church since Christ:*

But

But the former is true, as I proved out of Deut. 29. 10, 11, 12. *upon which text, what vain altercations there were, and what words were used against the expreß Letter of the text, you ſhall ſee in the relation of the Diſpute, if I be called to publiſh it.*

Anſw. For my part I ſhall not conſent that Mr. *B.* publiſh the relation of the Diſpute, having found his dealing ſo injurious to me in that which he hath already done, and his partiality towards his opinion and party. I have looked over two ſuch relations of the Diſpute as I could get, and I finde in them that I did deny the *minor*, and when Mr. *B.* alledged *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12. to prove it, I did diſtinguiſh of being God in reſpect of ſaving benefits, and thus God is engaged in Covenant to be God to infants now no viſible Churchmembers as he was then, to wit to the elect onely, or in reſpect of outward advantages, ſuch as were peculiar to the nation of the Jews, as that they ſhould poſſeſs *Canaan*, have Gods worſhip and preſence with them in a more ſpecial manner then other people, Chriſt to come out of that people, *&c.* as *Rom.* 9. 4, 5. the Apoſtle reckons them, and in this reſpect it was granted that infants in the Church before Chriſt had God ſo engaged, and that neither infants out of the Church Chriſtian, no nor believers in it, no nor all believers afore Chriſt, ſuch as *Cornelius* had God ſo engaged, and that in this reſpect the oath of God was meant, appeared from *v.* 13. which ſaith thus, *that he may eſtabliſh thee to day for a people unto himſelf, and that he may be unto thee a God as he hath ſaid unto thee, and as he hath ſworn unto thy Fathers, to* Abraham, *to* Iſaac, *and to* Jacob, which appears to be meant of their ſetling in *Canaan* and their proſperous ſtate there, as many places evince, where it is mentioned particularly *Gen.* 12. 7. *&* 13. 15. *&* 15. 8. *&* 17. 8. *&* 22. 17. *&* 26. 3. *&* 28. 13, 14. *Deut.* 34. 5, &c. beſides many other paſſages in the ſame ſpeech of *Moſes*, *Deut.* 29. 16, 21, 23, 24. 27. *Deut.* 30. 2, 5. 9, 10, 16, 18. and moſt evidently the concluſion of it *Deut.* 30. 20. From which paſſages it is as evident as the light, that the meaning *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12. was this, that God did bring into Covenant by *Moſes* (the chief ſtanding for the reſt) the whole nation of *Iſrael*, that they might for themſelves and their poſterity unborn binde them to obſerve the lawes of *Moſes* given in *Horeb*, and thereby be eſtabliſhed a people to God, and he might be a God to them in ſetling, keeping and proſpering them in *Canaan*, if they did obey. Now Mr. *B.* aſſerted that God did covenant with all the little ones and others there preſent, to be their God, and that in reſpect of ſpiritual benefits, and to that end, urged *Deut.* 30. 6. which he made conditional, and to other then the elect. Againſt which I urged, that [*to circumciſe the heart*] is the ſame with *writing Gods lawes in the heart Heb.* 8. 10. which Dr. *Twiß* rightly concludes to be abſolute and to the elect onely, and that to aſſert it to be conditional is *Pelagianiſm*, and I deſired the Auditors to take notice of Mr. *Bs.* aſſertion in that thing: I confeſs I had not time to collect and to produce the texts here mentioned (which was one reaſon why I was ſtild averſe from extemporary verbal diſputes) but this was the ſubſtance of *that altercation* which Mr. *B.* cals *vain*, and ſaith, *words were uſed againſt the expreß letter*

ter of the text. Concerning which, although I will not undertake to justifie all I then said, yet the answer I then gave I still avouch as right, and conceive Mr. Bs. assertion of circumcising the heart, to love the Lord, to belong to other then the elect, and to be conditional to be very erroneous, and refer the reader to Mr. Bs. own words in answer to Mr. Bedford in the *Friendly accommodation* pag. 361, 362. to discern the errour of it.

Mr. B. saith, *I further add out of Ephes.* 2. 12. *Those that were aliens to the Commonwealth of Israel, were strangers to the Covenant of promises, and without hope, and without God: and there is no Scripture speaketh of delivering any from this sad state but Churchmembers; therefore sure it can be no mercy to be put out of the Church.*

Answ. Though the conclusion were granted it hurts not me, who do not assert the putting infants out of the Church, who were in, but the not taking of them into the visible Church Christian. However the text speaks of the *Ephesians* who were *uncircumcised in the flesh* v. 11. but doth not say that all that were uncircumcised, or aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel, were without God in the world. For it is certain that *Cornelius* and many other Proselytes uncircumcised, were not without God in the world, and therefore persons might then have Christ, though not be visible Churchmembers; and if Mr. B. say, that none but visible members in the Christian Church have Christ, God, hope, he must damn all abortives and still born children of believers, and all those that are converted, (and shew it not as dumb persons) on their death-bed, or any other way, *in articulo mortis.*

Again, saith he, *God added to the Church such as should be saved: therefore to be cast or put out of the Church is no known way of mercy.*

Answ. The conclusion is granted, and yet the text proves not that all who are added to the Church shall be saved, or that all that shall be saved, are or shall be added to the Church visible.

Again, saith hee, *the Church is the family of Christ (even the visible Church is called the house of God* 1 Tim. 3. 15.) *But it is no known way of mercy to be out of Gods house and family.*

Answ. I grant it, and yet a person may be in Christs house, and a temple to him, and not a visible Churchmember.

Again, saith he, *the Church is the pillar and ground of Truth*; *therefore no mercy to be taken off it.*

Answ. I grant it, yet doubt whether the Church be termed so, 1 Tim. 3. 15. and not rather either *the mystery of Godliness* v. 16. as *Cameron de Eccles. c. de Eccles. durati, & de Eccl. Const.* or *Timothy* as *Gataker Cinni lib.* 2. *c.* 20.

Again, saith Mr. B. *the Church visible, is the visible body of Christ; but it is no mercy to be separated from Christs body.*

Answ. True, yet it may be a mercy in respect of the yoke of the law not to be in the visible Church Jewish, yea by accident it may be a mercy to be separated from a visible Church Christian as when the Church is tyrannous in its rule, or unsound in the doctrine taught to it.

Again, saith he, *the Church visible is Christs visible Kingdome*: But

it

it is no mercy to be out of Christs Kingdome; therefore it is no mercy to be out of the Church.

Answ. The same which was made to the former objection is to this.

Lastly, saith Mr. B. *Do but read all those hundred glorious things that are spoken of the City of God, all those high praises that are given to the Jewish Church, in* Deut. *and the* Psalms, *and all the Scriptures (who is like unto thee O Israel, &c.) And then read all the far more glorious things, that are spoken of the Gospel Church since Christ: And if after this you can still believe, that God did in mercy cast infants out of one Church and never take them into the other, and that Christ came in the flesh to put them out of the Church in mercy, as if he could fitlier save them out of his Church then in it; I say, if after reading the foresaid passages, you can believe this, for my part I give you up as forlorn, and look upon your understandings in this as forsaken by God, and not onely void of spiritual illumination, but common reason: and pray the Lord to save the understandings of all his people from such a plague, and to rescue yours before you go further.*

Answ. I say not that God did in mercy cast infants out of one Church, nor that Christ came in the flesh to put them out of the Church in mercy, as if he could fitlier save them out of his Church then in it; but that God never took them into his visible Church Christian, and that Christs comming in the flesh is a mercy recompensing the visible Churchmembership Jewish by birth, when God brake off that people from the olive for their unbelief, and that Christ can and doth as fitly save infants, though not in the visible Church Christian, as he did when they were in the visible Church Jewish, and yet fear not Mr. *Bs.* direful *omen* and sad despair of my understanding, but have as good hopes of mine and my followers understandings in this thing, as of Mr. *Bs* and his followers, and leave it to the intelligent to judge, whether we are void not onely of spiritual illumination, but common reason. I have read what is said of *Israel*, and yet think it a mercy now not to bee a visible Churchmember in it, no not though it were now as it was in the best state under *David*, *Solomon*, &c. And I conceive Mr. *B.* hath read many hundreds of as glorious things spoken of *Moses* Law as of the Church, and yet I think Mr. *B.* counts it a mercy now not to be under it. I finde the glorious things spoken of the Gospel Church since Christ, meant all or most of it, as it contains that part which is the invisible Church of true believers or elect persons. And I judge God hath dealt mercifully with infants, if he put them into the invisible Church, though hee put them not into the visible, if not, either their being in the visible benefits them not or aggravates their condemnation.

Mr. B. proceeds thus. "But let us see what Mr. *T.* answers to this in "his Sermon, which upon deliberation hee afterward preached to con-"fute my arguments, and therefore cannot lay the blame upon his un-"preparedness. And truly in my judgement he doth here plainly throw "down his weapons, and give up the whole cause (though not directly "confessing his errour: he is not yet so happy:) I were best give you his

" his own words, left I be thought to wrong him: they are these; [*As for those petty reasons, if it be done, it must bee in mercy or judgement, I say in mercy in respect of the whole Catholike Church; now* Christ *being come, and wee having a more spiritual churchstate then they had; their churchstate was more carnal and fleshly, and agreeable to their time of minority: It is in mercy that it is taken away. And as for that exception, It cannot be taken away in mercy, unless some priviledge be to them in stead of it; we answer, It is in mercy to the whole Church, though no priviledge be to them*] " So far Mr. *Ts.* words. I confess I never heard a cause more " plainly forsaken, except a man should say flatly, *I* have erred, or " I recant. 1. He much altereth the terms of my argument, as you may " see by it before. The argument is thus; It can be no mercy to any " to have a mercy taken away from them, except it be to give a greater " in its stead. But here is no greater mercy given to infants in stead of " Churchmembership; therefore it can be no mercy to them, that it be " revoked, or taken away. To call these [petty reasons] is the onely " strength of Mr. *T.* his answer. For I pray you mark. 1. Hee never " denied the major proposition [that it can be no mercy to any to have " a mercy taken from them, except they may have a greater in stead:] " He could not deny this with any shew of reason: For otherwise, If it " be a mercy meerly to deprive the creature of mercy, then wee shall " turn hell into heaven, and make it the greatest place of mercies, be- " cause none are deprived of mercy so much as they; no nor of this par- " ticular mercy: for none are further removed from being members of " the Church then the damned.

Answ. It is true finding the boastings concerning Mr. *Bs.* dispute *Janu.* 1, 1649. to be many, after my return from *Leimster* (to which place *I* was then designed and where I was *Janu.* 6.) *I* did though without any copy of the disputation or arguments in writing (which I could not obtain from Mr. *B.*) as well as my memory could bear them away, in the close of my Afternoons Sermon, *Jan.* 13. at *Bewdley*, recite and refute his arguments in the disputation. Wherein it is true *I* was somewhat more deliberate then in the dispute, yet for want of the arguments in writing, *I* could not then give so full and exact an answer to his arguments as had been requisite, nor perhaps shall now to this, because Mr. *B.* doth not plainly set down though requested by me, what that benefit, priviledge, or mercy is, which he conceives annexed to infants visible Churchmembership unrepealed. But that either *I* throw down my weapons or forsake my cause by my answer then to this argument, is but Mr. *Bs.* dream. Of what alteration there was of the terms of his argument he must bear the blame, who would not give me his arguments in writing under his own hand; nor am *I* to be blamed for drawing it so short, being fearful to wrong him by a fuller reciting. And *I* perceive *I* had great cause so to do, when *I* finde Mr. *B.* himself altering the terms of his own *major* in a few lines, in the former it is [*except it be to give a greater in its stead*] in the later [*except that they may have a greater in stead*] which are not the same. And for my answer. if my terming his arguments [petty reasonings] had been mine onely answer, yet it had

had been a good and sufficient answer, if this be granted (which I conceive an evident truth) that of Divine institution, (and such is this of visible Churchmembership) there is no reason can be right but what is from Gods own appointment, though it may seem right to us it should be so. Papists argue that if God did not make one œcumenical bishop (as there was one High Priest among the Jews) to preserve unity, *non satis discretus esset, he should not be discreet enough.* Now this seems to our reason plausible, and yet we justly say, that in things positive our reason is deceivable, and Gods appointment onely is to be attended. And so it is in this; though this reason of Mr. *B.* seem plausible, yet it were no forsaking the cause though I cou'd not answer it any otherwise then thus, It is Mr. *Bs.* petty reasoning from his own conceits of what he imagines fit in a matter of meer institution, concerning which it is nevertheless manifest from the History of the New Testament, that God hath appointed otherwise then is Gods way according to his reason; which indeed is but arrogant presumption, when it prescribes to God. But I shall answer his argument more amply: And though I did not deny his *major* in the Dispute or *Sermon*, I say, if it be understood of a greater mercy in the same kind, and to the same persons, it is not true; the believing Jews were deprived of their possessions in Judea in mercy, yet had not a greater mercy in the same kind but another in the gifts of the spirit; it was in mercy that the Priests converted to the faith were deprived of their office in the Temple, and their children of the portion of the offerings there, which were mercies to them, and yet no such office or portion provided for them and their children, but the benefit redounded to the Gentiles converted, whose conversion was prayed for by *David, Isaiah* &c. and was a mercy to them, though their posterity might be broken off, and the national Church dissolved. I conceive that Gods ways are so free and various in this kind, that Mr *Bs. major* cannot be universally true, nor is Mr. *Bs.* reason cogent. For suppose God annihilate in mercy, there is no greater mercy given, yet Hell is not turned into Heaven, and made the greatest place of mercies, in this case there is a meer deprivation of mercy in mercy: But the thing is more apparent in deprivations of some temporal benefits. God may deprive in mercy, that is, not in judgement of some temporal benefit meerly because he will, out of his freedome to dispose of his own, yet give no greater mercy in stead of it then he should have had if that had not been taken away; and that God doth not do so, who can say? me thinks the Apostles determination, *Rom.* 11.34. should satisfie that he doth. And yet Hell should not be the greatest place of mercies, for there is not onely a privation of temporal, but also of spiritual and eternal mercies, and that too with accumulation of torments, which is otherwise in the case proposed. And for the particular mercy of Churchmembership, the infant visible Jewish Churchmembership was but a temporal mercy, and a comparative mercy in respect of the nations, it neither certainly assured their eternal, nor present welfare; yea, when Christ came, considering how the nation of the Jews was against Christ, it was then rather their danger then their mercy, and was recompenced

 suf-

sufficiently in being out of that Church, which consisted of a rebellious and gainsaying people, and being, though not visible Churchmembers in the Christian society, yet in the families where the spirit of God was given, and Christ known.

Mr. B. adds. 2. *And observe next, that as Mr* T. *denieth not the major, so here he plainly grants the minor, and so yeelds the whole cause. For the minor was,* [*that here is no greater mercy given to infants in stead of Churchmembership:*] *Doth not Mr.* T. *acknowledge this? when he saith twice over:* 1. *That it is a mercy to the whole catholick Church (to have their infants put out of the Church:) And so if the mercy be onely to the catholick Church, that they be none of the Church (visible,) then it is not to them a mercy: So that he taketh it to be a mercy onely to others, but none to them, according to this answer.* 2. *Yea, he saith it more plainly the second time, that it is in mercy to the whole Church, though no privilege (much less a greater mercy) be to them (to the infants themselves:) So that for my part, I think I may well break off here, and take the whole cause as yeelded. For if it be no mercy to any to be deprived of mercy, except that they may have a greater: And if infants have no greater in stead of this, but onely their parents have a greater: and both these be confessed: then it must follow, that it is no mercy to infants to be deprived of this mercy of their Churchmembership; and consequently, God hath not taken it from them in mercy for their good (which is the thing I am proving:) And Mr.* T. *yeeldeth that it is not taken from them in justice to their hurt: and therefore it is not taken from them at all. And thus you see what is became of the cause that hath been driven on with such confidence.*

Answ. However I onely denied the *minor* in the Dispute and *Sermon*, yet Mr. *B.* may see by the answer before, that here I deny his *major* in the first argument in this chapter, yea, and that he can prove that it is not in justice that the Churchmembership visible Jewish ceased, though I still adhere to it, that it was in mercy; and of this argument I have here denied the *major*, though I did not so before, and am ready to shew that I have not yeelded the *minor*, nor any whit of the cause, and therefore suppose Mr. *B.* hath need to manage his weapons better ere he gain this cause; yea, though he should have this argument yeelded, yet the cause is not gained, for the reason before given. But let us view his *minor*, and my answer. His *minor* is [*that here is no greater mercy given to infants in stead of Churchmembership,*] my answer was, That in mercy to the whole catholick Church the Jewish infant Churchmembership ceased, and therefore the infant visible Churchmembership Jewish in mercy ceased. To understand his *minor*, it is to be observed that Mr. *B.* asserts 1. a law or ordinance of infants visible Churchmembership antecedent to that of Circumcision. 2. That this is by promise and precept. 3. That this infant visible Churchmembership essentially contains a right to Gods soveraignty, Christs headship, favour, protection, provision, and other blessings due from such a Soveraign and head to his members. 4. That this belonged not onely to the infants of the Jewish nation, but also of believers in all ages. 5.

That

That this mercy belonged to the infants of the believers of the Jewish nation when they were made Christians, and so could not be in justice taken from them, though the nation of the Jews were broken off for unbelief. 6. That in mercy it cannot be said to be taken away, without a greater mercy to the infants of believrs in stead of it. 7. That the comming of Christ in the flesh, the extent of the Church over the world through faith, the changing of Churchmembership by birth into that by faith, and so making the Church more spiritual, is not a greater mercy to the infants of Jew believers in stead of that visible Churchmembership. 8. That without visible Churchmembership in the Christian Church catholick, the infants of Jew believers are in worse case then they were in the Jewish Church national. On the contrary, I deny 1. such a law or ordinance. 2. That the *Hebrew* infant visible Churchmembership was by promise and precept. 3. That this visible Churchmembership contained essentially such a right as Mr. *B.* asserts; though it was a mercy in comparison of the state of other nations, yet thereto was annexed a heavy yoke of legal impositions, the deliverance from which was a mercy, and in this respect it was in mercy not continued to believers infants of the Jewish nation. 4. That it belonged to any other infants then of the *Hebrew* people. 5. I assert that when the *Jewish* nation or *Hebrew* people were broken off for unbelief in Christ, visible Churchmembership of infants was in justice taken away from the whole people, and consequently from the infants of *Jew* believers, who were onely visible Churchmembers as a part of that nation, yet in mercy to them sith their visible Churchmembership in that nation was dangerous to them, yea inconsistent with Christianity, the *Jewish* nation being a rebellious and gainsaying people: as it was a mercy for *Lot* to be in *Sodom*, and he was in justice to the place outed; and yet in mercy to himself, when it was to be destroyed. 6. I assert, that it might be truly said that the infant *Jewish* visible Churchmembership may be said to be taken away in mercy from the infants of believers of that nation, though no greater mercy were given to those particular infants of the same kind barely in stead of it. 7. I assert, that it cannot be said to be taken away in justice from infants of believing Gentiles, sith it was never granted to any Gentile nation to be Gods visible Church, nor were their infants visible Churchmembers, except by proselytism they were incorporated into the *Jewish* people. 8. I assert, that the not taking in of believing Gentiles infants into the visible Church Christian was not an act judiciary of God as a Judge, but Gods free act of soveraignty changing Churchmembership by birth into Churchmembership by faith. 9. I assert, that the comming of Christ in the flesh, and the consequents thereof, the breaking down the partition wall, taking in the Gentiles by faith, *&c.* without taking in infants into the visible Church Christian, were greater mercies then the *Jewish* infant Churchmembership (which was clogged with legal burdens, and was an imperfect state) and did abundantly countervail the Jewish infant visible Churchmembership in the best state of that, and did bring as much benefit to infants as that relation did. 10. That the infants of

believing Gentiles no members of the visible Church Christian are not in worse but better condition, in respect of any real Evangelical blessing, then the *Hebrew* infants were with their Churchmembership. 1. Because the spiritual blessings of regeneration, in dwelling of the spirit, justification, remission of sins, adoption, Gods favour, protection, provision, eternal life, are as much assured to them in infancy without visible Churchmembership, as they were with it. 2. They do actually enjoy sooner these mercies, if in the invisible Church (without which none ever enjoyed them) and in more ample manner without Jewish visible Churchmembership, then they did with it, the spirit being now more powred out, the Gospel cleared, the Church enlarged, onely legal ceremonies, and rest in *Canaan* with prosperity therein being taken away. Mr. B. and the reader hereby may fully understand what I deny, and what I grant, and how I answer this his petty reasoning without yeelding the cause, and when he hath refuted these assertions, let him sing his triumph, and not as he vainly and insolently doth afore the victory.

He adds. *But yet let us follow it further. And* 1. *what means Mr.* T. *to talk of mercy to others, when our question is, whether it be a mercy to themselves to be unchurched?* 2. *By this arguing he may prove any thing almost in the world a mercy: For all shall work together for good to them that love God,* Rom. 8. 28. *And therefore if I should ask him, whether it be in mercy to wicked men, that God giveth them over to themselves, and at last damneth them, Mr.* T. *may thus answer that it is: for it is a mercy to the whole catholick Church, that is, to other men: but what is this to the damned? So Mr.* T. *saith, It is a mercy to the whole catholicke Church: But what is that to infants who are unchurched?*

Answ. 1. What I mean, he may if he please discern by what is here said, and in what sense infants may be said to be unchurched, and how it may be a mercy to them and others. 2. The damnation of themselves cannot be a mercy to wicked men when it is a benefit to the elect, because it never produceth them good: But the mercy to the catholick Church is a mercy to believers infants, 1. in that it frees them from legal burthens; 2. in that there is a near capacity and probability of the best good for them remaining in their parents or others godly families.

He adds. *And what a strange reason is that of Mr.* T. *to say, It is a mercy, because their Churchstate was carnal, fleshly and agreeable to their minority; but ours is spiritual.*] *what is this to them that are put out of that carnal Churchstate, and kept out of this spiritual Churchstate too? If they had been admitted into this better state (as no doubt they are) then he had said somewhat. Else is not this as great a mercy to the poor cast Jews? They are put out of the carnal Churchstate too. But did God give so many admirable Elogies of the Jews Church; and can Mr.* T. *yet think that it is better to be of no visible Church, then to be of theirs?*

Answ. I alledge the more spiritual Churchstate as one reason of Gods changing of churchmembership by birth into churchmembership by

by faith, and as a mercy to the catholick Church; For thereby they are free from the bondage they were in under carnal ordinances, which infants are partakers of in actual poſſeſſion, and capable of the ſpirit, though they be not actually viſible churchmembers; and therefore it is not true that by my doctrine they are kept out of the ſpiritual churchſtate. And Mr. *B.* doth much miſtake, as if the carnal churchſtate the *Jew* had when Chriſt was come was a priviledge or benefit: For though many admirable Elogies were given by God of the *Jews* Church, yet none of them were given of it in Chriſts time, *they were a rebellious and gainſaying people, a generation of vipers, denied the holy one, and the juſt, and deſired a murtherer, made the temple a den of theeves*, &c. And therefore I verily think it was better then to be of no viſible Church, then to be of theirs. As for the Jews who believed not, they were juſtly put out of Gods favour, their temple was deſtroyed, and they caſt out of their land for denying Chriſt: Yet they were not put out of their carnal churchſtate actually; for they adhere to it unto this day, and it is their curſe.

4. Saith Mr. *B.* *And where did Mr. T. learn in Scripture to call the Jews churchſtate carnal?*

Anſw. From 1 *Cor.* 10. 18. where the nation of the Jews are called *Iſrael after the fleſh*, in contradiſtinction to *the Iſrael of God* or *in the Spirit*, *Rom.* 9. 6. *Gal.* 6. 16. From *Rom.* 2. 28, 29. where there is diſtinction of *the Jew outwardly* from *the Jew inwardly*, of *Circumciſion, which is outward in the fleſh*, from *Circumciſion that is of the heart in the ſpirit, not in the letter.* From *Gal.* 4. 25, 26, 23, 29. where *Hieruſalem that then was* is contradiſtingued to *Hieruſalem above*, and the former *is in bondage with her children*, the later *free*, the children of the former *born after the fleſh*, the later *after the ſpirit.* From *Gal.* 3. 3. where *to be of faith* is *to begin in the ſpirit, to be of the works of the law* is to be *perfect by the fleſh.* From *Epheſ.* 2. 11. where their circumciſion is termed *circumciſion in the fleſh made by hands.* From *Philip.* 3. 3, 4, 5. where Hebrew diſcent, and churchmembership thereby are termed *the fleſh.* From *Heb.* 9. 10. where their ordinances are termed *carnal ordinances.* I had thought this had been ſo well known to Mr. *B.* that it needed not proof.

But he further demands, "Or what doth he mean by churchſtate? "whether the eſſential nature of the Church it ſelf? or any carnal or- "dinances of worſhip which were accidental to it? Is not this word "[*churchſtate*] like his former of [*church call*] deviſed terms to "darken the matter with ambiguities, and ſignifying what pleaſeth the "ſpeaker.

Anſw. Neither the term [Church ſtate] nor [Church call] were deviſed by me, but are terms ordinary in the writings of Divines. I have ſhewed the uſe of the later before, and proved that the Church hath its denomination and definition from it, and that according to Mr. *B.* himſelf: And for the former, me thinks Mr. *B.* ſhould not be ignorant of it, who its likely knows a Book of learned Dr. *uſher*, intituled, *De Chriſtianarum Eccleſiæ ſucceſſione & ſtatu.* And to imagine it to be deviſed

to

to darken the matter with ambiguities is one of Mr. Bs. evil surmises, when the word is as apposite for its use as any term I think Mr. B. can give in stead of it; and if it signifie what pleases the speaker, it is so much the better, for that is the use of words, and this later accusation acquits it from darkening the matter with ambiguities, if it signifie; for that which signifies the speakers mind doth give light, and not darken with ambiguities: So ridiculous is Mr. Bs. accusation, that his later words cross his former. And to help Mr. Bs. understanding if I can, I tell him I mean by it neither the essential nature of the Church it self, nor any carnal ordinances of worship which were accidental to it; but the manner of being or qualification incident to it from providence, whereby it is denominated flourishing or decaying, numerous or small, rich in knowledge or poor, carnal or spiritual by reason of the way of entry into it as natural descent or faith, more or less of the spirit, the promises, ministery, rites, &c. it hath. Which term [state] comprehends innumerable terms, such as are rich and poor, noble or ignoble, fat or lean, and many more; which whether they are to be reduced to the predicaments of quality, relation, or passion, or to be called *modi entis* I leave it to Logicians to determine, I hope this will serve to indoctrinate Mr. B. in the meaning of my speech. But Mr. B. is resolved to follow me with more questions, which he must not expect I will answer, as I have done, after it is bout.

5. Saith he, "And how long might I wait before Mr. T. would "prove from Scripture, that it is a mercy to the whole catholick "Church to have all infants put out or unchurched? These are the "men that make their followers believe that we have no Scripture for "our cause, when themselves give us but their magisterial dictates. "But I wonder whence he should fetch such a Dream. What? are "infants such Toads or Vipers in comparison of men of years, that "it is a mercy to the whole catholicke Church to have them cast "out? Are not the aged worse then they? And were we not once all "infants?

Answ. I say not that all infants are put out of the catholick Church, and so need not prove it; nor had I asserted it was it either in the *Dispute* or *Sermon* my work to prove what I said by way of answer, but for Mr. B. to disprove it. Yet what I assert is distinctly before set down, not without some proof from Scripture; and I may wait long afore either I shall finde his pretended ordinance of infant visible Churchmembership unrepealed proved from Scripture, or my assertions disproved by any solid arguments without idle questions, and vain exclamations, which I resolve to neglect. And of the former sort are the questions here, which insinuate as if I conceived it were a mercy to the catholick Church that infants are not in the visible Church Christian as members, because they are Toads, Vipers, worse then the aged; whereas I onely say, that the dissolving of the Jewish Church national (in which and by reason of which infants were visible Churchmembers, and no otherwise) was in mercy to the catholick Church: Which is the very doctrine of the Apostle, Rom. 11. 11, 12. that through their fall salva-

tion

sion is come to the Gentiles, the fall of them is the riches of the world, the diminishing, decay or loss of them the riches of the Gentiles. Which happened not through the wickedness of infants above other men; but partly through the wickedness of the Jewish people (of which the infants were a part, and onely Churchmembers there, and while that nation were Gods Church;) partly through Gods contrivance, which was, that the Gentiles should have their course of mercy while the Jews were broken off, and at last both have mercy in their season.

Mr. B. goes on in his cavilling vein. *If this doctrine be true, why may we not expect to be taught, that infants must also be cast out of heaven, in mercy to the whole catholick church?*

Answ. Because we find no such taught by the Apostle as the other doctrine of mine concerning the mercy to the catholick Church is by breaking off the Jewish Church.

If it be (saith he) *no carnal churchstate to have infants in heaven, why is it a carnal Churchstate which containeth infants in it on earth?*

Answ. That any are infants in heaven its not likely. 2. If there should be, yet being fully sanctified, they should not be carnal, but spiritual, and the Church there onely consist of spiritual persons by spiritual regeneration; whereas if the Church Christian should consist of infant visible Churchmembers by carnal generation, the state of it would be carnal as the Jewish was, and not spiritual by faith, as the Scripture makes it, *Joh.* 1.12,13. & 3.5,6. *Gal.* 3.26,27.

Again, saith Mr. B. *And if it be no benefit to the Catholike Church to have infants kept out of heaven, nor no hurt to the Church to see them there; why should it be a benefit to the whole church to have them kept on earth? or any hurt to the church to see them here members?*

Answ. It were no hurt if God had so ordered it; their non-visible Christian Churchmembership is a benefit to the Catholike Church in the manner before said, because God hath so ordered it.

But yet (saith Mr. B.) *let us come a little nearer; what ever it may be to enemies or to man-haters* (*of which sort the Church hath none*) *yet me thinks to those that are love as God is love, and that are merciful as their heavenly father is merciful, and who are bound to receive little children in Christs name, and who are become as children themselves; to such it should seem no such mercy to have all infants unchurched. But such are all true members of the Church; and therefore to the Church it can be no such mercy.*

Answ. I wish it were true that the visible Church (of which we are speaking) hath no enemies or man-haters. It is not true that wee are bound to receive little children in Christs name; nor do I say that it is a mercy to have all infants unchurched, or that they are all unchurched; nor do I thank it true that all true members of the Church visible, are such as Mr. B. describes. But this I say, the non-visible Churchmembership Christian of infants is such a mercy as I describe, however it seem to the Church.

"But yet nearer; *saith Mr.* B. Whatsoever it may be to strangers, "yet me thinks to the parents it should seem no such mercy to have their

"children

"children put out of the Church: Hath God naturally planted such "tender affections in parents to their children? and doth grace increase "it? and the Scripture encourage it? and yet must they take it for a "mercy, that their children are put out? when Mr. *T.* will not say it is "a mercy to the children.

Answ. To the parents notwithstanding their natural affection, it is a mercy, and ought to seem a mercy, that God hath dissolved the Jewish National visible Churchmembership, and by consequent their infant visible Churchmembership, and hath freed them and their infants from the legal bondage, and hath out of all nations gathered his Church by preaching the Gospel, without admission of infants into the visible Church Christian. And surely if this reason were good, parents might complain that their children are not admitted to the Lords supper as the Jews children were to the Passeover.

"Yet further, *saith he*, why then hath God made such promises to "the parents for their seed? as if much of the parents comfort lay in the "welfare of the children; if it be a mercy to them that they are kept out "of the Church, may not this doctrine teach parents to give their chil-"dren such a blessing as the Jews did? His blood be on us and our chil-"dren. For their curse is to be broken off from the Church; and if that "be a mercy, the Jews are then happier then I take them to be: And how "can we then pray, that they may be graffed in again?

Answ. I find no promises in all the New Testament, much less Evangelical promises, made to believing parents for their seed, nor any whit of the comforts of parents in the New Testament in the welfare of their children, but in Christ and in the fellowship of the spirit, *Phil.* 2. *v.* Yea, whereas in the Old Testament most of the promises were of increase of children, their prosperity, rest and peace in their dwellings, *&c.* in the New Testament an unmarried estate, if without sin, is rather preferred as *more happy*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. and the poor and persecuted rather adjudged blessed then the rich and those that live in peace, *Matth* 5. 4, 10. However parents have as much comfort by my doctrine rightly understood, as they can have by Mr. *B's.* Nor doth it teach parents to curse their children as the Jews did. The curse of the Jews was not in being broken off from the Jewish Church national, but in being not in the Olive, that is the Church of true believers, but in the national Church Jewish; and that they were not broken off from it, was their unhappiness: and we are to pray, not that they may be graffed in again into the national Church Jewish, but into the invisible Church of true believers and elect persons.

6. Saith Mr. *B.* "But what if all this were true? Suppose it were "a mercy to the whole Church to have infants put out; yet it doth not "follow that God would do it. He is the God of infants, as well as of "the aged; and is mercifull to them as well as others; all souls are "his: He can shew mercy to the whole Church in an easier way then "by casting out all their infants: And his mercy is over all his "works.

Answ. God is the God of the spirits of all flesh, yet he hath not

mercy

mercy on all flesh; all souls are his, yet he did not take any one nation for his people besides the Jewish; his mercy is over all his works, yet he hath broken off the Jews from being his people; he is naturally mercifull, yet sheweth mercy freely as he will. I say not, he casteth out all infants of the Church out of the Church; yet sure if it were supposed a mercy to the whole Church to have infants put out, it seems to follow that God would do it, sith all things work for their good, and with his son he gives them all things, *Rom.* 8. 28, 32. 1 *Cor.* 3. 22, 23.

I will tell you, saith Mr. *B. how Mr.* T. *followeth this with examples. He saith*, [*that the release of the Jews servants, and the consecration of the Nazarites and first-born, and the land of Canaan, were all priviledges, and yet these are taken away.*] *To which I answer: There are abundance far greater given in their stead: And what is that then to those that have nothing in their stead? Besides, if Mr.* T. *think that the mercy of Churchmembership is of as low a nature as to be Nazarites, or to have Canaan, he is much mistaken.*

Answ. Not onely these, but other examples, as namely of the Priests and Levites children, who were by inheritance to attend at the Tabernacle, and to be nourished by the offerings, and to be Priests; instead of which, Ministers infants have now no particular mercy, they are not visibly in the order of Priests, as the infants of *Aarons* house were: Of the poor, who had tythes and corners of fields, and sheaves fallen, and other provision, and so had the stranger; do shew, that a mercy was taken away from infants of *Israel*, and no particular mercy in the same or the like kind given to infants of Christian people or Ministers in their stead. When Mr. *B.* shews what those abundance far greater mercies are, which are given in the stead of the release of the *Hebrew* servants even infants, the restoring their inheritances at the year of *Jubilee*, the consecration of *Nazarites* and first born even infants, the reckoning the children of the Priests as heirs to the priesthood, provision for them, the poor, the strangers; it is likely the same he alledgeth will serve to shew how infants visible Churchmembership is recompensed by the mercies now given to the whole Church and them. Nor do I think I am mistaken in counting the mercy of infants visible Churchmembership to be of as low a nature as to be consecrated as *Nazarites*, or the first born male which was to be presented to God, or to be reckoned by discent Priests; but am sure Mr. *B.* doth over value the *Jewish* infant visible Churchmembership, and thereby misleads himself and others: And therefore I desired him in my Letter to set down distinctly what was the benefit and priviledge of infant visible Churchmembership which he asserted; the refusal whereof (when he desired to have a copy of my Sermon, that he might (as his fashion is) cavil; rather then answer it) shews his unwillingness to have his tenet examined, that truth might appear.

He adds. *But he saith* [that it was a priviledge to the *Jews* to be owned as Gods people distinct from the rest of the world, while others were passed by, yet this is repealed in mercy to us Gentiles.] *Answ. In my distinctions before you may find this answered.* 1. *Then it*

was no mercy to the Jews you think, but to the Gentiles: But our question is, whether it be a mercy to the unchurched infants? 2. The Jews being a Church and people of God, was a mercy; and this God took not from any of them, but those that cast it away: But the restriction of this to them, and the exclusion of the Gentiles, was no mercy to them, and this onely (with the ceremonial accidents) did God take away by the change of his laws. It would have been rather an addition to the happiness of the believing Jews, to have the Gentiles taken in, by taking down the partition wall: And so it will be when the Jews are graffed in again, and both made one body. If by else doth the Jewish Church pray for her little sister that had no breasts? And Noah *pray, that God would perswade* Japhet *to dwell in the tents of* Sem? *Though the restriction therefore and the exclusion (which are no mercies to the Jews) be taken away, yet no mercy is taken from them, but what is supplied with a far greater in Christ: And though they partake not of these, yet that is because of their own unbelief, who reject it, and not because the new law doth exclude them: For God hath in his new law or Covenant made a deed of gift of Christ and all his benefits, to all that will receive him, whether Jew or Gentile, without excluding or excepting any. And for his denying to particular persons the grace of conversion, that is nothing to our present business, as belonging to decree, and not to any change in the laws: And it was denied to many before Christ, and granted to many thousands Jews since Christ; and shall be at last to far more.*

Answ. The vanity of his distinctions is shewed before; the repeal of the priviledge of the Jews mentioned was in mercy to the Jew believer, though chiefly to the Gentiles, and the infants of both, but in justice to the Jewish nation. The Jews being a Church and people of God, was a mercy, and to be the onely nation that were Gods people, was an aggravation of it: and this God took away from believers, they were put out of the Jewish Church national, *Joh.*9.22. It was a mercy that the Jews were the onely nation God took for his people, and this God did take away, not by change of his laws, though that followed, but by his severity, *Rom.*11.22. breaking off that nation from the Olive. It would have been a happiness to the believing Jews, to have had the Gentiles taken in without dissolving the national Church Jewish, if God had thought it good; but he otherwise determining, it was a mercy to the catholick Church, that they were dissolved. If no mercy be taken from them, but what is supplied with a far greater in Christ; then Christ in the flesh is, instead of the Jewish Church national, and consequently of the infants visible Churchmembership therein, a far greater mercy, which I said before, and Mr. *B.* gainsaid. That in Gods new Covenant there's no deed of gift of Christ but to the elect, is proved before.

Mr. *B.* ends thus. *And thus you have heard all that Mr.* T. *upon deliberation hath said to this argument. And yet (would any man think it?) he concludeth that* [that this abundant clear answer to all alledged from the visible Churchmembership of the children of the Jews.] *O never let my soul be tainted with this errour, which so strangely bereaves men of common ingenuity!*

Answ.

Answ. Let my answer and Mr. *Bs.* argument be compared, and the Reader judge of our ingenuity. I for my part hope and pray that God will never leave me to be carried away with such frivolous reasonings as these of Mr. *B.* are.

SECT. LXV.

Mr. Bs. Argum. from Matth. 23. 37. Revel. 11. 15. *for infants visible Churchmembership* Ch. 12, 13. *are answered.*

I Have answered Mr. *Bs.* 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th. Chapters of the first part of his Book *of Baptism* in this *Review*, *Part.* 1. *Sect.* 6, 7, 8, 9. I think it not needful as yet to make reply to the exceptions against my answers, and therefore go on to answer Mr. *Bs.* 12th. Chapt. which begins thus.

"My 7th. Arg. shall be drawn from *Matth.* 23. 37, 38, 39. From "whence I argue thus; If Christ were so tender over *Jerusalem* that he "would have gathered them as a Hen gathereth her Chickens, then "surely he would not have put them or their infants out of the Church "(or repealed the merciful gift and ordinance of their Churchmem-"bership. But Christ was so tender of them, that he would have so ga-"thered *Jerusalem*, &c. Therefore sure hee would not have unchur-"ched their infants. The antecedent is the words of the Lord Jesus: "The reason and strength of the consequence lieth here. 1. It is not "some particular Jews that Christ would have gathered to himself (and "so into his Church as accomplished with higher privileges then be-"fore:) but it was Jerusalem, whole Jerusalem (which is usually put "for all Judea and the Jewish Nation) now if Jerusalem were gathe-"red, then infants must needs be gathered. I know nothing of any mo-"ment that can be said against this; but leave it to any tender consci-"ence to judge, whether it be likely that Christ should have unchur-"ched all their infants, when he would have gathered to himself the "whole nation, or whole Jerusalem. If that contemptible answer "should here bee again returned [that Christ would have gathered "them onely into the invisible Church] I have answered it before; "they that are visibly or apparently gathered into the invisible Church, "are gathered also thereby into the visible: And if all Jerusalem had "been gathered, it had been doubtless a visible gathering: O that I "could see as clear evidence for many other controverted truths, as I "see in these words of the Lord Jesus, to convince me, that hee would "have gathered all Jerusalem into his visible Church, and consequent-"ly not have unchurched all their infants; I should tremble to think "of resisting so plain testimonies of God. If Christs own words will "not serve, I know not what will. If any say, that by Jerusa-"lem is meant onely the aged of Jerusalem; I answer: It is "vain to call for Scripture if they dare contradict it at pleasure;

" or ſo make it ſpeak onely what they liſt. It is not fully a nation or " City without the infants. Beſides, Jeruſalem had inchurched infants " when Chriſt ſo ſpake; therefore how could his words be otherwiſe un- " derſtood by them, unleſs hee had exeepted infants. 2. Yet further, " Chriſt doth not in vain uſe the ſimilitude of a Hen gathering her " Chickens; The Hen gathereth the youngeſt moſt tenderly: Yea " how long will ſhe ſit the very Egs? Now who dare expound this thus? " As a Hen gathereth her young ones under her wings, ſo I would " have gathered the aged of you, but none of your young ones vi- " ſibly. 3. And doth not their leaving of their houſe deſolate, " mean the Temple, and ſo the unchurching them, till they ſay, " Bleſſed is hee that commeth in the Name of the Lord: and then " Jeruſalem (and therefore infants) ſhall bee inchurched again? " So CHRIST JESUS himſelf hath made me believe that he " would have gathered all Jeruſalem, but unchurched none of them.

Anſw. It is not *CHRIST JESUS*, but Mr. *Bs.* own ſhallowneſs or prejudice that makes him believe that here is any thing for infants viſible Churchmembership. That *Jeruſalem is uſually put for all Judea and the Jewiſh nation*, is more then I finde. But that by *Jeruſalem* and her children are not meant infants, is apparent from the text. 1. They are meant by *Jeruſalem who killed and ſtoned them that were ſent*, but they were not infants, *Ergo*. 2. Becauſe the way whereby Chriſt would have gathered Jeruſalem was by preaching the Goſpel to them, as is manifeſt 1. in that hee uſed no other way. 2. This was the way which he often attempted, which is implied in the phraſe, *how often would I?* 3. This is the way they refuſed, implied in the phraſe [*and ye would not*] that is, yee would not obey my admonitions of repentance nor believe the Goſpel; and ſo *Piſcator annal. loci ſæpiſſimè & benigniſſimè à me admoniti, non tamen obtemperare voluiſtis.* 4. From verſ. 34. 35. where the way by which hee would have gathered them, ſeems to bee by *ſending Prophets, and wiſe men, and Scribes or Apoſtles* Luk. 11. 49. *to them*, which were not ſent to infants. *How oft would I have gathered? That is* (ſay ſome) *by the external miniſtery of the Prophets ſent unto thee, verſ.* 34, 35. *Trap. on Matth.* 23. 37. 5. The often attempt of gathering here, is the ſame with *the viſitation*, or *over ſight Luke* 19. 44. as the agreement of the expreſſions and matter in both places compared evidently ſhews, now that was by teaching, *Luke* 1. 78, 79. And thus the *New Annot. Of thy viſitation*] *as if he had ſaid in thy viſitation, in which God manifeſted himſelf in my perſon offering thee mercy.* 6. Thus Proteſtant Divines often expound it, anſwering *Arminians* and others, inferring hence reſiſtability of converting grace by mans free-will; as *Diodati* in his *annot.* on *Matth.* 23. 37. expreſſeth their minde, *wee muſt of neceſſity underſtand this to bee meant of the diſpenſation of outward means by the word exhortations, commandments*, &c. Now it cannot be ſaid that Chriſt would have this way gathered the infants of *Jeruſalem*, for hee had ſaid heoften by his own, and Prophets and Apoſtles preaching would or attempted to do it. But this he would not nor attempted

to

to do to infants, *Ergo*, they are not meant under the term [*Jerusalem.*] 3. This is proved also from the end of his gathering, which was, that they might bee his Disciples, but hee never would or did gather any infants to him as his Disciples, *Ergo.* 4. It is proved also thus. Those onely are meant by Jerusalem, whom Christ *would have gathered but they would not*: But this cannot be said of infants, that they would not, there was no nilling of Conversion in them, *Ergo.* 5. They are meant by Jerusalem who are meant *by the City* Luk. 19. 41. and there they are meant, who *v.* 42. *might have known in that their day the things belonging to their peace, but then they were hid from their eyes, who knew not the time of their visitation, v.* 44. But this is not meant of infants, *Ergo.*

In answer therefore to Mr. *Bs.* argument altering the termes [*put out, unchurch*, which my doctrine doth not assert] into [*reveal the ordinance of infants visible Churchmembership*, or leave out of his visible Church] I deny the consequence of his *major*, and deny that which he alledgeth for proof of it, that by *Jerusalem* is meant all the people of *Jerusalem*, even the infants. And to his wish, I return a wish, O that I could see as clear evidence for many other controverted truths, as I see in these words to convince me that Christ means not infants by those he would have gathered unto him, and though I would not have Mr. *B.* of any man to turn *Quaker*, yet I think he should rather tremble at the allegation of this text so impertinent to his purpose, and not understand by [*Jerusalem*] Synecdochically the persons of years. Nor would this be any more to *contradict the Scripture at pleasure*, or to *make it speak onely what we list*, then for him to understand by [Jerusalem] Synecdochically (as he doth) the Jewish nation, or by [Jerusalem] to understand meronymically the people, even the infants of the City. To make the interpreting of speeches by tropes a contradicting them, or making them speak what they list is such a foolery, as I should rather have imagined to have come from some woman or Lay-preacher, then from a man of such magnified learning as Mr. *B.* is, had I not found it printed in his Book. As for what he saith, it is not fully a nation or city without infants, though it were true (as it is not) yet that proves not that infants are meant in every speech of a nation or city, any more then *Matth.* 24.7. infants shall rise against infants, because *nation shall rise against nation*, or *Matt.* 21.10. infants were moved saying, who is this? because *the whole city was moved, saying, who is this?* And hereby it may be seen how easily Christ might be understood without including infants, and so much the more easily, because though infants were in the Jewish Church, yet Christ who spake not of gathering into the Jews Church, but *to himself* (in whose visible Church were no infants) might be the more readily conceived to except infants, yea if he had meant infants could not be well understood by them. And for his challenge, I answer, I dare thus expound his gathering, of gathering onely the aged into his visible Church, if Mr. *B.* imagine (as he doth) the similitude of a Hen to be used in vain if infants be not meant, because the Hen gathereth the youngest, by this reason Christ should use the similitude in vain if he would gather any

other.

other then infants, ſith the hen gathereth not hens and old cocks under her wings, but onely little chickens. Me thinks by leaving their houſe deſolate, Mr. B. ſhould not mean the unchurching them. For then it will follow, that all the Jewiſh nation were unchurched (for ſo he will have meant by *Jeruſalem*) which will overthrow many of his conceits about making *Jewiſh* and Gentile Churches one body, the ſame. the Church not broken off, *&c.* and prove afore he is aware the repeal of his pretended ordinance of infants viſible Churchmemberſhip. But enough of the ſilly inſipid arguings (if I may uſe his language) of this Chapter, let's ſee whether the next have any better.

"Ch. 13. My 8th. arg. ſaith Mr. B. is from *Rev.* 11. 15. If the "Kingdoms of this world, either are or ſhal be the Kingdoms of the Lord "and his Chriſt; then infants alſo muſt be members of his Kingdom: "(and conſequently the gift and ordinance for their churchmemberſhip "is not repealed.) But the antecedent is the words of the text. What "can be ſaid againſt this that is ſenſe or reaſon? If they ſay, that by "[Kingdoms] is meant [ſome part of the Kingdoms] excluding all in-"fants: I ſay ſuch men need not look into the Scripture for their faith: "They may make their own Creed on theſe terms, let Scripture ſay what "it will: I know ſome places of Scripture may be produced, where the "word Kingdom and Jeruſalem, *&c.* is taken for a part: but if wee "muſt take words always improperly, becauſe they are ſo taken ſome-"time, then wee ſhall not know how to unde ſtand any Scripture, "and humane language will become uſeleſs; and by this any man may "put by any Teſtimony of Scripture, though it were to prove the moſt "fundamental truth: As the *Arrians* put off all teſtimonies for the God-"head of Chriſt, becauſe Magiſtrates are called Gods. But the circum-"ſtances of this text do evince to us, that Chriſt ſpeaketh properly "of whole Jeruſalem and whole Kingdoms, and not improperly of any "part onely.

"2. If they ſay, that [by Kingdom of Chriſt] is not meant the "Church of Chriſt, they then ſpeak againſt the conſtant phraſe of the "Scripture; which cals Chriſts Kingdom his Church and Converſim: "Chriſt is King and Saviour of the ſame ſociety. What is Chriſts "Kingdom but his Church? I know the Kingdome of Chriſt is more "large and more ſpecial: but here it cannot be meant of his Kingdom in "the larger ſenſe, as he *is de jure*, onely King (in regard of voluntā-"ry obedient ſubjects) nor as hee over ruleth common ſocieties and "things: For ſo the Kingdoms of the world were ever the Kingdoms of "the Lord and his Chriſt, and it could not be ſaid that now they are "become ſo. So that for any thing I can ſee, this text alone were ſuf-"ficient to decide the controverſie, whether infants muſt bee Church-"members.

Anſw. 1. I think this may bee ſaid with ſenſe and reaſon, yea and clear evidence out of the text, that by [Kingdoms of the world, Kingdoms of our Lord and his Chriſt, or as ſome copies have it, the Kingdom of the world is become] is not meant the men or members of either Kingdoms, and ſo neither infant, nor adult perſons, but the dominion, power,

rule

rule it ſelf which the men of the world had uſurped, chiefly Antichriſt, which was Chriſts before of right, but not till then become his by actual, full, and peaceable poſſeſſion, his enemies or the chief of them being not till then ſubdued, but tyranizing over his ſubjects. And though I confeſs the term connotes men over whom Chriſt ſhould have rule, yet the perſons over whom Chriſt ſhould rule then, were not onely the Church, but alſo his enemies, whom he ſhould ſubdue, and keep under, and judge, *Revel.*2 16,27. That by [Kingdome] is meant Rule, is manifeſt from many places, *Matth.*6.10,13. *John* 18.36. *Heb.*1.8. ſo *Revel.*17.17,18. And that this is the meaning here, ſeems to me to be manifeſt, 1. from that which is added, and *he ſhall reign for ever and ever*; which being the conſequent of the Kingdome or Kingdomes of the world becomming our Lords and his Chriſt, it ſhews, that the Kingdomes note the rule or dominion whereby he reigns, not the perſons over whom he reigns. 2. The ſame is confirmed from *v.*17. where the ſame thing is expreſſed in thoſe words, *we give thee thanks, O Lord God almighty, which art, and waſt, and art to come, becauſe thou haſt taken to thee thy great power, and haſt reigned*: And wherein that is, is expreſſed *v.*18, in judging all, rewarding his ſervants, deſtroying the corrupters of the earth. 3. From *ch.*12.10. where again the ſame or like thing is expreſſed thus, *Now is come ſalvation and ſtrength or power and the Kingdome of our God, and the power or authority of his Chriſt; for the accuſer of our brethren is caſt down*: Where *Kingdome* and *power* are put together, to ſhew, that by *the Kingdome* is not meant the perſons over whom the rule is, but the rule it ſelf. 4. It is ſo to be underſtood where it is mentioned as I conceive in the ſenſe meant *Revel.*11.15. as namely 1 *Cor.*15.24. 2 *Tim.*4.1. and other places. 5. Thus *Diodati* in his *Annot. on Revel.*11.15. *The Kingdomes*] *that is to ſay, Now God reigneth with his ſon, and that abſolutely having ſubdued all his enemies.* 1 *Cor.*15.24. that I omit others. 6. This ſenſe is the more confirmed, if it be read as ſome copies have it, *the Kingdome of this world is become.* On the other ſide Mr. *Bs.* interpretation ſeems to me either not ſenſe, or not true. For then it ſhould be thus, All the Kingdomes of the world, that is every perſon in the world, ſhould be Chriſts Church, that is, *a ſociety of perſons ſeparated from the world to God, or called out of the world*, &c. as he defines the Church, *of Baptiſm*, pag. 82. Now can this be good ſenſe to be all the world, the Kingdomes of the world, and to be called or ſeparated from or out of the world? Can all the world be ſeparated from the world? And there is no truth in this interpretation, ſuch it never was nor ſhall be, that the kingdomes of the world, that is, every perſon old and young in all the kingdomes of the world, ſhall become Chriſts Church. For then Chriſt ſhould have no enemies to remove out of his Kingdome, contrary to the Parable, *Matth.*13.30. expounded *v.*38,39,40,41,42. Now if this be the ſenſe, then it makes nothing for infants viſible Churchmembership, nor by [kingdomes] is all the members of a kingdome meant, and ſo infants, but both the conſequence of Mr. *Bs. major* is juſtly denied, and the inference from the conſequent of it. For if it be meant of

Chriſts

Christs rule (as the texts shew) though it connote the persons over whom the rule is, yet they are not thereby proved Churchmembers; for in the sense there meant, the rule or reign is over enemies as well as subjects: Yea, if the reign were over subjects, and infants comprehended, yet sith the reign over them is onely invisible, this cannot prove Infants visible Churchmembers.

Nor are Mr. Bs. reasons of any force to prove that *Revel.*11.15. by the kingdome of Christ must be meant the Church. For it is not true, that *the constant phrase of Scripture calls Christs Kingdome his Church and Conversim.* For though I deny not that the Church is termed the kingdome of Christ, yet I deny this is the constant phrase of Scripture to call the kingdome of Christ the Church, much less *Conversim.* The places alledged before, with many more, do evince the contrary; yea, there appear to me but few places wherein the Church is termed the kingdome of Christ. I am not yet fully resolved, that it is any where so meant, except in that *Matth.*13.41. though I deny not the fitness of the expression.

Nor doth his reason hold, that *here it cannot be meant of Christs Kingdome in the largest sense, as he over-ruleth common societies and things;* For though it be true, that in some sort *so the Kingdomes of the world were ever his*, that is, he did always so order them, that they passively did his will; yet it is certain, that in the reign of Antichrist the kingdomes of the world, that is, the rule which was exercised was not actively for God or Christ, but as it is expresly said, *Revel* 13.4. *They worshipped the Dragon who gave power to the beast, blasphemed God, made war with the saints, overcame them; the beast had power over all kindreds and tongues and nations, so that all that dwelt on the earth should worship him, whose names were not written in the Lambs book of life:* and so they *gave their Kingdome to the beast*, *Revel.*17.12,13,14,17. though they did Gods will But after *the Lamb overcame them*, v. 14. and *the Kingdomes of the world were his*, when *the Kings did hate the whore, and make her desolate*, &c. So that this may well be expounded thus, *the Kingdomes of the world*, that is, the rule which the Kings of the world have exercised for the Whore shall be so changed, that whether out of revenge of the mischiefs the Whore hath done them, or out of love to Christ, they shall hate her, and execute Christs doom upon her, which was not always done. And it seems a piece of inconstancy in Mr. *B.* who would not have the kingdomes of the world taken for a part in the forepart of this chapter, and yet denies it to be taken in the largest sense in the later part. And how the infant Churchmembership of Christians can be gathered from the terme, Kingdomes of the world becomming Christs, more then any others, I see not. But I proceed.

2. Suppose it were granted, that by *the Kingdomes of Christ* were meant men, and the Church of Christ, *Revel.*11.15. yet sure it is far more likely that by *the Kingdome of Christ* should be meant the invisible, then the visible Church. For the invisible Church either solely or chiefly is called the kingdome of Christ, and he is stiled the King of Saints;

Revel.

Rev. 15. 3. and Mr. *B.* saith here, *Christ is King and Saviour of the same society.* But in this sense I should grant the conclusion, that *infants must be members of Christs Kingdome.* And surely the visible Church-members who are not true believers, have not Christ to rule over them, but are enemies to Christ, and Satans subjects, and therefore not truly but putatively onely in Christs kingdome, nor they any part of it. They are not *children of the kingdome, Matth.* 13. 38.

3. But were it granted that *Revel.* 11. 15. is meant the visible Church, yet that therefore infants must bee a part of it, because they are a part of a Kingdome follows not, for Mr. *B.* saith, *I know some places of Scripture may be produced where the word Kingdome and Jerusalem, &c. is taken for a part.* Which is enough to shew that the argument is not good which he useth, For it must rest on this proposition, where *Jerusalem* is mentioned there all *Jerusalem* is meant, where Kingdomes are meant whole Kingdomes are meant, and therefore infants: which propositions are contradicted by Mr. *B.* himself, and therefore if the whole controversie were referred to these two texts *Matth.* 22. 37. *Rev.* 11. 15. to decide, Mr. *Bs.* cause would be lost for want of proof, even from his own confession. Nor doth Mr. *B.* produce any thing to prove that by [Kingdoms *Revel.* 11. 15.) is meant the whole of a Kingdome even the infants, but onely prattles that which me thinks a learned man should be ashamed of. For there is no colour of reason to charge them who expound [*Kingdom*] by a *Synecdoche* of the whole for a part, with *making their own Creed without Scripture, taking words alwayes in an improper sense, making humane language useless, putting by any Scripture such as are produced for Christs Godhead,* when he himself saith it is sometimes in Scripture so taken, and gives no proof of its being taken otherwise here. Yea, by rejecting such exposition without reason Mr. *B.* may be more truely said to make his own Creed without Scripture, to make the Scripture unintelligible, humane language useless, to fortifie *Biddle* and other deceivers, in their gross opinions of the *Anthropomorphites*, and others, insomuch that *I* think if the *Arians* were refuted no better then Mr. *B.* doth here the expounding of *Kingdoms* and *Jerusalem* synecdochically, *Arianism* would quickly prevail, and errours easily take, especially with Schollers.

4. Lastly, were it granted that by [*Kingdoms*] were meant the visible Church; and that infants were a part of the Kingdom thus meant, yet this very text, and that according to Mr *Bs.* own reasoning would prove the repeal of their Churchmembership till the accomplishment of the thing meant *Rev.* 11. 15. which whether it be yet, or shall be till the day of judgement is very uncertain, For Mr. *B.* here reasons thus, *it cannot be meant of Christs kingdom in the larger sense for so the kingdoms of the world were ever the kingdoms of the Lord and his Christ, and it could not be said that now they are become so.* In like manner I may say, if the visible Churchmembership of infants were meant *Rev.* 11. 15. then it was not so before the 7th. trumpet sounded; for it is said, *then the kingdoms of the world were become the kingdoms of Christ,* if they were then become they were not before, and consequently infants visible churchmembership not before.

Now when the 7th. trumpet sounded is uncertain; Mr. *Brightman* makes it to begin at Qu. *Elizabeths* reign, the *New Annotations when Antichrist is weakened*, Mr. *Mede at the imperial reign of Christ in the great day of judgement*, which *v.* 17, 18. do favour. And if infants be not visible Churchmembers till then, when perhaps there shall be no infants at all, Mr. *B.* will have but a very cold suit of it, if the deciding of the whole controversie, whether infants must be Churchmembers, be referred to this text alone. But enough, it not too much of these ridiculous though confident allegations of Mr. *B.*

SECT. LXVI.

Mr. Bs. 9th, 10th, 12 Arg. concerning infants better condition in the N. T. in his 14th, 15th, 16th, Chapters part. 1. of Bapt. to prove their visible Churchmembership, are answered.

"CHap. 14. *saith Mr. B.* my 9th. arg. is this: If the believing Jews "children (and consequently the parents in point of comfort) be not "in a worse condition since Christ, then they were before, then their "children ought still to be Churchmembers. (And consequently the gift "and ordinance is not repealed.) But certainly the believing Jewes "children (and consequently the parents in point of comfort) are not "in a worse condition since Christ then they were before: Therefore "their children ought still to bee Churchmembers. The antecedent I "scarce take him for a Christian that will deny. Christ did not come "to make believers or their children miserable, or to undo them, or to "bring them into a worse condition. This were to make Christ a de-"stroyer, and not a Saviour. Hee that came not to destroy mens lives "but to save them, came not destroy mens happiness but to recover "them. He that would not accuse the adulterous woman, will not cast "out all infants without accusation. 2. The consequence a man would "think should be out of doubt: If it be not, I prove it thus: it is a far "worse condition to be out of the visible Church then to be in it: there-"fore if the believing Jews children be cast out of the Church then they "are in a far worse condition then they were before: (and so Christ "and faith should do them a mischief, which were blasphemy to i-"magine.)

Answ. If Mr. *B.* had set down, as I desired him in my Letter, what the benefit, or priviledge is of infant visible Churchmembership which he asserts unrepealed, and what infants lose by not being in the Christian Church visible, the Reader with my self might have considered this argument more exactly: But till that be done, no man can exactly tell how to compare their former and later conditions wherein they are better or worse, nor how from the equall goodness of their condition their Churchmembership is interred. And for my part, I think such kind of arguings as these, to infer things that onely are by Divine in-

[stitution;

ſtitution, are meer devices of mens wit, and Mr. B. in uſing them (as indeed they are his onely ſtrength he hath in this point, for all the texts hee brings are quite from the matter, and ſome ſo manifeſtly impertinent, that a good text man would bee aſhamed ever to produce them as hee doth) doth but ſhew that he reſts more on popular arguments which moves mens affections then Scripture proofs, though moſt deceitfully like an Impoſtor he entitle his Book, *Plain Scripture proof of infants Churchmemberſhip and Baptiſm*, when there is not a text that is plain for it, ſcarce any that hath any ſhew of it. But leſt this argument be thought unanſwerable, I ſhall examine it. A worſe of a better condition are comparative terms, and as *Ariſtotle* ſaith in his *Categ.* περὶ πρός τι *nothing is ſaid to bee great or ſmall by it ſelf, but as compared with another*, ſo nothing is better or worſe by it ſelf, but as compared with another. It is neceſſary then that we examine the eſtate of believing *Jewes* children before and ſince Chriſts comming: The eſtate of the believing *Jewes* children before Chriſt, may be conceived to bee either in actual poſſeſſions or in promiſes. In actual poſſeſſions they had this priviledge, that they were a part of that nation which was then Gods people, ſeparated from other people by circumciſion, lawes, temple, inheritance in *Canaan*, prieſthood, and the children of the prieſts had this priviledge, that the males were to ſucceed in the prieſthood, and their children to be nouriſhed of the tithes, offerings, firſtfruits, the poor by a tithe and other wayes. The promiſes were either of ſpecial priviledge, as that Chriſt ſhould come out of that nation, or of temporal bleſſings, as that while they kept Gods laws they ſhould dwell in *Canaan* and proſper there, or of ſaving bleſſings. Theſe did belong onely to ſome believing Hebrews children, not to all, to *Iſaac* not to *Iſhmael*, to *Jacob* not to *Eſau*, the reſt were onely temporal benefits, and were accompanied with a yoke of lawes and rites intollerable. The children of believing Jewes condition ſince Chriſt, is either in reſpect of ſaving bleſſings, and ſo it is either the ſame which was before, or better in reſpect of the eaſier way of comming to the knowledge of Chriſt, in reſpect of the temporals. So it is in ſome reſpect worſe, they are liable more to perſecution with their parents, in ſome reſpects better, in that they with their parents are exempt from the legal bon age, which they and their parents as part of that nation or viſible Church were obnoxious to. So that in ſome ſenſe the antecedent or *minor* is granted, in ſome ſenſe denied, without fear of forfeiting my Chriſtianity.

And to Mr. *Bs.* proofs *I* anſwer, Chriſt did come to make Jew believers children in ſome reſpect, that is, of their temporal enjoyments in *Canaan* miſerable, or under perſecution, and ſo in a worſe condition, and yet he is thereby no deſtroyer of mans happineſs, but a Saviour of them, this worſe condition working for their eternal good. Nor is it any abſurdity to ſay, he that would not accuſe the adulterous woman, would leave out of his viſible Church Chriſtian all infants without accuſation, ſith this leaving out was onely an act of Soveraignty as a Lord, not of punitive juſtice as a Judge.

But the consequence is that which I denied before and now also, and to his proof I give the same answer, which he thus exagitates.

Can you imagine what shift is left against this plain truth? I will tell you all that Mr. T. could say (before many thousand witnesses I think) and that is this, He saith plainly, That it is a better condition to infants to be out of the Church now, then in it then which I thought a Christian could scarse have believed. 1. Are all those glorious things spoken of the City of God, and is it now better to be out of any Church then in it?

Answ. It is no shift but a plain truth, which if there had been many more witnesses, I should still avouch as part of my faith, and mee thinks if Mr. *B.* be a Christian, and not a Jew, hee should believe it too. For were not the *Jews* infants by their visible Churchmembership bound to be circumcised, and to keep *Moses* Law? was not this an heavie and intollerable yoke? Is it not a mercy to be freed from it? What real Evangelical promise or blessing do infants of believing *Jews* now lose, by not being Christian visible Churchmembers? I challenge Mr. *B.* to shew me any one particular real Evangelical blessing, which doth not as well come to an infant of a believer unbaptized, or non-admitted to visible Churchmembership as to the baptized, or admitted, or any true cause of discomfort to parents by my doctrine, which is not by his own. Dare he say, that the promises of saving grace, or protection, or other blessings, are not belonging to them because unbaptized, not admitted visible Churchmembers? If he dare not, let him forbear to calumniate my doctrine as unchristian, and tragically to represent it as cruel, and uncomfortable to parents, and so not like a solid disputant or judicious Divine cleer truth, but like an Orator raise passion without judgement, and endeavour to make me and that which is a plain truth odious, which course will at last redound to his shame, if it do not pierce his conscience. I said not as Mr. *Bs.* question intimates, that it is now better to be out of any Church then it, but that it is a better condition to infants to bee out of the Church now, then to be in it then, meaning that nonvisible Churchmembership to infants now is a better condition then visible Churchmembership was to them then. And for that passage, that *glorious things are spoken of the City of God*, to prove the contrary it is ridiculously alledged. For that speech is meant of *Jerusalem*, or *Sion preferred before all the dwellings of Jacob*, Psal. 87. 1, 2, 3. not of all the Jewish Church, and to it may be well opposed that of the Apostle *Gal.* 4. 25. *Hierusalem which is now in bondage with her children*, which proves my position.

Mr. B. adds. 2. *Then the Gentiles, Pagans infants now, are happier then the Jews were then; for the Pagans and their infants are out of the Church?*

Answ. It follows not from my position, which was of Christian believers infants with those promises and probabilities they have, and from thence followes not that Pagans infants out of the Church without those promises and probabilities Christian believers infants have, are happier then the *Jews* were then.

But, saith he, *I were best to argue it a little further.* 3. *If it be a better condition to be in that Covenant with God wherein he bindeth himself to be their God, and taketh them to be his peculiar people, then to be out of that Covenant, then it is a better condition to be in the Church as it was then, then to be out of that and this too: But it is a better condition to be in the aforesaid Covenant with God, then out of it: Therefore it is better to be in the Church as then to be in neither. The antecedent is undeniable: The consequence is clear in these two conclusions; 1. That the inchurched Jews were then all in such a Covenant with God: This I proved*, Deut. 29.11,12. *what Mr. T. vainly saith against the plain words of this Text, you may see in the end.* 2. *There is to those that are now out of the Church no such covenant, assurance, or mercy answerable. If there be, let some body shew it: which I could never get Mr. T. to do Nay he seemeth to confess in his Sermon, that infants now have no priviledge at all in stead of their churchmembership.*

Answ. If the Covenant be meant (as I have proved before, *Sect.* 64. it is) of the Covenant of the Law concerning settling them in *Canaan* if they kept the law of *Moses*, then the antecedent is not undeniable; but it is most true, that the condition of believers and their children now with the exhibition of Christ, the promises and probabilities they have of saving knowledge of Christ and salvation by him, is better out of the aforesaid Covenant with God then in it. But the consequence was also denied, because Mr. *B.* means the Covenant of grace: And if it be meant of the Covenant of Evangelical grace, neither of his conclusions are true; nor is the former proved from *Deut.* 29.11,12. For if it were true, that all that did stand there before the Lord did enter into covenant, yet they were not therefore in the covenant wherein God bindeth himself to be their God. Their entring into covenant was by their promise to obey God, which they might do, and yet not be in the covenant wherein God bindeth himself to be their God, sith Gods promise is not to them that enter into covenant, but to them that keep it; yea, if it were that they were in that covenant, yet that covenant did not put any into a happy condition but those that kept Gods laws, it being made conditionally, and so not all the inchurched Jews were in that covenant wherein God bindeth himself to be their God. Yea, if it were as Mr. *B.* would have it, that the promise of being their God were meant of Evangelical grace; yet according to his Doctrine it is upon condition of faith, and so it is either universal to all in or out of the Church, or to none but those who are believers, who were not all the inchurched Jews. Nor is the second conclusion true; there is the same covenant of Evangelical grace made to infants who are now no visible churchmembers as was then, to the elect now as was then, to whom alone it was made then and now. And as for mercy answerable to visible churchmembership of infants, enough is said here, *Sect.* 64.

Mr. *B.* adds. 4. *I argue from* Rom. 3.1. *what advantage hath the Jew, and what profit the circumcision? much every way*, &c. *If the Jews circumcised inchurched infants had much advantage every way, and those without*

without the Church have none; then it is better be in their Church then without the Church: But the former is plain in the Text; therefore the later is certain.

Answ. The advantage the Jew had, was when they were the people of God above them who were heathen infidels, not above Christian believers: Now it is true, that it was better to be in their Church, then to be without the Church, as heathen infidels and their children were, But this doth not prove what is to be proved, that the condition of Jews infants in their Church visible, is better then of Christian believers infants now no visible Churchmembers. Nevertheless the speech of the Apostle is not meant of Jew infants; for the instance he gives of *committing to them the Oracles of God*, is not true of the infants; and therefore it is denied, that Mr. *Bs.* anteceedent is plain in the text in respect of the forepart of it: And it is false also, that the infants of Christians, though not Christian visible churchmembership, have no such advantage as the Jews had; For in this thing the advantage of the Christians infant is more then of the Jews, sith the Scriptures being now more common and better cleared, they may sooner know them then the Jews infants could

5. Saith he, *Again from* Rom.9.4. *I argue thus: If then to the Jews pertained the adoption, the covenants, the promises,* &c. *but no such thing to them without the Church; then it is worse to be out of the Church, then to be in it as they were: But the former is the words of the Holy Ghost; therefore the consequent is certain.*

Answ. The consequence is denied, For if this were true, it would as well prove it to have been a better condition to be in the visible Church Jewish then, then to be in the Christian Church visible now. For now those things expressed *Rom.*9.4,5. belong not to them who are in the visible Church Christian; yea, it is now Christ is come the benefit of the Church to be freed from them, I mean some of them, as the services which were in sacrifices, *&c.* the glory which was the Ark, the Covenants, to wit, the Tables of stone, the adoption which excluded the Gentiles from being Gods people; and concerning the other three, the giving of the Law, discent from the Fathers, Christs consanguinity, they are such as cannot be to any other, and are all recompensed abundantly by the comming of Christ, the gift of the Spirit, preaching of the Gospel, without infants visible churchmembership. And therefore though there be no such thing as those things mentioned, *Rom.*9.4,5. to them that are out or in the visible Church Christian, yet there are better things to Christians, which make their condition, and their infants not actually visible churchmembers, better then the Jewish churchstate at the best.

6. Saith he, *If it be bettter to be in Gods house and family then out, and in his visible Kingdome then out; then it is better to be in the Church (though but as the Jews were) then out: But the former is evident; therefore the latter.*

Answ. It is true, it is better to be in Gods house and family then out, and so infants may be though they be not in the Christian Church visible;

ble; and though they be not in Christs visible Kingdome, yet they may be in his invisible, which is most truly his Kingdome and house, and this estate is better then to be in the Jewish Church visible. But it was not better with infants by vertue of their visible churchmembership, then it is with believers infants without it, sith they are freed from the yoke of bondage the Jews were under, and have equal portion, if not more of Evangelical grace then they had, and therefore the consequence is denied.

7. Saith Mr. B. *If it be better to be a sanctified peculiar people of God, then to be none such (but an excluded common unclean people;) then it is better to be in the Church (though but as the Jews were) then out of the Church: But the former is most certain; therefore the later. The consequence is plain, in that all the Church, both Jews and Gentiles are properly a peculiar people separated or sanctified to God; and so are they still called in the Old Testament and New: And therefore those without the Church must needs be an excluded people (even as election of some implieth passing by or rejecting of others;) and therefore are called common and unclean frequently.*

Answ. This being understood of the visible Church, it is false that those without the Church visible must needs be an excluded people from God; for then all abortives, and still born children, persons dying without signs sensible of faith and repentance though before God believers, excommunicate persons should be excluded from God. And as for Mr. *Bs.* proof, that *the Church are properly a peculiar people separated or sanctified to God*, this cannot be true in reality (which must make their condition better) but onely of those who are of the invisible also, of which infants may be, though not of the visible; of the rest it is true onely in appearance, which makes their condition not better in the Church, but worse then of those without, sith the odiousness of their hypocrisie provokes God against them the more, though cloaked from men by their fair profession.

8. Saith he. "If God do not usually bestow so many or greater "mercies out of his Church, as he doth in it; then it is worse to be out "of the Church, then to be in it (though but as the Jews were:) But "certainly God useth not to bestow so many or greater mercies out of "the Church, as in it; therefore it is worse to be out then in (though "but as the Jews.)

Answ. Mr. *B.* should prove the *minor* (which I deny) that God doth not bestow usually so many or greater mercies to infants now not visible Christian churchmembers, as he did to infants in the Jewish Church visible; (For so must his *minor* be, if his conclusion oppose my position:) which sith he proves not, my denial is sufficient answer.

9. Saith he, "If Christ have made larger promises to his Church "visible, then to any in the world that are not of the Church, (nay, if "there be no special promise at all, nor scarce common, to any without "the Church, but the conditional, upon their comming in,) then is it "worse to be out of the Church then to be so in it: But the former is "true, therefore the later.

Answ.

Answ. Mr. B. brings no proof for his *minor*, and therefore it is enough for me to deny it, as being false concerning abortives, still-born, infant children elect, and others.

10. Saith he, "If Christ have promised his presence to his Church "to the end of the world, and to walk among his golden candlesticks, "and take pleasure in her; but not so to those without the Church; "then it is better being within (though but as the Jews) then without. "But the former is true; therefore the latter. Did I not resolve on "brevity, it were easier to cite multitudes of texts for all these.

Answ. Mr. B. should prove his *minor*, that Christ hath promised these things to infants in the visible Church Jewish, and not to infants of believers, who are not visible churchmembers Christian; for which, though he talk of multitudes of texts, yet I shall not believe he hath any till he produce them.

He adds. "But upon this much I say to the contrary minded as "*Joshua* in another case, choose you of what society you will be of; but "as for me and my household, we will be of the Church of God.

Answ. And so say I, if I can prevail with them, or for them.

Mr. B. adds, "And had I children, I should be loth God should "shut them out. *Answ.* So say I.

Again Mr. B. "For without are dogs, extortioners, liars, *&c.* "Even Christ calls the woman of *Canaan* that was without, a dog; "though when he had admitted her into his Church, she became a "daughter.

Answ. The words, *Revel.* 22.15. *without are dogs*, the verse foregoing shews to be meant of being without the city where the blessed enter; and it being compared with *Rev.* 21.8. thence appears, that *they that are without are cast into the lake burning with fire and brimstone, which is the second death*: which if he say (as his words intimate) of all that are not visible churchmembers, he pronounceth a bloudy sentence against millions that are in heaven, and must be a hundred times more uncomfortable to parents concerning their abortive still-born children, then any thing I ever held. And his abuse of Christs words, *Matth.* 15.26. *Mark* 7.27. is yet more gross, in alledging them after that, *Rev* 22.15. as if *dogs*, *Matth.* 15.26. were of the same sense with *dogs* in the other, whereas *Rev.* 22.15. it is οἱ κύνες, and doth note such *as rend them that give holy things to them*, *Matth.* 7.6. but *Matth.* 15.26. *Mark* 7.27. it is τὰ κυνάρια, *little dogs*, and doth not note persons so called from their profane, mischievous, impious behaviour, but in opposition to *children*, that is *Jews*, such as were of Gentile discent, and therefore accounted unclean. And the application of them is as bad, as if the not making infants Christian visible churchmembers, made them dogs in either sense: Whereas to make them *dogs*, as *Rev.* 22.15. is meant, is not onely to make them non-visible churchmembers, but also of most wicked manners and damned wretches; and the term *dogs*, as used *Matth.* 15.26. might be applied as well to visible churchmembers not Jewish, such as *Cornelius*, *Acts* 10.2. as to those out of it. Nor doth it appear that our Lord Christ either admitted the woman of

Canaan

Canaan into his Church or termed her daughter (as Mr. *B's.* words intimate) but woman after her manifestation of faith. So that Mr. *B.* as his wont is, doth prophanely abuse the Scripture, to make his adversaries tenet appear odious without cause. What he adds, *I say therefore as Peter whither shall we go, if we forsake the Church? It is good for us to be here: those that will needs think it better to be out of the Church then in it, let them go, they need no Anathema, nor excommunication, seeing they think it such a mercy to bee without the Church, I will not say of it as* Paul *of his ship, except ye abide in it, ye cannot bee saved, and so I conclude, Christ did not come to believers hurt, by unchurching their children*, doth but shew his malignant disposition to spit as much venome as hee can against his antagonists and their doctrine, calumniating it as tending to forsaking the Church, thinking it better to be out of the Church then in it, thinking it a mercy to bee without the Church, Christ did come to believers hurt by unchurching their children, none of which followes from my tenet, but the charging of them on it shewing Mr. *B's.* spightfulness towards mee, and the truth, which the Lord forgive him.

In the same vein of scribling, Mr. *B.* proceeds thus *ch.* 15. *My* 10th. *arg is this from* Heb. 8. 6. [*Jesus is the mediator of a better Covenant established on better promises.* Heb. 7. 22. *And the Author of a better testament.* Rom. 5. 14, 15, 20. *where sin abounded grace much more abounded* Ephes. 3. 19, 20. *That ye may comprehend the height, and breadth, and length, and depth, and know the love of Christ which passeth knowledg*] *with a hundred the like places; from whence I argue thus, If the Church of Christ be not in a worse state now (in regard of their childrens happiness and their parents comfort therein) then it was before Christs comming, then our children ought to bee Churchmembers: (and consequently that ordinance and merciful gift is not repealed.) But all the said texts and many more shew that the Church of Christ is not in a worse condition now then it was then (but unconceivably better:) therefore our children ought to bee Churchmembers, as well as theirs was then. I have before proved that it is worse to bee out of the Church then in it; and then nothing else can bee said against this argument that I know of.*

Answ. That Mr. *B.* hath not proved any thing he should have proved in contradiction to my tenet is before shewed. To the argument here made I answer, 1. by denying the syllogism to be right in form for want of putting in the *minor*, those words (*in regard of their childrens happiness and their parents comfort therein*) and adding in the *minor* those words (*but unconceivably better*) which were not in the *major*, whereby the syllogism is monstrous consisting of four or five terms. 2. Letting that pass I deny the consequence of the *major*, and aver that though our infants be not visible Churchmembers now, yet the Church of Christ is not in a worse state now (in regard of their childrens happiness and their parents comforts therein) then it was before Christs comming, but unconceivably better, in regard of the comming of Christ in the flesh, the gift of the spirit, the preaching of the gospel, &c.

3. That none of the texts speak any thing for Mr. *Bs.* purpose, but rather against it. In the first it is said the Covenant of which Christ is mediator is better then that of which *Moses* or *Aaron* were mediators, and that it is established on better promises, the former containing for the most part promises of earthly blessings in *Canaan*, and that promise which was of righteousness, was upon the condition of keeping the Law, without promise of the spirit; now the new Covenant promises righteousness, forgiveness of all sins through faith in Christ, with a promise of the spirit. But these promises belong not to the Church as it is visible, but as it contains the elect, of which sort infants may be though they be not visible Churchmembers, there's not a word of promise that the visible Church shall consist of a whole nation, of all sorts of people in a nation infants and elder, much less shall consist of more sorts of people then were in the Jewish Church, but of more ample mercies spiritual to the elect, who were all of the invisible Church though not of the visible, and among them infants, abortives, stil-born children, which could not be of the visible; and therefore to speak truth, parents have more comfort by this Covenant both for themselves and children, in that it assures more ample grace, and that to more then visible members under the New Testament. The same answer is to be given to *Heb.* 7. 22. though the word be not as Mr. *B.* here reads it [author] but [surety.] The next text speaks of the abounding of grace by Christ beyond the evil of sin by *Adams* transgression, nothing at all of the enlargement of the visible Church since Christs comming in respect of the sorts of members, over that which the visible Church Jewish had. Yea such a position as it hath not the least footing in the text, so would it not stand with Mr. *Bs.* and other Pædobap ists doctrine, that the visible churchmembership is a priviledge of believers children: but in respect of extent of persons, it was better with the visible Church then, sith it comprehended servants, and the bought children of strangers. And for the last text, to imagine that the love of Christ is every whit the less if infants be not visible churchmembers, is such a conceit as I judge a meer dotage. But there is more of it in that which follows.

Further, saith Mr. *B. I might prove it out of* Ephes. 2. 12. *They that are out of the Church are said to be strangers to the Covenant, and without hope, and without God in the world, in comparison with those within the Church. O how little then do they apprehend that height and depth! &c. or know that love of Christ that passeth knowledge, who think that Christ will unchurch all the infants of believers now, that took them in so tenderly in the time of* Moses? *How insensible do they appear to be of the glorious riches of the Gospel, and the free abundant grace of Christ, who have such unworthy thoughts of him, as if he would put all our children out of his Church? How little know they the difference between* Christ *and* Moses, *that think they might then be churchmembers and not now? And yet (oh the blindness!) these men do this under pretence of magnifying the spirituality of the Gospel priviledges! As if to be a member of Christs Church were a carnal thing; or as if the visible Church were not the object and recipient of spiritual as well as common mercies!*

Answ.

Answ. The Apostle doth not say they that are out of the Church any more then they that are uncircumcised are without hope, without God, nor doth he speak comparatively but absolutely. Nor doth he speak universally of all without the Church, but particularly of the *Ephesians*, nor of them as out of the Church universal but Jewish, nor this as they were merely negatively or privatively out for want of not taking on them the yoke of *Moses* Law, but as they walked after the course of the world *v.* 2, 3. So that these things are not said of them barely as non-visible churchmembers then in the Jewish Church as infants are now in the Christian (for then these things might have bin said of *Cornelius* and his house as well as of them, who were uncircumcised, not in the Commonwealth of *Israel*) but as they were idolaters, alienated from the life of God, and so were neither members of the Church visible, nor invisible of true believers at that time. Therefore to charge us with making the estate of infants of believers by our doctrine as the estate of those mentioned *Ephes.* 2. 12. is a meer calumny tending to nothing else but indirectly to create prejudice in men against the truth. And of the same kinde is that which followes, which insinuates as if by denying infants visible churchmembership, we *lessened Christs love, were insensible of it, and the glorious riches of the Gospel, made Christ less tender now of infants of believers then in Moses time, and had such unworthy thoughts of Christ, as if he would put all our children out of his Church, and knew not the difference between Christ and Moses*, all which are meer flams and frivolous false accusations, fit to take with shallow Pædobaptists, who are caught with flourishes of Rhetorick rather then solid reason. And for that which hee censures as my blindness, I may rather admire his in not discerning it. For however to be a member of Christs Church may be more then a carnal thing, yet to bee a visible Churchmember by natural discent without faith is but a carnal thing, and in this respect the Church Jewish was more carnal then the Christian Church, as the Scriptures intimate, though they were the object and recipient of spiritual as well as common mercies. The rest that follows is in the same calumniating vein, for wee say as the Apostle *Gal.* 4. 27. that is, that the new Covenant or Gentile Church hath more children then the Jewish, in that there were more believers in the world on the preaching of the Gospel as is said *Revel.* 5. 9. then in the national Church Jewish, nor do wee, as Mr. *B.* belies us, *make all* or any *of the children of* the new Covenant or Gentile *Church cast out*, for they onely are those who are *by promise, born after the spirit*, that is, true believers *v.* 28, 29. and not as ignorantly and fondly Mr. *B.* imagines all the infant children of Gentile believers. Nor do wee by our doctrine contradict the Apostles words *Heb.* 11. 40. which are ridiculously applied to infants visible Churchmembership. For *the better thing provided for us* is that which the believers afore Christ received not, which is by some conceived to bee heaven, but generally Protestant Divines understand it of the exhibition of Christ in the flesh, and the clear knowledge of him, which if true, proves what I aver, that Christs exhibition in the flesh, the gift of the spirit,

and the revelation of the Gospel, and the taking in of the Gentiles, are in stead of that visible Churchmembership the Jewes had, and all the priviledges annexed. However it cannot bee infants visible Churchmembership as Mr. B. makes it, for that they had as Mr. B. asserts, and therefore the denying of it by me, makes not us in so much worse a condition then they. Nor do wee by denying infants visible Churchmembership aver the partition wall taken down *Ephes.* 2. 14. by Christ to be in part standing, For the partition wall is clearly meant of the body of Ceremonies, and necessitie of repairing to the Temple and taking the yoke of *Moses* Law on them, which kept the Gentiles from joyning with the Jewes in the worship of the same God, which I keep not up in any sort, much less *pluck up the wall of the Church or vineyard it self, and as for our children to lay all waste to the wilderness*, but Mr. B. by maintaining a national Church or visible Churchmembership by natural discent, doth keep up the partition wall in true construction, sith the way of pulling down the partition wall by God, hath been by making all one body through faith, the succession of which in the place of Circumcision and the Jewish Churchmembership, is the doctrine of the Apostle *Gal.* 3. and elsewhere, as is shewed before.

Mr. B. continues the same prattle *Ch.* 15. thus. "My 11. arg. is "this, If the children of believers be now put out of the Church, then "they are in a worse condition then the very children of the Gentiles "were before the comming of Christ: But that were most absurd and "false; therefore so is the antecedent. The consequent would plainly "follow, if the antecedent were true, as is evident thus: Before Christs "comming any Gentile in the world without exception, if hee would "might have his children to be members of the visible Church: But "now (according to Mr. *T.*) no Gentile may have his child a member "of the Church; therefore according to this doctrine, the very Gentiles "as well as the Jews, are in a worse condition now: and Christ should "come to be a destroyer, and do hurt to all the world, (which is most "vile doctrine.) That the Gentiles might have their children Church-"members before, if they would come in themselves, is not denied nor "indeed can bee: For it is the expres letter of Gods law, that any "stranger that would come in might bring his children, and all bee cir-"cumcised and admitted members of the Jews Church: This was the ease "of any that would be full proselytes; God in providence did deny to "give the knowledge of his laws to the Gentiles, as he did to the Jews, "but he excepted no man out of the mercy of his Covenant, that would "come in and take it (except some few that were destinated to wrath for "the height of their wickedness, whom he commanded them presently "utterly to destroy.) If any say that the Gentiles were admitted with "their infants into no Church, but the particular Church of the Jews, I "shall answer him 1. That it is false; for they were admitted into the "visible universal Church, as I shall shew more fully afterward. "2. If it were so, yet the Church of the Jewes was a happy Church "of God, in a thousand fold better state, then those without.

"So

" So that he that will be of the faith of our opposers, you see, must be-
" lieve that Christ hath come to deny the very Gentiles that priviledge
" which for their children they had before. Yea, that you may see it
" was not tied to the Jews onely, or the seed of *Abraham*, even when
" *Abrahams* own family was circumcised, (and as Mr. *T.* thinks, then
" first admitted all into the Church;) there was but one of the seed of
" *Abraham* circumcised at that time (for he had no one but *Ishmael*)
" but of servants that were not of his seed, there were admitted or cir-
" cumcised 318. trained men-servants that fought for him *Gen.* 14. 14.
" and how many hundred women and children and all he had, you may
" conjecture. And all these were then of the Church, and but one of
" *Abrahams* seed, and that one *Ishmael*. Therefore certainly though the
" greatest priviledges were reserved for *Isaac* and his seed, of whom
" Christ was to come, yet not the priviledge of sole churchmembership;
" for the very children of *Abrahams* servants were churchmembers.
" And so I think this is plain enough.

Answ. It is most vile doctrine, to say, Christ came to be a destroyer, and to do hurt to all the world; and it is most vile doctrine which Mr. *B.* insinuates, as if the denying of infants visible churchmembership did infer their destruction: which is most palpably false, such neither were all churchmembers visible saved, as *v. g. Ishmael*, *Esau*; nor all non-visible churchmembers damned, as *v. g.* abortives, still-borns. And therefore Mr. *B.* by these insinuations discovers nothing but his own virulency, and I can justly deny the consequence of his argument till he shew me what benefit the infants of believers now do lose by not being Christian visible churchmembers which tends to their destruction, and what is the benefit of infant visible Christian churchmembership which is for their salvation, which they have not though they be not visible churchmembers, I mean real and not meer putative benefit. For my part, 1. I think still that infants were not admitted into any visible Church but the Jews, and their being of the universal was onely in that they were of the Jewish. 2. I think it is a benefit not to be of the Church Jewish, in which men were entred by circumcision, and bound to keep the law; and that *Cornelius*, and such other as were not full proselytes, were in as good a case as the full proselytes; and that it is but vain talk of Mr. *B.* that the Church of the Jews was a happy Church of God, in a thousand fold better estate then those without onely as proselytes of the gate. 3. That though there were in the Jewish Church other then *Abrahams* seed, yet they were all of the *Hebrew* Commonwealth. 4. That many of those churchmembers had no part in any of the promises made to *Abraham*. And I think this argument of Mr. *B.* takes onely with them who superficially look into the thing, as Mr. *B.* hath done.

SECT. LXVII.

Mr. B's. 12th. arg. ch. 17. part 1. of Baptism, from Deut. 29. 10, 11, 12. is answered, and my answers vindicated.

CH. 17. he proceeds thus. "My 12th. Arg. is from the forementioned Text, *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12. where all the Jews, with all their little ones were entred into Covenant with God. From whence I argue thus. If the Covenant which those infants who were then churchmembers were entred into with God was a Covenant of grace (or a Gospel Covenant) then it is not repealed, (and consequently their churchmembership is not repealed, as being built on the Covenant, or inseparably conjunct:) But the said Covenant which the infants who were then churchmembers did pass into, was a Covenant of grace, (as distinct from the law, which was repealed;) therefore neither it nor their churchmembership is repealed. Here I shall prove, 1. That all the infants did pass into this Covenant. 2. That they were churchmembers that did so. 3. That it was such a Covenant of grace. 4. And then it will follow that it is not repealed.

Answ. The argument from this Text was urged very hotly by Mr. *B.* in the Dispute at *Bewdley, Jan.* 1. 1649. but in another manner, as I gather from two copies of the Dispute, which though imperfect, yet both agree, that the argument then was this, *They who* solemnly entred into Covenant with God were visible churchmembers: But the infants of the Jews in the wilderness uncircumcised did so, *Ergo.* Mr. *B.* himself in his *Corrective, sect.* 5. *The Text in* Deut. 29. *was brought to prove that God entred into Covenant with infants to take them for his people, and to be their God, and consequently made them churchmembers.* The form here used doth vary the conclusion, and the *medium* and particularly the term [*who solemnly entred into Covenant with God*] into this [*were entred into Covenant with God*] and in his *Correct. sect.* 5. into this [*God entred into Covenant with infants to take them for his people, and to be their God*] between which there is so great a difference, that as the argument was framed in the Dispute, I should not deny the *major*; but as there it is framed, I should deny the consequence, it being certain God may enter into Covenant with some to take them for his people, and to be their God, who neither are nor ever shall be visible churchmembers; as elect persons dying with death-bed repentance not manifested, &c. But I shall keep to the form as it is here used. And 1. I grant that the churchmembership of the infants which did pass into Covenant, *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12. is not repealed: For it being an individual accident can neither in congruous sense be said to be repealed, nor it being *non ens* now is it capable of repeal if the speech were right. 2. I grant also that Gods Covenant of grace, or his Gospel covenant is not repealed, that is, changed into another Covenant. 3. I grant also that invisible church-

churchmembership is built on the Covenant of grace, or the Gospel covenant, or is inseparably conjunct with it. But this I deny 1. that any law of infants visible churchmembership unrepealed is contained in *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12. 2. That the mutual Covenant entred into there was the Gospel covenant of grace. 3. I say, that if it were, yet it follows not that infant visible churchmembership is not ceased, or in Mr. *Bs.* dialect repealed. But let us view Mr. *Bs.* proof.

1. Saith he, *Mr. T. denied long together in the face of many thousand people, that the infants were entred into any such Covenant, against the plain letter of the Text: Yet he persisted to deny it without any reason (as you may see in the Dispute, if out.) If plain Scripture will not satisfie these men, why then do they call for Scripture? The words are, Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God, your Captains of your Tribes, your Officers, Elders, and all the men of Israel, your little ones, your wives, and the stranger that is in thy camp, from the hewer of thy wood unto the drawer of thy water, that thou shouldst enter into Covenant with the Lord thy God, and into his Oath which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day, that he may establish thee to day for a people unto himself, and that he may be to thee a God, &c. He that saith infants did not pass into this Covenant, I question whether he believe this to be the word of God: For how should it be spoken plainer?*

Answ. The thing which I denied was, that infants did visibly and solemnly enter into Covenant, which Mr. *B.* affirmed, and I gave the reason, because they did by no visible sign declare their assent to the Covenant: And when Mr. *B.* replied, that *the parents did it for them*, I answered, the parents act for them might bind them, but yet it is not their act, nor that which makes a visible churchmember; and sure had I conceived his *minor* so meant [*that the infants did by their parents visibly and solemnly enter into Covenant*] I should have granted it, and denied his *major* [*They who visibly and solemnly entred into Covenant with God by their parents act for them, were visible churchmembers*] Now this answering of mine he endeavoured then and since to represent with as much disparagement as might be to me, though what ever imperfection there were in my answer (which I do not deprehend to have been such as Mr. *B.* hath made it) it was in a great part from Mr. *Bs.* ambiguous use of words, and his captious taking advantage from my words, and not explaining his own, which made me answer somewhat perplexedly. But the matter being now in print, let's view the Dispute as it stands in the Books. I had said in my *Sermon*, and after in my *Antidote*, *sect.* 5. that [*thou*] *v.* 12. doth not necessarily comprehend the little ones. To this Mr. *B.* in his *Correct.* pag. 249. replies, 1. that *he either sets a low value on my conscience, or judgement*; which is not worth answering, 2. *Do you not know*, saith he, *that* [*thou*] *is a collective term, usually through the Books of Moses spoken of all the people, except any be particularly excepted?* Answ. I do know it is a collective term, yet often used with exception of infants by the matter of the speech, though not particularly. And for this I need go no further then *Deut.* 29. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. *Deut.* 30. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20. And in some of

these,

these, *v.* 2. *thou and thy children*, *v.* 6. *thine heart and the heart of thy seed*, *v.* 19. *thou and thy seed*, Deut. 29. 29. *us and our children*, are so expressly distinguished, that I am much confirmed that [*thou*] Deut. 29. 12. doth not comprehend the little ones, *v.* 11.

3. Saith he, *Are not little ones here named? and yet are they excluded?*

Answ. They are named, *v.* 11. yet not meant by [*thou*] *v.* 12.

4. Saith he, *why should* Moses *say, here stand your children and wives, that not they but you might enter into Covenant?*

Answ. 1. Why should the strangers stand there, *v.* 11. and yet *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob* not *their fathers? v.* 13. 2. I conceive God would have a general appearance for the more solemnity of the thing, but that some should act in the name of the whole people, and therefore mention of all, *v.* 11. yet the act of covenanting which was personal, *v.* 12. restrained onely to the representatives.

5. *Doth not Mr.* T. *confess that the Jews infants were in Covenant? why else were they circumcised, which is the seal of the Covenant?*

Answ. 1. Circumcision is no where called in Scripture the Seal of the Covenant, and how far I allow it, may be seen *sect.* 31. 2. Infants were circumcised, not because they were in Covenant, those who were not in Covenant were to be circumcised. 3. The Jews infants were in the political or domestical Covenant made to *Abraham*, all of them upon condition of their obedience to the law, some of them in the Covenant or promise of saving grace made to the elect, none of them in the Covenant by their own personal act of covenanting or promising, which is that alone which I deny, and which makes visible churchmembers in the Christian Church.

6. Saith Mr. B. *I desire no means to convince any man of your strange abuse of the Text, but only that he will read it.* [*Ye stand this day all of you*, &c. *and that he may be to thee a God*] *He that can considerately believe Mr.* T. *that the word* [*thou*] *v.* 12. *doth not necessarily comprehend the little ones, if I knew him, I would tell him, that I will not undertake by Scripture to convince him of any thing at all. And I say again in sobriety, that if the Papists had as plain Scripture for their Religion as it differs from ours, I would not delay a week, but would turn Papist*, &c.

Answ. Mr. B's. words onely express his confidence in his conceit, which in this and many more things I conceive to come from his hasty determinations, without weighing all objections to the contrary. But I desire both him and the Reader to let me know what that entring into Covenant is which may be termed the infants act, afore he censure my interpretation of [*thou*] as not comprehending little ones necessarily, but as noting some instead of the rest, as a strange abuse of the Text; sure it was no act of words or sign shewing any consent or assent to the Covenant or Oath of God: And if, as *Piscator* conceives in his *scholie*, it were *by passing through* (as the word in the *Hebrew* is) *the parts of the divided living creatures in testimony of the covenant*, I say again, surely neither little ones, nor all the rest did pass between the parts of the the beasts divided, but some in stead of the rest. I think they will not say, it was their bare presence which was the entring into Covenant;

for

for their ſtanding there was before it, and the entring into Covenant a conſequent of it. I do not accenſe him, as he knows who hath done, of being a Papiſt; nor dare I abſolve Mr. *B.* from yeelding too much in ſome of his writings for Papiſts, Arminians, and Socinians advantage, in ſeeking to avoid Antinomianiſm and Anabaptiſm. But I hope both Mr. *B.* and his Reader will be more ſober and wiſe then to go over to the Papiſts upon this declaration of Mr. *B.* who if he did not ſuggeſt to the people as if it were my impudence to deny it at the Diſpute, I was miſtaken, and ſo were others, and I intreat him to pardon my miſtake. But Mr. *B.* adds.

Where he ſaith, that [*you*] *v.* 14. *is diſtinguiſhed from* [*them that ſtand, &c.*] *I anſwer*: 1. *I think not; but from them that were abſent: q. d. not with you onely, but* (*both*) *with him that is here* (*that is you*) *and him that is not here.*

Anſw. I find no interpreter who doth not render ו *v.* 15. by the adverſative, and the *Tigurine* Divines render it *ſed et* but alſo, which ſhews a plain diſtinction of [*you, v.* 14.] from *him* that *ſtandeth here with us this day before the Lord our God*; and if I underſtand any thing in this kind, Mr. *Bs.* expoſition is not good ſenſe, to expound *not with you onely, but with him that is here with us that is you.* For *v.* 15. *him that ſtandeth here* is oppoſed to *you, v.* 14. and *you onely* being an excluſive terme, muſt exclude the reſt, and when it is ſaid [*with us*] meaning himſelfe, and [*you*] *v.* 14. it is meere nonſenſe to expound it thus, him that ſtandeth with us, if us comprehend him that ſtandeth there, as it doth according to Mr. *Bs.* expoſition. Beſides, the different numbers of [*him that ſtandeth here with us*] and [*you*] do ſhew that they are not the ſame. And I thinke I may ſay as Mr. *B.* I deſire no meanes to convince any man of Mr. *Bs.* ſtrange expoſition, but onely that hee will read the Text.

But he ſaith. 2. *were it otherwiſe, yet it were onely from the people of other nations that ſtood among them.*

Anſw 1. If Mr. *B.* mean thy ſtranger which is in thy Camp, *v.* 11. I expect ſome reaſon why [you onely] *v.* 14. ſhould exclude them more then the little ones and wives; rather me thinks [you onely] ſhould include thoſe mentioned *v.* 10. and him that ſtandeh with us here this day ſhould mean thoſe *v.* 11. And the plain ſenſe ſeems to be this, that though the Captains, Elders, Officers, men of *Iſrael* who were to enter into Covenant, did by themſelves onely covenant, yet *Moſes* in Gods ſtead did make that Covenant and Oath not onely with them, to whom his ſpeech was directed, but alſo with the reſt, *v.* 11. 2. If he mean the ſtrangers not of that congregation or Church of *Iſrael*, ſurely the Covenant was not made with them, as here *Moſes* ſaith it was with him that ſtandeth here with us this day.

Mr. *B.* adds of me. *where he ſaith* [*ſome entred into Covenant in behalf of the reſt*] *I anſwer*: 1. *God entred into Covenant on his part immediately, or by Moſes the Mediatour with them all, and not with ſome onely.*

Answ. Be it so, yet on the other part some entred into Covenant in behalf of the rest, and so [*thou*] *v.* 12. comprehends not little ones, *v.* 11. for sure if in behalf of any some entred into Covenant, and [*thou*] comprehend not them, them they were the little ones.

2. Saith he, *I doubt not but the parents entred their children into Covenant, and not the infants themselves; which shews, that God hath given parents this interest and authority.*

Answ. 1. This is a confession of what I aver, and of which Mr. *B.* and his followers have made such exclamations against me. For if [*thou v.* 12.] entred themselves into Covenant, and infants entred not themselves into Covenant, then infants are not comprehended under [*thou, v.* 12.] But so it is. *Ergo.* The consequence is plain of it self, the *minor* is for the first part the words of the Text, unless Mr. *B.* will say, *that thou shouldest enter into Covenant* is not, that thou shouldest enter into Covenant thy self, which is a gross absurdity; and the other part is Mr. *Bs.* own: and thus Mr. *B.* hath justified me in that which he counted so strange an abuse of the Text. 2. For my part, I doubt whether the parents entred the children into Covenant, and do rather conceive that the Captains, Elders, Officers, *v.* 10. did enter into Covenant by some solemn act of passing between the parts of a beast divided, or otherwise in stead of the children, wives, and servants, *v.* 11. and not the parents for the infants, 1. because the distinct mention of those, *v.* 10. under the titles there used, do intimate that they were representatives of those *v.* 11. now *v.* 10 persons are not expressed under the title of parents, but under other relations: 2. Because it being a national covenanting, it seems most suitable to the end of it, that it was done by national Officers: 3. If there were any other then those persons, the solemnity could not be likely done with decency, the number being so great as could not hear *Moses*, nor do such acts as might signifie the covenanting: 4. Because it was so at other times, *Exod.* 19. 7. *Josh.* 9. 15, 19. which if true, this place proves not that God had given parents the interest and authority to covenant for their children: 5. The wives were parents as well as the husbands, but it is not probable that the wives did covenant for the children, therefore not the parents as parents, but under some other consideration.

3. Saith Mr. *B. But that any other that had the use of reason should not enter their own consent is a fiction not to be admitted: And yet Mr. T. in his confutation Sermon, excludeth the wives from a personal covenanting, as well as the infants; but barely on his own authority: Nay, he saith, it was onely the captains and Officers, though the Covenant is made with the rest.*

Answ. I have given my reasons for what I conceive, I impose them not on others, it is sufficient for present that I have vindicated my assertion so much inveighed against by Mr. *B.* that [thou] *v.* 12. doth not necessarily comprehend infants.

2. Saith Mr. *B.* "Mr. *T.* denied in our Dispute, that these infants "were visible churchmembers; for when hee had maintained that

"[none

"[none were churchmembers but those that were circumcised] and "that [churchmembership was not then without circumcision] I told "him, that the infants for 40. years in the wilderness were not circum- "cised, and yet were churchmembers, and proved it from this Cove- "nant; yet did he resolutely deny it, that the infants were church- "members: Whereupon seeing he wasted time in wrangling, I was "bold to say, I did verily believe that (contrary to our first agreement) "he disputed against his own conscience, seeing he could not believe "himself, that the infants then were no churchmembers, and that none "but the circumcised were churchmembers: But he took it ill, that *I* "should so charge him to go against conscience; and yet when I told "him, that women were churchmembers, though not circumcised, he "confessed all, and yeelded that the infants were so too. And indeed "else God had no Church, or almost none in the wilderness, when all "but *Caleb* and *Joshua* were dead of the old stock; and all of forty years "old were uncircumcised; yet *Steven* calls it the Church in the wilder- "ness, *Acts* 7.38. But I think it vain to prove that those were church- "members that entred such a Covenant. He that will deny this, is scarce "to be disputed with.

Answ. I do confess there was much time wasted in the Dispute, and that my answers were varied according to my several apprehensions of Mr. *Bs.* meaning, which by reason of his ambiguities and uncertain expressions I could not be assured of, nor would he be brought to explain any thing to me, but what I could force him to by distinction, which yet hee shifted off, that I might be still at a loss what to determine. First hee asserted a law of admitting infants visible churchmembers unrepealed, which I conceived was that of circumcision, and thereupon denied infants in the wilderness to have beene visible churchmembers, meaning solemnly admitted, in which sense I meant that churchmembership was not then without Circumcision. But when hee denied, hee meant Circumcision, I pressed him to tell what other law there was, which hee then did not, but went to prove them churchmembers, which I confessed, if not understood as to admitted, but as part of that people as the women were. Secondly, when I found hee used not the term visible churchmembers as it is taken by Protestant writers for those that professed the Christian faith, I denied infants were churchmembers visible by the way which made them such in the Christian Church, though they were visible churchmembers according to the way of constitution of the Jewish Church, which was a Commonwealth, of which all that were members were churchmembers. This is the true summe of what past between us in that time Mr. *B.* speakes of, in which nothing was spoken against my conscience (as hee unbrotherlike charged mee,) and such altercation as was, was necessitated on my part by his averseness from explaining his meaning, which *I* instantly pressed him to, but still hee put by with one flirt or another at mee, that hee might drive mee to speake something, which hee might represent (as hee still did) in the most odious manner hee could to the auditors,

which injurious way hath been that which hath confirmed his party, though thereby they are abused by him. For present I grant the infants *Deut.*29.11. were then visible churchmembers, but not by that Covenant.

Against this Mr. *B.* in his *Correct. sect.*5. saith thus. "2. He saith, "*Moses* made that Covenant with him that was not there that day, that "is, their posterity not yet born; shall it therefore be said, that they "were visible members? *&c.*] I answer, 1. it is evident the Cove-"nant spoke *de præsenti* to those that were: but *de futuro* onely of those "that were not in being, but future: They that were not, could "not bee members visible or invisible. As they had a being, so "they had a membership; that is *in posse, & in futuritione, non in esse.* "By vertue of this deed of gift they should be born church members. "If a Landlord do by lease make over any land to you, and your chil-"drens children, paying so much rent; doth it follow that your chil-"dren (who are born) are none of this mans tenants, because your "childrens children (who are unborn) are not his tenants actually, "but potentially? Or, if a King be set over us, and our children, and "childrens children (by compact,) doth it follow, that our children in "being are not his subjects in being because our childrens children in "*posse* are not subjects in *esse* but in *posse* onely? Ah here is good ar-"guing!

Answ. I find *Moses* speaking of God's Covenant, but not the Covenant speaking, nor is that expression good sense; nor was the speech to any other then were there, though it was of what should be after, and that as well what should be after to them that were present, as to them that were to be after, *v.*13. and I think it true, that they which were not could not be members visible, though if the invisible Church be so from election, as most Protestant Divines say, they might be members invisible. And it is true, that as they had a being so they had membership (visible) not in being but potsibility and futurition. But this is no answer to my reason, but a strengthening of it. For whereas the the reason was this, That Covenant doth not make actually visible churchmembers, which is made with them who are not actually visible churchmembers: But that Covenant was made with them that were not actually visible churchmembers, for it was made with the unborn, who are confessed not to be actually visible churchmembers by Mr. *B.* himself; *Ergo.* The *major* is plain from the rule in Logick, *The same as the same doth always the same.* And for Mr. *Bs.* instances, it is true, that it follows not, the children born are not tenants or subjects actually because the unborn are not; but it follows, the lease and compact of themselves do not make actually tenants or subjects, because if they did they would do so the unborn as well as the born; so in this point, though the arguing be not good, the unborn are not actually visible churchmembers, therefore the born are not; yet this (which was my arguing) was good, By the Covenant which was made with the unborn they were not actually visible churchmembers, therefore by the same Covenant of it self, without any other cause, neither were the born in-

fants

fants actually visible churchmembers; and consequently Mr. *B.* cannot from the making of this Covenant prove the Jewish infants actually visible churchmembers.

To my saying, that an entring into Covenant by parents doth not make a visible member in the Christian Church however (not as Mr. *B* prints it though) it did in the Jewish, he saith much in the compass of a few lines, all which is answered before in several *sections*, chiefly 50,51,52,57. But he saith, 3. *That this was a Covenant of grace is all the question.* To which I say, though it be a question between us, yet it is not all the question. For both in the Dispute, and in all my writings, I denied that the Covenant of grace doth make visible churchmembers; and therefore Mr. *B.* if he would have made good his argument, he should have proved that visible churchmembership and the Covenant of grace are inseparably conjunct, which Mr. *B.* failing to do, fails in proving the chief point of his argument. But let's view what he saith, *Correct.* pag. 251.

"You add, *saith he*, [this proves not the Covenant a pure Gos-
"pel covenant, not including peculiar benefits to the Jewish nation.]
"I answer, if by [pure] you mean that it is not onely a Gospel cove-
"nant, but that and more, it yeeldeth as much as I need; for if it be a
"Gospel covenant, no matter though there be more. But if you
"mean, that it is not essentially a Covenant of grace, I could heap up
"abundance of arguments against you; you may find many in Mr. *Ball*
"of the Covenant. I add: That Covenant wherein God taketh them
"to be his people, and engageth himself to be their God, is a Cove-
"nant of grace: (for since the fall God entreth himself into no such
"Covenant with any but in Christ, and upon terms of grace.) But such
"is this Covenant made with the Israelites and their little ones; there-
"fore this was a Covenant of grace.

Answ. I mean by pure Gospel Covenant, that Gospel Covenant which was without mixture of domestick or political benefits proper to *Abrahams* seed inheriting, which is set down *Heb.*8.10,11,12. out of *Jer.*31.33. and I say, that though there is perhaps an Evangelical promise or two intermixed in the enlargement of *Moses* his discourse, yet *Deut.*29.13,14,15. the Oath or Covenant there made was not purely Evangelical, or essentially a Gospel Covenant, but a political, legal, national Covenant, such as God doth not enter into now with all those to whom he vouchsafes Gospel grace. And I prove it thus. 1. That Covenant which contains promises of the land of *Canaan*, the inheritance of it, and prosperity therein, is not essentially a Gospel Covenant, or a pure Gospel Covenant. But so doth that, *Deut.*29.13,14,15. *Ergo.* The *major* is manifest: For the Gospel Covenant doth not promise those things. The *minor* is plain from the words [*as he hath sworn unto thy fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.*] But that was a promise of *Canaan*, as appears from *Gen.*12.7. & 13.15. & 15.8. & 17.8. & 22.17. & 26.3. & 28.13, 14. *Deut.*34.5. and many passages in *Moses* his speech, *Deut.*29.16,21,23,24,27. *Deut.*30.2,5,9,10,16.18. and most evidently the conclusion of it, *Deut.*30.20. & 28.11. 2. The Cove-

nant

nant and Oath made then, was the same which was said to them before, *Deut.*29.13. But that was the Covenant of the law in *Horeb*, *Deut.*29.1. Now that was not essentially the Covenant of grace, as is proved before, *sect.*43. 3. That Oath and Covenant which was of being God to them upon condition of their obedience to his laws given by *Moses*, that is not a pure Gospel covenant, but a legal, *Rom.*10.5. *Gal.*3.12. But such is this, *Deut.*29.8,29. & 30.2,8,10,11,14,16. where the judicial and ceremonial are meant as well as the moral. 4. That Oath and Covenant which had the legal threatnings annexed to it, was not a pure Gospel covenant, or essentially the Covenant of grace, *Gal.*3.10. But such was this, as appears from *Deut.*29.20,21,25. & 30.18,19. *Ergo.* What Mr. *Ball* hath written to prove Mr. *Bs.* position, I omit, 1. Because Mr. *B.* hath not set down the place. 2. Because I conceive Mr. *B.* hath produced the chief. To the first, I answer by denying the *major*, and the proof of it; and aver, that since the fall God did enter into a Covenant with the Jews which was not in Christ upon terms of Gospel grace. The *minor* is true, but God covenanted to be their God upon condition of their obedience to the law of *Moses*, as the words *Deut.* 29.13. imply, that he may establish thee to day for a people to himself by keeping the laws according to the Covenant they entred into.

He adds. 2. *That Covenant wherein the Lord promiseth to circumcise their hearts, and the hearts of their seed to love the Lord their God with all their heart, and with all their soul, that they may live, was a Covenant of grace, (for the Apostle to the* Hebrews, *ch.*10.16,17. *so describes it:) But this was such a Covenant, as is written* Deut.30.6. *Therefore this was a Covenant of grace.*

Answ. Besides the exceptions following, it should be proved, that the promise, *Deut.*30.6. was the Oath or Covenant mentioned *Deut.* 29.13,14. and not rather an interlocutory promise on a special occasion, to erect their hearts in expectation of mercy upon their return from captivity.

3. Saith Mr. *B. That which St.* Paul *makes the words of the righteousness of faith, was the Covenant of grace: But this is such, as is evident by comparing* Rom.10.6,7,8. *with* Deut.30.12,13,14. *But to this you give two sorry answers, being resolved to say somewhat.* 1. [*It is spoken of the command.*] *Answ.* 1. *And is it not also of the promise foregoing?* 2. *And is not this from as great a mistake as the other, to think that Gods command is no part of his Covenant? That* [*he will be their God*] *is his promise: but is that all the Covenant? That* [*they shall be his people, and so take him for their God, and resign themselves to him*] *this is both commanded by him, and covenanted by them.*

Answ. The answer was right that the speech of *Moses*, Deut.30. 12,13,14. however accommodated by *Paul* to another purpose, is meant of the word of the law, the commandments, and statutes which were written in that very book of the law, *v.*10. which *Moses* delivered, and it was nigh to them that they might hear it and do it: Which cannot be meant thus, Who shall ascend into heaven to bring Christ

from

from above, or who shall descend into the deep, that is to bring Christ again from the dead, that we may hear Christ thus brought down and up, and do it, it were not good sense, nor any way congruous to the speech of *Moses*. And to Mr. *Bs.* reply, 1. I say it is not spoken of the promise, for that is not a thing for us to hear and do, but for God. 2. Though the command may be a part of the Covenant in a large sense, as it includes all that pertains to a Covenant, yet in strict and exact sense, a Covenant being an aggregate of promises, the command is not part of the Covenant. 3. However it is no part of the Covenant and Oath which God swore *Deut.* 29. 13. For what God swore was that which he would do, not what he appointed them to do, and consequently no part of the Covenant of grace, for that is of what God will do for us; our faith, though it be the condition of the thing promised, yet is it not the Covenant of grace. 4. *The word*, *Deut.* 30. 14. cannot be meant of the Covenant of grace, sith the condition is the hearing and doing of all the law of *Moses*, that they *might keep Gods commandments, and his statutes, and his judgements*, (which reach to judicial, and ceremonial precepts, as well as moral) *that thou mayest live and multiply, and the Lord thy God shall bless thee in the land, whither thou goest to possess it. Locus ille indubitanter de obedientia totius legis loquitur. David Parem castig. Bellarm. tom.* 4. *degrat. & lib. arb. l.* 5. *c.* 6.

2. Saith Mr. *B.* "You answer [it is frequent with the Apostle to "accommodate words to his purpose that have a different sense in the "places whence they were taken, from that to which the Apostle appli-"eth them, as *Rom.* 10. 18.] *Answ.* A man would think here you "plainly mean, that it is frequent with the Apostle to wrest and per-"vert the Scripture to his own ends from its true sense; and you can "mean no better, except you mean that he alludeth to the words, ma-"king use of the meer phrase without the sense; and indeed that is usu-"al in common speech: and such is that, *Rom.* 10. 18. But that he doth "not barely allude to this in *Deut.* 30. is left undeniable. 1. He bring-"eth it in, *v* 6. as Gods description of the righteousness of faith, *&c.* "having before said, *Moses* describeth the righteousness which is of the "law, *&c.* 2. He addeth the very exposition to every sentence: [who "shall ascend into heaven] that is, saith he, to bring Christ down from "above? And who shall descend into the deep] that is to bring Christ "again from the dead? 3. He fully expresseth it *v.* 8. But what saith "it? The word is nigh thee, *&c.* that is, the word of faith which "we preach, that if thou confess with thy mouth, *&c.* Is not here a "full discovery, that the Apostle expoundeth, and not onely alludeth "to these words? Name mee one place in the New Testament, "that more evidently speaks in an expository way of any Text in "the Old?

Answ. As much is said by the most godly and learned Protestant interpreters of this place as by me, and therefore if I be chargeable with accusing the Apostle of wresting and perverting the Scripture to his own ends from its true sense, they are likewise so chargeable. *Beza annot. ad Rom.* 10. 8. *By this term* [*the word*] Moses *understandeth the law*

which

which God by his voyce published, all his people hearing, so that they might pretend no ignorance, when they had the tables of it described, and so might every one recite it out of their mouth, and might have it within as it were engraven in their knowledge and mind. But what Moses *spake of the law, all that* Paul *accommodates to the Gospel by allusion: that at length by the Gospel he may teach us to enjoy that indeed which the law promiseth, and be freed from that which it threatneth. Diodati annot. on Rom.10.6. St.* Paul *maketh use of this passage though spoken in another sense. The new Annot. on Rom.10.8. By the word, Deut.30.14.* Moses *understood the law which the Lord published with his own voice, and* Paul *applies it to the preaching of the Gospel, which was the perfection of the Law. On v.18. This place is taken out of Psal.19.4. and is properly meant of that knowledge of God, which all men may have by contemplation of the heavens, and the creatures therein; yet it is by the Apostle very fitly applied to the sound of the word preached by the Apostles. Trapp on Rom.10.8.* Moses *meant it of the Law, but it more fitly agreeth to the Gospel. Piscater analys. Paulus alludit ad verba Mosis, Deut.30.14. Willet on Rom.10. qu.10. Some think that* Moses *in that place, Deut.30.12. directly speaketh of the law according to the literal sense; and St* Paul *by a certain allusion applieth that unto faith, which* Moses *uttereth of the law. So Theodoret, Chrysostome, Oecumenius. Likewise Tostatus upon the place,* Paul *by a certain agreement hath translated this place, and applied it unto faith. Vatablus also saith, that* Paul *followeth not* Moses *sense, but some words. Yet Pareus inclineth to think St.* Paul *here useth but an allusion to that place of* Moses, *dub.6. Daniel Heinsius, Exercit. sacr. in Rom 10.6,7. E Rom. 10.18 patet verum esse quod non semel alibi monuimus, sed & a magnis observatum Theologis, in epistolam præsertim ad Hebræos, meminimus; novi fœderis scriptores verba veteris & eleganter & venuste non semel alio transferre. Quod tam usitatum est τοις ἐξω, ut vix ullus sit Homeri versus cujus verba non mutato sensu usurpentur. In his autem quod Matthæus, c.2. v.18. e Jerem.31.15. (quod & B. Hieronymus vult) usurpavit, neque pauca sunt in psalmis quæ pro instituto suo Paulus maxima cum venustate usurpat. Quod nec mirum est, cum utrobique idem spiritus, qui tanquam propria ac sua, ante dicta usurpavit.* And yet none of these Authors did conceive *Paul to have wrested and perverted the Scripture to his own ends from its true sense*; nor doth my speech infer any such accusation. Nor do I mean that *Paul alludeth to the words, making use of the meer phrase without the sense*; but that he accommodates words to his purpose, that have a different sense in the places whence they are taken, from that to which the Apostle applieth them, which is no wresting of them. To the reason of Mr. *B.* I answer. To the first, that I do not find that the Apostle *v.6.* brings it in as Gods description of the righteousness of faith, but by a *prosopopeia* the righteousness of faith is brought in as directing the believer. To the second, it is true *Paul* addeth the very exposition to every sentence, but not an exposition of the Text in *Deut.*30.12,13,14. but an exposition of the words of the righteousness of faith as they are applied thence by the Apostle to his purpose. And yet plain Texts which are not so accomodated I cannot so put off as I will.

Your

Your laſt anſwer, ſaith Mr. *B. is the worſt of all. You ſay, if the Covenant did contain promiſes purely Evangelical, yet the Covenant in reſpect of them cannot bee meant of all and every of the Iſraelites, that God would bee a God to them, that is, ſanctifie, juſtifie, adopt them to bee heirs of eternal life.*] Anſw. 1. *God ſaith, you ſtand all here, &c. to enter into the Covenant, and oath, &c And you ſay, it cannot be all, whom ſhall we believe God or you?*

Anſw. Both, for we ſay in this point the ſame, that ſome in the name of all did enter into Covenant, and his oath to be a God to them, and yet he not be a God to them all that entred into the Covenant, but to to them onely that kept the Covenant.

2. Saith hee, *You foully miſ-interpret the promiſe, to bee to them a God, as if it were ſuch as could bee verified to none but the elect. God hath promiſed to others to bee their God, who are not elect, as is undeniable in the text. Therefore in a larger ſenſe, as I have before in due place fully explained it.*

Anſw. It is ſure foul language to tell me I foully miſ interpret the promiſe to be to them a God, when I interpret not at all the promiſe *Deut.* 29. 13. but onely infer from Mr. *Bs.* interpretation of it as purely Evangelical (which I count falſe) that then it in reſpect of promiſes purely Evangelical ſhould be meant onely of the elect, which I agree with him to be abſurd. Nor is the matter ſalved by telling me *that God hath promſed to others to be their God who are not elect*, For however hee hath not promiſed to be a God in reſpect of promiſes purely Evangelical to be a God by ſanctifying, juſtifying, adopting to eternal life, to any but the elect. Yet Mr. *B.* asks me.

And why may not God promiſe juſtification, adoption (and ſanctification in the ſenſe as Divines, and Scripture moſt uſe it, for the work following faith) and eternal life, and all on the condition of faith, and this to more then the elect? and hath he not done ſo? But of this and of infants condition before

Anſw. 1. By ſanctifying I meant the ſanctifying by which faith is produced, which is the ſame with regeneration, writing the lawes in the heart, *Heb.* 10. 16. and is uſed ſo 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. *&* 6. 11, *&c.* and thus he ſanctifieth onely the elect, *Epheſ.* 1 4. 2 *Theſ.* 2. 13. and I ſuppoſed Mr. *B.* had meant the ſame by circumciſion of the heart, to love the Lord, *Deut.* 30. 6. and that hee included it in the promiſe of being a God to them, *Deut.* 29.13 and this ſure is proper to the elect, if Mr. *B.* ſay true, *Friendly accommod.* p. 362. *Cor novum is given to the elect onely.* And ſure if Mr. *B.* did not mean this, he did not mean the Covenant of grace, or the Goſpel covenant, in which this is the firſt promiſe, *Heb.* 10. 16. 2. But let after-ſanctification be onely meant, and juſtification condition of faith, yet I think the promiſe is made of theſe to none but the elect, ſith none are believers but they. An offer may bee made to others by men, but no promiſe by which God is bound, and will performe it to any other. 3 If the Covenant bee on condition of faith, then it is not made to infants, for they believe not. Nor is the promiſe made to infants

on condition of parents faith, for though Mr. *B.* dream so, yet the Scripture saith not so, nor is it true. For 1. the promise should then be made to *Esau* as well as to *Jacob* in infancy, which the Apostle refutes *Rom.* 9, 11, 12, 13. 2. If the promise were made to infants upon their parents faith, then God is engaged to sanctifie them in infancy, and if so he doth it, and if he do, either holiness by sanctification of the spirit may bee lost, or else they must all go to heaven, for all holy ones go thither, 3. The promise to the father is upon condition of his own faith, therefore so is the promise to the child, for there is not a different promise to the father and the child upon different conditions. But I haſten.

He adds, *You would faine ſay ſomewhat too to that* Deut. 30. 6. *but like the reſt, 1. You confeſs it is a promiſe of ſpiritual grace, but to the Jewes after their captivitie, 2. And upon condition of obedience, 3. And not performed to all their ſeed, but onely to the elect.*] Anſw. 1. *But did God promiſe ſpiritual grace to the Jews after the captivity and not before?*

Repl. The promiſe *Deut.* 30. 6. is to the Iſraelites to do it for them onely after their captivity, *I* ſaid not after *the captivity* as Mr. *B.* ſpeaks.

Was not the promiſe, ſaith he, *made to them that then were?*

Repl. It was.

Were not they, ſaith he, *captivated oft in the time of the Judges, and ſo it might at leaſt be made good then?*

Repl. I grant it.

If God, ſaith he *would do as much for them before they forſook him, and brake the Covenant by rebellion, as he would do afterward when they repented, then he would circumciſe their hearts before as well as after: But the former is true, therefore the later.*

Repl. I grant it, yet this proves not the promiſe as it is there *Deut.* 30. 6. to be made to them of what God would do for them afore their captivity.

2. Saith hee, *And if it bee on condition of obedience, then you confeſs there are conditional promiſes, and then it was made to more then the elect.*

Anſw. I deny the conſequence.

3. Saith hee, *If it were not performed to any but the elect, no wonder, when it was a conditional promiſe, and the reſt performed not the condition: which God will cauſe the elect to perform.*

Anſw. Sure it was not promiſed to any but to whom God performs it. For though it were on a condition of theirs, yet it was ſuch a condition as was to be wrought and was promiſed by him, which hee did onely to the elect. And thus Mr. *B.* may ſee my vindication of my deſcant on this text, and the Reader perhaps will wonder at the vanity and wilfulneſs of Mr. *Bs.* exceptions againſt it.

Sect. 68.

SECT. LXVIII.

Neither from Rom. 4.11. *nor by other reason hath Mr.* B. *proved*, ch. 18, 19. part. 1. *of Baptism, That Infant Churchmembership was partly natural, partly grounded on the Law of Grace and Faith.*

CH. 18. Mr. *B.* writes thus. "My 13th. arg. is from *Rom.* 4. almost "all the Chapter, wherein the Apostle fully sheweth, that the pro- "mise (upon which his priviledges were grounded) was not made to "*Abraham* upon legal grounds, but upon the ground of faith: "From whence I might draw many arguments, but for brevity, I "desire you to peruse the Chapter; onely from the eleventh verse: "And hee received, &c. From whence I thus argue. If infants then "usually were entred and engaged Churchmembers by that Circum- "cision which was a seal of the righteousnes of faith, and was not "given on legal grounds; then that Churchmembership of in- "fants is not repealed: (as beeing built on grounds of Go- "spel, and not Law, and sealed with a durable seal, that is, the "seal of the righteousnes of faith.) But the antecedent is plain in "the text.

Answ It is true *Rom.* 4. 13, 14, 16, 20, 21. there is mention of Gods promise to *Abraham*, and in particular two speeches are cited *v.* 17. *Gen.* 17.5. *I have made thee a father of many nations* (which implies a promise) & *v.* 18. *Gen.* 15.5. *So shal thy seed be*, & it is true the privileges of justification by faith, of the father of believers, of heir of the world, were by faith, and the promise, but that his visible Churchmembership or his infants was by promise is not said, nor is there a word in that Chapter or elsewhere, to prove that Churchmembership of infants was built on grounds of Gospel and not Law, or that it was sealed, or that the seal was durable which was termed *the seal of the righteousnes of faith*, or that the Circumcising of any person besides *Abraham* was a seal of the righteousnes of faith, and therefore I deny the *minor*, which hee termes *the antecedent*, and the consequence of the *major* also. For if his reason were good, I might by the same *medium* thus argue, If that Circumcision by which infants were usually then entred and engaged Churchmembers was a seal of the righteousnes of faith, and was not given on legal grounds then that Circumcision of infants is not repealed, But the antecedent is plain in the Text, *Ergo*. What answer Mr. *B.* gives to this argument will also answer his own, and I presume he will not hold Circumcision unrepealed, which hee must if his argument be good.

Mr. *B.* addes, "I urged this on Mr. *T.* many years ago, and "all his answer was, that *Abrahams* Circumcision was a seal to o- "thers that should come after, of the unrighteousnes of *Abrahams* "faith but no otherwise. A strange answer, and very bold! I hear that

" since he answereth, that it was onely such a seal of *Abrahams* righte-
" ousnes by faith, but not of others afterward.

Answ. I am sure Mr. *B.* in this (as he doth almost in every thing I have spoken, written or done, which he hath had occasion to mention) doth mis-report me, my answer to him and others was not as he and they represent it. This is my answer, 1. That *Rom.* 4. 11. no other persons Circumcision but *Abrahams* is termed *the seal of the righteousnes of faith.* 2. That to *Abraham* his Circumcision *was a seal of that righteousnes by faith, which hee had afore hee was circumcised.* 3. That *Abrahams* personal Circumcision is a seal of the righteousnes of faith to all that believe as he did, and to no other. 4. That the usual Circumcision of infants, was not a seal of the righteousnes of faith, or of the Covenant of grace to every circumcised person.

" But, *saith Mr. B.* 1. The Text seems to speak of the nature and use of
" Circumcision, and the end of its institution: as being ordained at first
" of God to seal onely a Gospel righteousnes of faith, and not a legal
" righteousnes of works or ceremonies.

Answ. 1. If Circumcision were at first ordained of God to seal a Gospel righteousnes of faith, then it did not seal visible Churchmembership of infants (for that is not a Gospel righteousnes of faith, sith it may bee without Gospel righteousnes of faith, and these may bee without it) as Mr. *B.* saith in this Chapter. 2. The nature, use and end of Circumcision in others, is not at all expressed *Rom.* 4. 11. but onely of *Abrahams.* 3. The use and end of Circumcision was at first to signifie that Covenant God entered into with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. after to binde the circumcised to observe the law of *Moses*, as the Apostle conceived it *Gal.* 5. 3.

2. *Saith he,* " Doth God institute a standing ordinance to endure
" till Christ, to have one end for him to whom it was first given, and
" another to all others? Is not the nature, end, and use of Sacraments
" or holy engaging signs and seals, the same to all? though the fruit be
" not alway the same. These are poor shifts against a maniteſt truth,
" which deserve not answer.

Answ. 1. Doth not Mr. *B.* of *baptism p.* 2. *ch.* 2. himself answer, that *baptism*, which he terms a Sacrament or holy engaging signe and seal, *hath more ends and uses then one*, and that the infant is capable of some, though not of others: yea though he make the end to be in the definition of Sacraments that it is of their nature to be signs, and so no Sacraments but what do signifie; yet hee will have baptism to bee a Sacrament to an infant to whom it never is any signe or signifies any thing, for the baptised infant either never saw it, or never saw it as a signe of the engagement Mr. *B.* speaks of, and so it is never a signe to the baptised, the Baptism leaving no visible impression on the body as Circumcision did, to signifie to the infant when hee comes to age. Whence I infer, 1. That according to Mr. *Bs.* own doctrine, the Sacrament of Baptism hath one end to those to whom it was first given, to wit, to signifie their owning of Christ as their Lord, and another end to almost all others, to wit, infants, to seal them Gods promise without

their

their personal owning of Christ. 2. That according to him, the nature, end, and use of Sacraments, or holy engaging signs and seals is not the same to all; for Baptism is no holy engaging sign to an infant, who doth neither signifie by it, nor hath any thing signified to it by it, no nor is naturally capable of it, and consequently it is no Sacrament to it, sith it is not either actually or potentially a sign to the infant, no not when grown up of any thing signified by it. 2. Doth not Mr *B.* acknowledge, that *Abrahams* Circumcision did *seal the righteousness of faith which he had being yet uncircumcised*? sure he will not deny this, which the Apostle expresly teacheth. But sure it had not that end in all others, therefore he must acknowledge one end of Circumcision for *Abraham* which to all others it had not 3. About the nature, end, and use of Sacraments, I have expressed in part my mind before, *sect* 31. Nor either there or here do I use any shifts against a manifest truth, but Mr. *B.* hath levied a company of poor feeble arguments, which but for the shallowness or prejudice of Pædobaptists, deserved not an answer.

Ch. 19. he saith thus. *My* 14*th. arg. is this. If the law of infants churchmembership were no part of the ceremonial or meerly judicial law, nor yet of the law of works, then it is not repealed. But it was no part of the ceremonial law, nor meerly judicial, nor part of the law of works (as such.) therefore it is not repealed. The consequence is evident, seeing no other laws are repealed. The antecedent I prove in its parts.* 1. *None will say it was part of the law of works; for that knows no mercy to those who have once offended: But churchmembership was a mercy.*

Answ. 1. Mr. *B.* should have first proved any such law at all (which he hath not proved yet) distinct from the law of Circumcision; and this is my answer to this argument, that there is no such law at all, and this is enough. Yet I add, 2. If his pretended law of infants visible churchmembership be no part of the law of works, then it is not of the law of nature, which before and after he asserts; for the law and Covenant of nature, is the law and Covenant of works, which I think Mr. *B.* will not deny, surely it is not of grace in Christ; *Ergo.* That is not of grace in Christ which was afore the fall; but such is the law of nature, *Ergo.* 3. That the law of works knows no mercy to those who have once offended, is a dictate of Divines, which needs proof. That the law at mount Sinai was a law of works, is proved before, *sect.* 43. But that yeelded some mercy, *Levit.* 4. 2, 20, 26, 31, 35. *Numb.* 15, 22, 23, 24, 28. *Ergo.* 4. How far, and in what manner visible churchmembership of infants was a mercy, and how it is otherwise now, is shewed before, *sect.* 64, 66.

2. Saith Mr. *B. If it were part of the ceremonial law, then* 1. *let them shew what it was a type of, and what is the antitype that hath succeeded it, and prove it to be so, if they can.*

Answ. 1. I do not take every thing typical to have been ceremonial; nor every ceremonial thing to be typical: Or if it be so, yet I am sure, of every thing ceremonial which was typical, Mr. *B.* cannot shew what was the antitype in particular, at least he cannot prove it. When Mr. *B.* hath shewed and proved what was the antitype to all the dishes, bowls, snuffers, and other utensils about the tabernacle, and of every

thing

thing appointed concerning them, their colour, fashion, metal, &c. and of every rite prescribed *Israel* by *Moses*, there may be some equity in Mr. *Bs.* task. But till then it is enough to tell him, that to it with other things typified, Christ, *Col.* 2.17. succeeded. The churchmembership by birth hath had churchmembership by faith to succeed it, as is before proved from *Gal* 3. and if that be not enough, let Mr. *B.* answer, and not slight what Mr. *Samuel Fisher* writes in his *Baby baptism meer Babism*, about the ceremonial holiness of the Jews infants, *pag.* 112. 113, 114, 115, 116, *&c.*

2. Saith he *If the very materials of the Church were a ceremony, then the Church it self should be but a ceremony. And so the Church in* Abrahams *family should be more vile then the Church in the family of* Noah, Melchizedech, Sem, Job, Lot, *&c. which were more then ceremonies.*

Answ. The Levitical priesthood was ceremonial, and yet not the materials, that is the men, a ceremony; so churchmembership might be a ceremony, yet not the churchmembers. But I do not term either the one or the other a ceremony, it is sufficient that it was a meer positive thing alterable and that it was altered.

3. Saith he, *And that it was no part of the meerly judicial law, appears thus.* 1. *As was last said, then also the Church in* Abrahams *family should be more vile then the aforesaid; for their churchmembership was not a piece of meer policy, as we call the judicials.*

Answ. If it were by any law that infants were Churchmembers, it is more likely to be by a judicial law then any other of the three sorts of the Mosaical laws, which Divines do so distinguish. And to the argument I say, 1. By making infants Churchmembership to be by a mixt or meer judicial law in *Abrahams* family, it is not made a piece of meer civil policy not Ecclesiastical, for the Jews Commonwealth was a holy policy, and the members of the State were members of the Church, and consequently, it is rather made more excellent by referring it to the meer judicial laws, as the constitution of the *Sanhedrin* and other things are, and the admitting of the proselytes and their children was by the Elders of the Jews. 2. How to say concerning the families of *Noah*, &c. we cannot resolve, sith we find little or nothing of them, no mention of *Noahs* infants, or *Melchizedecs*, *Sems*, *Jobs*, or *Lots* except *Ammon* and *Moab*, nothing said of their Churchmembership, or of the government of the families, what it was, or by what law.

1. Saith he, *It cannot be shewn that it hath any thing of the nature of a meer judicial law in it (except we may call the moral laws or Gospel promises judicial, upon which meer judicials are built:) why is it not as much of the judicial law to have women Churchmembers as children? yet who dare say that this is meerly judicial?*

Answ. It can be shewn, that if there be such a law, it is a meer judicial law, because it belonged to the ordering of the Commonwealth or policy of *Israel*, as it is termed, *Ephes.* 2. 12. and the entring of proselytes was to be done by the eldership of the people, and not by the priests. And this we dare say of the womens visible Churchmembership

as

as well as the infants, and that neither of them were by a moral law or Gospel promise as Mr. B. fancies.

3. Saith he, *It is of the very law of nature to have infants to be part of a Kingdome, and the Kings subjects. And Mr. T. hath told me his judgement, that the Jews Church and Commonwealth was all one: therefore according to Mr. T. his grounds, it must needs be requisite even naturally that infants should then be Churchmembers. I thinke this is past denial.*

Answ. Kingdomes themselves are not of the law of nature, no nor of the law of nations, if they were, all other government then of Kings were against these laws, much lesse can it be of the law of nature to have infants to be part of a Kingdome, and the Kings subjects. According to my judgment, the Jews Church and Commonwealth were not all one naturally, but by institution; and therefore, according to my grounds, it is not requisite even naturally that infants should then be Churchmembers. So that I find none of these things past denial.

4. Saith he, *The promise that took them in, and the seal were both grounded on the righteousnes of faith, as is proved before; therefore not a meer judicial.*

Answ. Neither were they taken in by a promise, nor was the promise or the seal grounded, that is, made or given by reason of the righteousnes of faith, to or in those to whom they were made or given. Nor is any such thing before proved by Mr. B.

5. Saith he, *Infants were Churchmembers long before the time of* Moses, *when the Jews were formed into a Commonwealth, and the judicial laws given them. And as the Apostle argues, the law which was many hundred years after, could not make void the promise, and so it could not be that this was part of the meerly judicial law.*

Answ. The Jews were formed into a Commenmealth, and judicial laws given, as may appear by the appointment of *Onan* and *Shelah* to take their brothers wife, *Gen.* 38 8. and the sentence of *Judah* concerning *Tamar*, *v.* 24. before *Moses* time, though then both were compleated. Though the law makes not void the promise, yet the law of infants visible Churchmembership, if there were any such, might be meerly judicial.

6. Saith he, *That it is neither a meer judicial, nor proper to the Jews, appeareth thus. That which was proper to the Jews, was given to them onely; that is, onely to* Isaac *and his seed, on whom the Jewish priviledges were intailed. But many hundreds were circumcised as Churchmembers (among them many infants) in* Abrahams *family, before ever* Isaac *was born; and all the proselytes with their infants afterward that would come in. The children of* Keturah *and their children, and the children of* Ishmael, *&c. were once all Churchmembers; let any shew when they were unchurched, except when they unchurched themselves by their wickednes; or let any shew that the same sons of* Keturah, *who must circumcise their sons as Churchmembers while they were in* Abrahams *family, must leave them uncircumcised and unchurched when they were removed from that family. Did God change laws, and revoke such mercies and priviledges to*

the

the seed of Abraham, *meerly because of their removing from his house, and change of place? who dare believe such fancies, without one word of Scripture? Remember therefore, that it is here plainly proved, that infants Churchmembership was not proper to the Jews.*

Answ. That which was proper to the *Jews* was not proper to *Isaac* onely and his seed, but common to *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacobs* family, or the people that either by birth or proselytism were *Hebrews*: When *Ishmael* was cast out, and the sons of *Keturah* sent away from *Isaac*, Gen. 25.6. they were not Churchmembers, nor their children, no more then the circumcised children of the *Jews* by strange wives when they were separated from the holy seed, *Ezra* 10. & *Nehem* 13. which the Lord did for that reason which he judged fit, however it seem to us. Nor is this conceit a fancy, but plain from those Scriptures named and others, which still reckon the *Ishmaelites*, *Edomites*, *Ketureans*, and posterity of *Jews* by prohibited women and separated from the congregation of *Israel*, as a profane people, and so not Churchmembers. Nor do I think they were bound to circumcise their infants as Churchmembers, or did it when separated from the *Hebrew* people. So that Mr. *B.* hath not yet proved, that infants Churchmembership was not proper to the *Jews*, but that *it is partly natural, and partly grounded on the law of grace and faith*, as he speaks.

SECT. LXIX.

Mr. B. ch. 20. *by his 15th. arg. from infants being once members in the universal visible Church, hath not proved their visible Churchmembership unrepealed.*

CH. 20. "My 15th. arg *saith he*, is this: If all infants who were "members of any particular Church, were also members of the uni- "versal visible Church (which was never taken down;) then certain- "ly their Churchmembership is not repealed: But all infants, that "were members of any particular Church, were also members of the "universal visible Church; therefore their Churchmembership is not "repealed. The consequence is beyond dispute, because the univer- "sal Church never ceaseth here. And in my judgement, the whole "argument is so clear, that were there no more it were sufficient.

Answ. The very conclusion is so palpably false, that no man that understands it but will wonder that Mr. *B.* should shew himself so besotted, as to prove so industriously a thing contrary to sense, that the visible Churchmembership of no infants who were members of any particular Church is repealed, that is, ceaseth. For who knows not that *Isaac*, *Jacob*, *Moses*, *David*, with millions more are dead, and are now no members in any visible Church? If it be said, that Mr. *B.* means the *species* of infants, I reply, then he speaks non-sense and false. For the *species* is but one, and therefore to term the *species* which is but one

[all

[*all infants*] in the plural number is non-ſenſe. And falſe for the *ſpecies* was never a member of any particular Church, for members are individuals, nor is the univerſal viſible Church *totum univerſale*, which may bee thus divided into adult and infants as into two ſorts of Churches, but *totum integrale*, an integral whole conſiſting of parts exiſting, and when the parts ceaſed to exiſt then they were not members viſible, and the whole Church viſible muſt needs ceaſe when all the members exiſtent are deceaſed. It is falſe alſo that the *ſpecies* an be termed viſible: For that is viſible which may be diſcerned by ſenſe, but ſenſe diſcerneth not *ſpecies*, but individuals. If it be ſaid that Mr. *B.* means that the univerſal viſible Church is as a fluent body, as a river which continues the ſame from a ſucceſſion of other water in the ſame channel, neither will this ſerve for his purpoſe. For 1. in that ſenſe the infants that were members ceaſe, and other infants ſucceed; 2. it is manifeſt that the viſible Church is not now among thoſe people, to wit the Jews, who had heretofore infants viſible churchmembers, they are broken off from being Gods viſible Church, and ſo the ſucceſſion of churchmembers in that people ceaſeth, and it is that which is denied to bee in the other channel, to wit the viſible Chriſtian Church, infants do or ought to be taken to ſucceed in the place of the deceaſed Jewiſh infants, and if the ſenſe be thus, the whole argument is this; If infants viſible churchmembership be and ought to be taken to be in the Chriſtian viſible Church as in the Jewiſh, then it is not repealed. But infants viſible churchmembership is and ought to be taken to be in the chriſtian viſible Church as in the Jewiſh, *ergo*. of which I ſhould deny the *minor*. But this hath no likelihood to be Mr. *Bs.* meaning, whoſe words import plainly that which I count non-ſenſe and falſe. And therefore I anſwer to his argument, if the parentheſis (*which was never taken down*) be a part of the antecedent in the *major*, and the ſenſe be this [and the univerſal viſible Church exiſtent in the age wherein infants were members of a particular Church was never taken down or ceaſed not] and this be ſupplied in the *minor*, I deny the *minor*, if it be not ſupplied I deny the ſyllogiſm to be good, as not having the whole *medium* in the *minor* which was in the *major*, if it be underſtood in another ſenſe (which I count non-ſenſe) that the *ſpecie* of infants in the *Jewiſh* particular *Church* were members of the univerſal viſible *Church Chriſtian*, the *minor* is to bee proved. As for what Mr. *B.* ſaith, *the univerſal Church never ceaſeth here*, if it be meant of the univerſal viſible Church definite of that age (in which alone infants viſible members of a particular Church are members) it is falſe, if of an univerſal *Church* viſible indefinite, ſo as that the ſenſe be, ſome or other univerſal *Church* viſible never ceaſeth, or an univerſal viſible Church in ſome age or other ceaſeth not infant members in the particular Church are not members in ſuch an univerſal, but in the definite of one age, and the *minor* of Mr. *Bs.* argument in that ſenſe is falſe; Or if the ſenſe bee (as it ſeemeth by what followes) *That the nature of the univerſal viſible Church ceaſeth not heere*, I deny the conſequence of the *major* in Mr. *Bs.* ſyllogiſm; And ſay, That it is non-ſenſe to term the

nature of the universal visible Church the universal visible Church, as it is to term humanity or manhood a man, or *Peter* humanity or the humane nature. All know that understand the Metaphysicks, that whatever the difference bee whether formal or modal or some other, yet the one is not rightly predicated or said of the other: no man saith the essence of a thing (which is all one with the nature) is the thing, but that by which it is. In like manner it is non-sense to say infants were members of the nature of the universal Church visible. For membership hath relation to an integral whole not to an essential, no man makes infants a part of the definition of the universal visible Church, but of the completeness of it. But let's view Mr. *B.* proof.

1. Saith he, "That there is a universal visible Church, Mr *Rutherford* "and others have largely proved: They of *New England* indeed deny "a universal visible governing or political Church; but not this that I "speak of (as you may see in Mr. *Shepheard* and Mr. *Allens* answer to "Mr. *Ball*) But lest any should deny it, I will bring one proof or ra- "ther many in one, 1 *Cor.* 12, 13. We are all baptised by one spirit in- "to one body, whether Jews or Gentiles. Here you see it is one and the "same body that all are baptised into: Now that this is the visible "Church I prove thus. 1. That one body that hath distinct visible mem- "bers with variety of gifts is the visible body: But this is such. 2. That "one body which is visible in suffering and rejoycing is the visible bo- "dy. But this is such *v.* 25, 26. 3. That body which is capable of schism, "and must be admonished not to admit of it, is the visible body; But "this is such *v.* 25. 4. That body which had the visible seals of Bap- "tism and the Lords Supper was the visible body; But this was such *v.* "13. 5. That one body which had visible universal officers was the visi- "ble universal Church or body; But this was such: Therefore, *&c.*

Answ. I list not to interpose my judgement in the controversies between Mr. *Ball* and Mr. *Rutherford*, and Mr. *Hudson* on the one side, and Mr. *Allen*, Mr. *Shepheard*, and Mr. *Hooker* on the other side, which rest much on the meaning of the term [Church] in such passages as these 1 *Cor.* 12, 28. *&* 10. 32. *Acts* 8. 2. *Gal.* 1. 13, *&c.* and some Logick notions of an universal and integral whole, of a similar and dissimilar whole, the distinction of a Church entitive and organical, and the like. Nevertheless because it concerns the present point that I should say somewhat in this thing, I shall thus far express my conceits. 1. I think by the word *Church* in none of the places alledged by Mr. *Hudson vindic. th.* 2. a particular fixed congregation organized is meant except the last, 3. *Joh.* 10. where I conceive the casting out could be onely out of that particular Church where *Diotrephes* did Lord it, and where alone he did and could *forbid those that would receive the brethren*, though perhaps the effect might extend further. Nor do I think on the other side, that in any one of them by [*the Church*] is meant the universal visible organical political Church collectively taken, which Mr. *Hudson* asserts not *Acts.* 8. 3. *Gal.* 1. 13. For *Saul* did not make havock, persecute or destroy the whole Church so taken, nor only the particular Church

of

of *Jerusalem*, but the word [*Church*] there is taken without quantity, and so neither notes the universal nor particular, all nor some, but indefinitely in *genere confuso*, the *disciples of Christ*, or *any of that way*, *Acts* 9. 1 2. *them that believed on Christ*, Acts 22. 19. *them that called on his name*, Acts 9. 14. *the Saints*, Acts 26. 10. whersoever hee could reach them. And in the same sense it is taken *Acts* 2. 47. 1 *Cor.* 10. 32. 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. and I think the sense is the same *Eph.* 3. 10. whether [*by the Church*] be meant of what was done to or on the Church, that is the believers called out of the Gentiles, to whom hee gave his spirit manifestly as on *Cornelius*, or by the teachers in the Church, especially of the wonderful mysteries which were revealed in the exercise of gifts then given. *Matth* 16. 18. It is true, is meant the visible Church, but not the universal organical collectively taken, nor any particular Congregation organized, but the visible in respect of the part which is invisible, against which the gates of the grave or death shall not prevail, to keep them in, but they shall be raised up again to everlasting life at the last day. Nor is it said that the keyes should bee given to the Church but to *Peter*, the use of which was to bee in the calling of the Church effectually. The other text 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. cannot be meant of the Church visible universal organical collective, nor of a particular Congregation, not this latter for reasons given by Mr. *Hudson*, nor the former, for *the Apostles*, *Prophets*, *Teachers*, are distinct from the Church there taken: but they are not so from the Church universal visible organical collective, *Ergo*. Therefore I conceive Apostles, *&c.* are not said to be set in the Church collectively taken as a *totum integrale organicum*, but in the Church distributively taken, that is, in the several Churches where they were imployed, as *Peter* among those of the Circumcision, *Paul* among the Gentiles. To which the term ἔθετο *hath set*, gives me occasion to encline, which I conceive to be the same with ἔδωκε *gave*, *Eph.* 4. 12. and it notes not a setting, by way of law constituting such to be in the Church, but a setting or disposing by way of providence in several Churches for their profit, as he saw good. 2. I conceive the term Catholike or universal Church (between which Mr. *Bl. Coven. sealed pag.* 155. saith Divines distinguish) is sometimes taken in contradistinction to the Jewish National Church, sometimes as comprehending both the believers before and since the incarnation of Christ, and in both senses I conceive it notes the invisible Church, or *the Church of the first born which are written in heaven*, Heb. 12. 23. *who are fellow heirs of the same body and partakers together of the promise of Christ through the Gospel*, Ephes. 3. 6. and this is the Catholike Church in the Apostles Creed, which we believe though we see it not. 3. I acknowledge a Catholike visible Church both before and after Christs incarnation entitive, though I think not organical since Christs ascension and the Apostles decease, and that this Catholike visible Church consists of all the visible Church-members and Churches particular visible in all the world and that this is visible onely in the several parts, which exist, and because these parts are in fluxu as a City, Army, Commonwealth, there are sometimes more sometimes fewer, sometimes the same persons may be visible Church-

members and sometimes not, some parts may be formed after one manner some after another, the same sort of persons may be (as infants) in a Church visible of one constitution and not in another, he may bee a member (as *Cornelius*) in one Church that is not in another. So that the Church universal visible which I acknowledge is not uniform, and is onely as in numbring a total sum of many particulars cast up. 4. I conceive the text Mr. B. alledgeth serveth not his purpose. For though I think it is meant of the Church visible, yet not in respect of all the parts of the Church visible, but those that are so visible as that they are also of the invisible Church, to wit, true believers. 1. Because it is said that *they are by one spirit baptised into one body, and made to drink into one spirit*, now this must be understood of that unity of spirit which unites to Christ, not barely in respect of common gifts to the sanctified and unsanctified. But this cannot bee said of all the visible members of the visible Church, therefore it is not meant of them. 2. Because the many members termed *one body* are termed *Christ*, *v.* 12. which can bee meant of Christ mystical onely, for those that are onely Christ by profession are not termed Christ, but those who are spiritually united to him now those are *one spirit*, 1 *Cor.* 6. 17. *new creatures*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 17. to whom *there is no condemnation*, *Rom.* 8. 1. *of his flesh and of his bones*, *Ephes.* 5. 30, 31, 32. And to his reasons I answer, that though they prove the body meant 1 *Cor* 12. 13. was visible, yet they prove not that all parts of the visible Church are comprehended in that body, but onely such as were also of the invisible.

2. Saith Mr. B. *That the Jews infants were members of this universal visible Church, I prove thus: There is but one visible universal Church or body: therefore they must needs be of this one, or be unchurched. See Gal.* 3. 16. *Ephes.* 4 4. 1 *Cor.* 12. 12.

Answ. The unity there ascribed is not visible but invisible, to wit, by the union of the same spirit, and the body though visible in respect of some parts, yet is not said to bee one in resp & of any but those who are invisibly also joyned to that body, or for their sake, as Mr. B. *pag.* 340 If Christ *Gal.* 3. 16. bee not meant of Christ personal, it is certain it is meant of no more then Christ mystical, or the Church invisible, and so 1 *Cor.* 12. 12. the like is to be said. And that it is so *Ephes.* 4. 4. appears from the words where these are joyned *one body* and *one spirit*. Therefore I deny that those texts are meant of the universal visible Church as visible, but onely of that part of the universal visible Church of that time which was also of the invisible, which is one by unity of the same spirit. As for the universal visible Church it cannot bee said to bee one in several ages numerically, for it is but the total of all the members then existent (for if they bee not existent among the living they are not visible) and they are sometimes the same, sometimes others (hee that is now of the visible Church may cease by death or apostasie to be so to morrow) sometimes more sometime fewer, but they are one in respect of profession of the same faith, or in some other visible appearance to be of Gods people. Now the infants of the Jews might be members of the visible Church universal of a former age,

but

but were not of the universal visible Church of that age, which was not one numerically with the universal visible Church of a former age, nor meant to be so, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13.

2. Saith he, *Every one that is a member of the particular, must needs be a member of the universal; else one might be a part of the part, and yet not a part of the whole.*

Answ. It is true of the universal made up of those parts, but he may be a member of the particular Church of uncircumcised, as *Cornelius*, who is not a member of the particular Church of the circumcised; and he may be a member of the universal visible of one time, who is not a member of the universal visible of another time. A Jew before the offer of Christ might be a member of the Jewish Church national, as the Pharisees, to whom *John Baptist*, Ch. ist, and his Apostles preached; yet were not members of the universal Church visible when they rejected the offer of Christ. Infants were members of the visible universal Jewish Church, who were not so of the universal visible Christian in another age. Mr. *B*'s mistake is I conceive in this, that he thinks the universal visible *Church* is one and the same in every age, which is a gross mistake.

But he saith, *This is all beyond dispute; and Mr. T. denied none of it, when I urged it on him, he confesseth, 1. There is a universal Church visible. 2. That the Jews Church was not the whole universal. 3. That every one that is a member of a particular Church, is also a member of the universal. 4. And that the Jews infants were members of the universal. 5. And this universal Church is not dissolved.*

Answ. I have made some search whether ever I confessed that this universal *Church* visible of which the Jews infants were members is not dissolved, and do not remember or find that ever I did so; if I should, I do revoke it, as being most false: and I rather think (if I did yeeld any thing that seemed like it) that what I confessed was, that the nature or essentials of the *Church* are not dissolved, in stead of which (as I guess by what follows) Mr. *B.* put this as my confession. He adds,

what then remains to be denied? why this is all that he saith to the whole [that their membership in the universal Church was onely by reason of their membership in the particular; and therefore ceased with it.] And how is this proved? why Mr. T. saith it is so, and that is the best proof, and all that I could get.

Answ. It was enough when I was a respondent that I said so, it had been Mr. *B*'s part to have disproved it: But I did then think, and do still think it so plain, that it needs not proof; and (as very a wrangler as Mr. *B.* is) I think Mr. *B.* grants as much when he saith, *that every one that is a member of a part is a member of the whole*, and *that the individual Church that then was, was broken off for unbelief*; and I know no visible *Church* but an individual. Me thinks it is all one as if I had said, the finger is onely a member of the whole body in that it is a part of the hand, and when the hand ceaseth to be a part of the body, the finger ceaseth to be a member. But yet M. *B.* will try *whether he can disprove this any better.*

3. Saith he, *I think I have sufficiently proved, that even the nature*

of

of the Jews Church was not repealed, but onely the accidental ceremonies; and the individual Church that then was, is broken off for unbelief; but the Olive still remained.

Answ. The visible Church Jewish could be no other then the individual Church Jewish, which if broken off, though the nature of the Jews Church was not repealed, and the Olive still remained, yet the instant Churchmembership which came onely in with the Jewish national Church, might and did cease.

2. Saith he, *If the Jews Church were repealed, yet he that will affirm that the whole species of infants are cast out of the universal visible church, must prove it well: For if I find that they were once in it, I need no more proof that they remain in, till some one shew me where it is revoked, which is not yet done by any that I know of.*

Answ. The repealing of the nature of the Jews Church, and of the Jews Church (which intimate that the nature of the Jews Church and the Jews Church were a law capable of repeal) is a piece of *Banterian* non-sense, which I use not. That the Jewish Church national is broken off, and that churchmembership by birth is altered into churchmembership by faith, is so fully proved before, *sect.* 50, 51, 52. besides what elsewhere is said by me, that I count it superfluous to add any more. If it satisfie not Mr. *B.* it's to be ascribed to his pertinacy in his opinion, which to be his proper temper I was told long ago, and much experience of him by my self and others find to be true.

3. Saith he, *The universal Church is more excellent far then any particular, and so our standing in the universal Church is a far higher priviledge then our standing or membership in any particular: Therefore it will not follow, that infants lose the greater, because they lose the lesser; and that they are cast out of the universal, because they are cast out of the particular.*

Answ. The universal may be more excellent then any particular extensively, because the universal comprehend the most excellent part, and the rest also; but not intensively, sith all the excellency may be from one part. Christ the head is not the universal body, and yet the whole body is not more excellent intensively then Christ, that is, hath not more perfection then Christ; for all the excellency in all the members is Christs, and from Christ. Yet the standing in the universal is not a higher priviledge then in the particular Church; yea, if there be a standing in the universal besides the standing in the particular, yet the standing in the particular is a higher priviledge. Else why do Ministers exhort men to joyn with some particular Church, and to submit to their Pastors? is it not for their advantage? Sure Mr. *B.* who condemns Seekers and those that are separatists from a particular Church, and those that live out of communion with any particular Church as Christs body at large, and so members of the universal Church, should not think they have a higher priviledge then members of a particular Church. If he do, he doth wrong them in condemning them, and disswading them from that state which is a higher priviledge. Much lesse is true concerning infants, who are not visible Churchmembers, but

as

as they ſtand in the particular Church. For they are now by their own profeſſion viſible Churchmembers, but meerly in that they are part of that nation which God takes for his people, as God did the Hebrew nation, and no other before nor ſince. This is clear, if we ſuppoſe the whole Hebrew nation deſtroyed except one male infant, this male infant would be no viſible Churchmember, there being nothing by which he is diſcernable to ſenſe to be more one of Gods people then another infant, though there were many Churches of Gentiles in other places: Whereas on the other ſide, if a Chriſtian by profeſſion were in no particular Church, but ſtood alone in an Iſland of unbelievers, remote from any particular Churches, I preſume Mr. *B.* would ſay he were a viſible member of the univerſal, though of no particular. Whence it follows, that if infants loſe their ſtanding in the particular Church Jewiſh, they loſe their ſtanding in the univerſal.

4. Saith he, *Perſons are firſt (in order of nature, or time, or both,) members of the univerſal Church, before they are members of any particular. So was* Noah, Lot, Abraham, *and all men before Chriſt, and ſo are all ſince Chriſt. The Eunuch in Acts 8. was baptized into the univerſal viſible Church, and not into any particular. It is ſo with all others: It is the general uſe and nature of Baptiſm; they are baptized into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, and ſo into the catholick Church, but not into any particular Church: If any ſuch thing be, it is ſecondary, and accidental and additional, and no proper end of Baptiſm. So that it being firſt in order, that we are entred into the viſible univerſal Church, it is likely to be of more durable continuance.*

Anſw. Avoiding unneceſſary diſceptations with Mr. *B.* about the general uſe and nature of Baptiſm, and about the priority in order, or time, or both, according to which perſons are members of the univerſal viſible Church afore they are of the particular, I do agree, that perſons who were viſible Churchmembers by their ſenſible profeſſion of the true God, were members of the univerſal afore they were of the particular: But deny this concerning infants, for the reaſon before given.

5. Saith he, *It is no good conſequence that is fetcht from the removal of a particular Church, or of the Jews particular Church, to breaking off from the univerſal; therefore this will not prove infants are broke off. If a Jew had been forced into a ſtrange countrey, yet there, both he and his children had been Churchmembers of the univerſal Church, when all the Jews were ſcattered abroad in captivity, ſo that they had neither temple, nor altar, nor prieſt, but perhaps one dive in one Town, and another in another, as they do at this day; you could not ſay, that theſe were of the viſible particular Church of the Jews, though you might ſay ſtill that they were Abrahams ſeed, and they and their children were members of the viſible univerſal Church.*

Anſw. The conſequence is good as I frame it, Their churchmembership viſible ceaſeth, who were viſible Churchmembers onely in that they were part of that viſible Church which now ceaſeth; But ſo it was concerning infants viſible churchmembership, *ergo*, it ceaſeth: Which is different from that which Mr. *B.* impoſeth on me. To his ſuppoſitions

I say, that they were in that case members of the visible particular Church of the Jews, which was a particular Church, and so accounted even in their captivity, though not in a flourishing estate as in their own country. And for the instance of *Keturahs children when they left the Church of Abrahams family*, if their infants were visible Church-members (which I conceive they were not) then it was because they joyned themselves as proselytes to the *Hebrew* people, which I think is not true, and therefore conceive if any of *Keturahs* children who left the Church of *Abrahams* family, professed the God of *Abraham*, they were members of the universal, but not their infants. And for what Mr. *B.* adds, *If a Jew then, or a Christian now, were cast upon the coasts of America, where he should never be a member of a particular Church more, yet he should be a member of the universal still*; I grant it, while they profess God in Christ. And for what he adds, *Neither Joseph, Mary, nor Jesus in his infancy were unchurched, because they lived in Ægypt* (*though I confess it is disputable whether Christ were ever a Churchmember properly; but I pass by that*) I grant it, for they remained members of the Jewish Church then when they were in *Ægypt*. as I presume Mr. *B.* counts those of his Church of *Kederminster* members still, who may by imprisonment, traffique, service of the State in war, sickness, or otherwayes be absent thence in *England*, or forreigne parts against their will.

6. Saith he, "Again, to lose their standing in the visible univer-
"sal Church, is to lose their place in the visible body (1 *Cor.* 12. 13.)
"and in the house o the living God, 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. the pillar and ground
"of truth: But to be removed from one particular Church, or from
"every particular Church, is no casting out of Christs body, or Gods
"house: therefore it will not follow upon the removal from a parti-
"cular Church, that they are removed from the universal; especially
"when we are not speaking of individual infants, but of the whole spe-
"cies. So that I think this argument is unanswerable: Infants were
"members of the universal visible Church (as Mr. *T.* confesseth)
"This is the Church that we are now baptized into; and this Church
"constitution is not altered or taken down; therefore infants member-
"ship of this Church is not taken down, what ever it be of the Jews
"particular Church.

Answ. The consequence is good as I framed it in the paragraph next before, yea though Mr. *B.* two propositions here be granted: Nor can Mr. *B.* overthrow it, till he prove that the Jews infants had a standing in the universal visible Church, severed from their standing in the Jewish particular, for which he hath yet brought no proof. His saying *that he spake of the whole species, not of individual infants*, makes his speeches to appear ridiculous non-sense. For the whole *species* hath no standing in the visible Church universal or particular, nor can be said to be admitted in, or cast out, or removed from one or every particular Church. These things cannot be said of a *species*, but of individuals, such a *species* is conceived abstractively from all individuifica-ting circumstances of time, place, &c. which must be conceived in vi-

sible

sible Churchmembership and removal or casting out. And that *we are baptised now into that universal visible Church in which infants were members*, is utterly false, and that the Church constitution is altered in that the Jewish particular Church ceaseth is proved before, therefore there is not ing in this argument unanswerable. As for what Mr. *B.* adds to this Chapter *p.* 339. I finde not that he brings any more strength in it which needs further answer. He refers me to Mr. *Hudsons vindic.* but tels me not what part he would have me answer, perhaps there is not any thing in the book that opposeth mee besides what is already answered, and I am not yet so obsequious to Mr. *B.* as to go over a whole book to finde an adversary to fight with; if Mr. *B.* knew any strength in it to oppose me with, he should have himself produced it or referred me to the particular place where I might finde it. As for the texts which hee cites out of Mr. *Hudson*, an answer is fully made to what hee brings them for in the 2d. *part* of this *Review*, *sect.* 9. in which Mr. *B.* and others may see how shamefully they abuse Scripture, to prove a church national comprehending infants like the Jewish in the time of the Gospel. And I add, that if Mr. *B.* weigh Mr. *Hudsons* words in his *vindic. ch.* 4 *sect.* 5. *p.* 93, 94. *I acknowledge the Jews to be a national Church. But my description of the Church Catholike was of the Church as it is now, since the partitition wall is broken down, for then it became Catholike. I conceive there were believers of the sons of Keturah that did not partake of all the priviledges of the Jewish Church except they became proselytes. It is the Evangelical Catholike Church which my question is about; into which the Jewes themselves being converted were admitted by a new initial seal*, viz. *baptism, and did not stand in it by their former national membership, but received a Catholike membership by baptism, I conceive that a man of any nation, converted to be a visible believer is a member of the Church Catholike enitive, and hereby hath right to all Church priviledges that belong to the whole Church, Gods method used in the national Church of the Jews, being* in populo Israelitico, *must needs differ from the method* in populo Catholico; hee will finde that learned man speaking as much for my purpose as his own. They that boldly affirm that *Christs Covenant, his satisfaction, his Church, his sealing, extend to any more then elect*, joyn with the *Arminians* against the Scripture and the most approved Protestants, and the contrary *containe no desperate expressions*, as Mr. *B.* being misled speaks. Mr. *Hudsons* words *pag.* 220. are not right. If any hold that the believing Jews children are still Churchmembers, and yet deny that the Gentiles children are so hee may hold it still notwithstanding the assault made by Mr. *B.* here. For by *the taking down the partition wall*, *Ephes.* 2. 14. and the *removing the enmity v.* 16. Jews and Gentiles are not made one visible Church after the Jewish frame, but one by faith, and by it the Gentiles are called, *Acts* 15.9. not a whole nation parents and children as the Jewish Church, but believers repenting, *Acts* 11.17, 18. *one body, one Lord, one faith, one baptism*, &c. *Eph.* 4. 5 6. proves not the Gentile and Jewish Church visible to be the same, but the invisible of both. *Gal.* 6. 15. hath not a word tending to prove that there is the same reason of Jews

and Gentiles infant visible churchmembership, but of the equal interest in Christ of Gentiles who are new creatures, as of the Jews. It is no part of *Pauls* Epistles, and therefore not much of their substance to prove the taking in of the Gentiles, and grafting them into the Olive which the Jews were of, if by it were meant the visible Church Jewish, but it is most palpably false. The *discipling nations, the Kingdoms of the world becomming Christs, Rev.* 11. 15. prove not infant discipleship, or churchmembership. All hitherto brought by Mr. B. hath yeilded no sufficient proof, let's view the rest.

SECT. LXX.

Mr. Bs. 16th, *and* 17th. *arg from the promise of mercy,* Exod. 20. 6. *and of blessing,* Psal. 37. 26. *are answered.*

CH. 21. saith Mr. *B.* "The 16th. arg. then is this: *Exod.* 20. 5, 6. "From hence I argue thus: If God have made over this mercy (of "Churchmembership) in the moral law, to the children of all that "love and obey him, then it is not proper to the Jews children, nor "is it ceased: But God hath made over this mercy in his moral law to "the children of all that love and obey him; therefore it is not proper to "the Jews children, nor is it ceased. Nothing but the antecedent here "needeth proof. Every man I think among us will confess, that the mo"ral law was not proper to the Jews, and that it is not ceased. Even the "most of the *Antinomians* confess the ten Commandments are in force "as the law of Christ, though not as the law of *Moses*. However, if they "be against the preceptive part of the law, yet sure they will not bee a"gainst the promissary part. Though there be some clauses that were su"ted to the Jews peculiarly, yet I never yet met with man that would "say this was so. If the ten Commandments be not currant proof, there "is no disputing with them out of Scripture.

Answ. There is need of proof of more then the antecedent to make this argument good. For 1. the conclusion is not that which Mr. B. should prove, Churchmembership and visible Churchmembership, children and infant children being not all one. God may shew the mercy of Churchmembership to infants, and yet not make over to them visible Churchmembership, and he may make over visible Churchmembership to the children of them that love him, and yet not to them in infancy. So that the conclusion may bee granted as it stands, without any impeachment to my tenet. But if it be meant of visible Churchmembership of infant children, the *minor* is to be denied. And to the proof, 1. I except that this promise was proper to the Jews made to back the legal Covenant, and though it be a promise annexed to the observing a moral precept, yet as in the fifth Commandment termed *the first commandment with promise, Ephes.* 6. 2. So in this, the promise hath special reference to their prosperous and safe estate in *Canaan*, in which they

they were continued while they kept themselves from idolatry, and on the other side expelled, captivated, enslaved, when they served idols, unto the third and fourth generation, upon which considering the time of making this promise, the usual tenour of promises in the Books of *Moses*, as *Deut.* 7. 9, 12. to the same purpose, the place where this promise is put, the event which doth best expound it, and that no where under the Gospel promises are made to believers children, but onely to believers themselves of Evangelical mercy, yea the Apostle concludes that notwithstanding the promise to *Abraham* and his seed *Gen.* 17. 7. and to *Israel*, yet *God hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardens*, *Rom.* 9. 18. I do determine (without fear of Mr. *Bs.* censure) that this promise was suited to the Jews peculiarly. 2. I hence infer that if this mercy be meant of Churchmembership, yet it might bee, yea was proper to the Jews children. 3. The mercy here cannot be proved to be visible Churchmembership. 4. That it is onely to those mens children who love him and keep his Commandments, which is an invisible thing, and so whose infants are visible Churchmembers by this promise cannot bee known. 5. That this promise is made good though it be not performed to all those that love him, nor to all their children, nor to any in infancy. 6. That this promise is not true without the exception of election, and the expounding of it as conditional and not absolute, sith it must then follow that God exempts none yet from mercy, there being not a thousand generations from *Noah* to this day. So that till Mr. *B.* have proved the contrary to these (which he can never do) his proof from hence will appear to be of no force. But let us examine what he saith.

"Let mee try therefore whether this 3d. Commandment in the "words cited do not prove the *minor*: to which end I argue thus. If "God have assured his mercy by promise to the children of all them "that love and obey him, then he would have them be taken for mem-"bers of his Church. But hee hath here assured his mercy by pro-"mise to the children of them that love and obey him: therefore he would "have them bee taken for Churchmembers: The *minor* is plain in the "text. The consequence of the *major* I prove thus: (*viz.* that all those "must be taken for Churchmembers on whom God hath thus stated or "assured his mercy by promise) (the word [*mercy*] I shall explain a-"non:) If God have estated and assured his mercy by promise to no o-"ther society of men in the world but the Church, then all those are "members of the Church on whom his mercy is thus estated and assured: "But God hath estated and assured his mercy on no other society. Ther-"fore, *&c.*

"Here let me a little explain my meaning. Sometime when God pro-"miseth mercy, it is first to some particular person or family: Sometime "to a whole *species* or sort of persons. 2. Sometimes it is some particu-"lar named mercy, and sometime in the general naming no sort or in-"dividual mercy. 3. Sometimes it is upon a special ground proper to "some one person or to few; and somtimes it is upon a common ground. "4. When the mercy is specified, it is sometime meerly corporal and

" time ſpiritual. 5. And of ſpiritual mercies, ſometime it is common to o-
" thers beſides the ſaved; and ſometime ſpecial and proper to the ſaved.
" 6. Sometime it is mercy limited to a ſhort or certain time; and ſome-
" time eſtated and aſſured for continuance while the law ſtandeth. Now
" you muſt underſtand firſt, that God may beſtow on ſome particular
" perſon or family, on the ground of ſome ſpecial ſervice, which they or
" their fathers have done, or of meer mercy ſome ſpecial corporal bleſ-
" ſing, eſpecially limited to ſome ſhort or certain time: And that his
" common preſerving ſuſtaining mercies are over all his works; and
" and yet none of this will prove men Churchmembers. 2. But when
" God doth not name any particular perſon or family for his mercies,
" but eſtates them on a *ſpecies* or ſort of perſons; and when it is not a
" meer corporal mercy that is ſo ſtated, but either a ſpiritual mercy
" (common or ſpecial) or elſe mercy in the general without ſpecificati-
" on, and when this is not on any ground of any particular action or
" ſervice done by any particular man, but upon a ground (or condi-
" tion) common to others not named; and all this not limited to
" any ſhort or certain time, but ſtated to continuance, and that by
" a legal promiſe aſſuring it, and not onely a meer offer of it,
" in this caſe it will certainely proove them members of the
" Church.

Anſw. 1 Mr. *B.* leavs out in the *minor* the term [*all*] which was in the *major* of the firſt ſyllogiſm: which if it had been put in the *minor* (as it was neceſſary hee ſhould do to prove the concluſion hee ſhould prove) it would not have been proved out of the text; which doth not aſſure mercy to all the children of all that love him, but to thouſands, that is, multitudes of them; and to thoſe mercy is not aſſured abſolutely without condition of their love of God, nor is mercy in the text promiſed perpetually, but as *Andr. Rivet.* on *Exod.* 20. 6. *God doth not ſo extend the bounds of his mercy, that hee may not alſo deny it to the poſterity of ſome godly men. For theſe things are ſaid of thoſe things which for the moſt part happen, Gods liberty beeing alwayes reſerved in his judgements and the diſtribution of good things. So wee reade the ſonnes of Godly parents to have been forſaken of God and grievouſly puniſhed.* 2. The conſequence of his *major* is denied, and to his dictates (for proof hee brings none but his own ſayings) I anſwer firſt, by denying that all thoſe muſt bee taken for viſible Churchmembers on whom God hath ſtated or aſſured his mercy by promiſe, *Exod.* 20. 6. no nor though it were ſtated as Mr. *B.* would have it, no promiſe, no not of ſanctifying graee making of it ſelf a perſon a viſible Churchmember, as I have ſhewed often before. 2. I deny that *the mercy, Exod.* 20. 6. is ſtated as Mr. *B.* imagines; but ſay, 1. That the mercy there meant, is ſtated on the *Iſraelites* ſpecially. 2. That it is not meant of ſpiritual but outward mercies, not now promiſed to the moſt holy Saint on earth. 3. That it was declared on a particular ground of Gods peculiar reſpect to *Iſrael*, whom hee brought out of *Egypt.* 4. That it is limited to a

certain

certain time, while they continued to be his people, which was not to be perpetually. 3. I deny that the words, *Exod.* 20. 6. *Deut.* 5. 10. do expresly contain a promise, but [only] a declaration of Gods frequent calling, which I confess doth imply a promise, as his declaration, *Exod.* 20. 5. *Deut.* 5. 9. doth imply a threatening; yet I think it not fit to call it a promise, sith the Apostle *Ephes.* 6. 2. termes the fifth commandment, *the first commandment with promise.* But Mr. *B.* adds.

Now that it is the priviledge of the Church onely to have God thus engaged to be mercifull to them, (and that in a way of distinction from others, as it is in this commandment promise,) is to me a truth beyond dispute. And if any do doubt of it, I argue with them thus. 1. If no such promise of such mercy to any sort of men out of the Church can be shewn in the Scripture, then we must take it as proved that there is none: But no such promise can be shewn effating such mercy on any others; therefore, &c. They that can shew any such promise, let them produce it.

Answ. The assertion is not a truth beyond dispute, but may be questioned, nor is the consequence good, there being no such declaration of God that he hath made no such promise of such mercy to any sort of men but what can be shewn in the Scripture; and if it were, yet till Mr. *B.* hath shewed that the mercy *Exod.* 20. 6. is greater then God vouchsafes to persons out of the Church visible, it may be held (notwithstanding any thing Mr. *B.* produceth) that such mercy is promised to persons out of the Church. However, it is most false that *God hath assured his mercy on no other society then the Church.* If the promise, *Gen.* 3. 15. be understood of all mankind as meant by the womans seed (as he before in his third Letter to me, and after here, *ch.* 23. expounds it) then there is a promise of mercy stated on others then the Church; and the same may be said of *Gen.* 9. 12, 15, 16. besides what is implied in the speeches, *Psal.* 36. 6. *Psal.* 145. 9. 1 *Tim.* 4. 10. Till Mr. *B.* shew a greater mercy is stated on the children of all that love God then is on *Cyrus*, *Isa.* 45. 1, *&c.* there is a promise shewn in Scripture of such mercy to one out of the Church. The like to *Nebuchadnezzar*, *Jer* 27. 6. And the promises of calling the Gentiles, of re-ingraffing the Jews, *Rom.* 11. 26, 27. are promises to persons out of the Church, and yet of mercy, yea the chiefest mercy; and therefore Mr. *Bs.* dictates are but vain. Yet he goes on thus.

2. *Briefly consider to the contrary: 1. Those without the Church are said to be without hope, without God, strangers to the Covenant of promises, Ephes.* 2. 12.

Answ. It is said of the Ephesians, that they were once without hope, *&c.* and it is said also that they were Gentiles uncircumcised; but it doth not follow therefore that all Gentiles uncircumcised were without Christ not having hope, without God in the world: Nor doth it follow, that all Gentiles were out of any visible Church who were uncircumcised; nor doth it follow, they had no promises of mercy who were strangers from the Covenants of promise there meant. It is true, this Text proves that the estate of the Gentiles afore the Gospel was

preached

preached to them, was as *Paul* describes it: Yet this neither proves that there were none who were out of the Commonwealth of *Israel*, and were strangers from the Covenant of promises made to *Israel*, had no mercy assured to them equal to that, *Exod.* 20.6.

2. Saith Mr. *B.* *The promises are all Yea and Amen in Christ*, 1 Cor. 1.20. *And Christ is the head over all* (*indeed but onely*) *to the Church*, Ephes. 1.22. *To his called he giveth the precious promises*, 2 Pet. 1.4.

Answ. The promises, 2 *Cor.* 1.20. are such as were in *Christ*, and must be understood of saving promises, which are not made to the visible Church as visible, much less to the children of visible churchmembers as such, but onely to those that are of the invisible, and therefore this Text proves not that no mercy such as is meant, *Exod.* 20.6. is assured to any society or persons but those of the visible Church. The same also may be said of 2 *Pet.* 1.4. where the promises are given to the effectually called, and that by them they are partakers of the Divine nature. And for the other Text, though there be no mention of promises in it at all, yet if any be implied, the speech is meant onely of the Church of Gods elect (not the meer visible Church) which alone is *his body, the fulnes of him that filleth all in all*; and therefore if these Texts prove no mercy promised but to the Church, they prove no mercy promised but to the invisible Church, which is contrary to Mr. *Bs.* purpose here.

3. Saith he, *By faith it is that promises were obtained*, Heb. 11.33.

Answ. It is said, by faith they subdued Kingdomes, in the same *v.* and therefore after the rate of Mr. *Bs.* reasoning, none should subdue Kingdomes but the Church. The faith there is such a faith as the just lived by, *ch.* 10.38. therefore if Mr. *Bs.* arguing be good, promises of mercy should be made to none, but those who believe with such a faith, and consequently it is not the meer visible Church but the invisible onely to whom such mercy is assured. The answer is by denying the consequence, that because promises were obtained by faith, therefore mercy is not assured to any by promise but the Church.

4. He adds. *To* Abraham *and his seed were the promises made*, Gal. 3.16. *both common and special*: *The children of the promise are accounted for the seed*, Rom. 9.8. *Therefore if those without the Church were children of the promise, then they should be the seed. The promise is sure to all the seed*, Rom. 4.16. *The promise is to you and your children, and as many as the Lord shall call*, Acts 2.39. *The seed are heirs of the promise.*

Answ. Mr. *Bs.* heedlesness still appears. He should prove, that such mercy as he conceives promised *Exod.* 20.6. (which he will not avouch to be saving mercy) is assured to none but the Church, and he means the visible Church: but here he brings promises of saving mercy, which he dare not lay to be made to the children of all that love him, *Exod.* 20.6. and are indeed made onely to those who are of the invisible Church, and therefore impertinently alledged. The promises, *Gal.* 3. 16. are such as are made to Christ either personal for his body mystical, or to Christ mystical, and the promises are those by which is *the inheritance*, *v.* 18. *righteousness by faith*, *v.* 21, 22. which can be true onely of

the

the elect, and so that, v. 29. *If ye be Christs, then are ye* Abrahams *seed, and heirs according to the promise.* So *Rom.* 4. 16. is meant onely of true believers, and *Rom.* 9. 8. of the elect onely. Now it's not denied, that the promises of righteousness and life belong onely to the Church invisible; but these promises are far different from the promise to the children of them that love God, *Exod.* 20. 6. which Mr. *B.* will have onely meant of the visible Church, and of things much below saving benefits. The Text, *Acts* 2. 39. is as impertinently alledged, as hath been proved at large before, the promise there being not meant of any visible priviledge nor the fathers there considered as believers, or lovers of God, but as crucifiers of Christ, and the promise not said to be to any of either sort, but those who were called by God.

5. Saith Mr. *B. The Church is the house and family of God, and the promises are his treasure, and Christs legacies, and the word of promise is his Testament; therefore not for those without. The Church is the pillar and ground of truth, and the word is the truth. In the middest of the Church are Gods praises,* Heb. 2. 12. *therefore in the Church are his mercies and promises. It is by the Church that the manifold wisdome of God is known,* Eph. 3. 10. *The Church onely is that body whereof the Lord of the promises is head,* Col. 1. 18.

Answ. The promises of saving benefits are Gods treasure, and belong onely to the invisible Church; but it follows not therefore that God makes no promise, or the mercy *Exod.* 20. 6. belongs to none out of the visible Church. Let it be yeelded, the Church is the pillar of truth, and the word is the truth; yet that God makes no promises to *Cyrus, Nebuchadnezzar*, and others out of the Church, or that his promise to them is not true, or that he vouchsafes no mercy to them, follows not. God is praised in the Church, and his counsel made known, and Christ the head of the Church onely, and yet all praise, promise, and mercy not appropriate to the Church.

6. Yet again. *They that are not in covenant, are not under the promises of this mercy, or have not this mercy stated on them by promise; But those that are without the Church are not in covenant. This argument is past contradiction. No man dare say but these are covenant mercies in this promise mentioned. Wicked men in the Church are within the covenant, as I have proved in the Appendix of my Aphorisms; but those without are not in covenant, though they may have some conditional promises offered. The covenant and such promises as these go together: Therefore it is called the covenant of promises,* Eph. 2. 12. Rom. 9. 3, 4. *So is mercy onely assured by the covenant,* Deut. 7. 9, 12. *and that to the Church onely,* 1 Kings 8. 23. Neh. 1. 5. & 9. 32. Mic. 7. 20. Luke 1. 50, 72. 1 Pet. 2. 10. *Many more Scriptures shew the conjunction between Gods mercy and covenant; and most certainly they are all out of covenant that are out of the visible Church.*

Answ. If Paedobaptists had not a mind to mock rather then to teach people by their writings, me thinks being so often called upon to speak distinctly what covenant they mean, when they say infants and visible churchmembers are in covenant, and in what manner they are in covenant

nant by Gods act, their own, or the baptizers, they would ſtill when they ſpeak of being in covenant clear their meaning. There are divers Covenants of God; that with *Noah*, *Gen.* 9. that with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. that with the Jews, *Exod.* 19. the new Covenant, *Heb.* 8.9,10,11,12. Being in Covenant muſt needs come from their own act of covenanting, and then the ſenſe is, Wicked men in the Church are within the Covenant, that is, they promiſe to God: But in this ſenſe no infant is in Covenant with God; for no infant promiſeth to God. Or being in Covenant is from Gods act of promiſing, and thus it is moſt certainly falſe that *they are all out of Covenant that are out of the viſible Church*: For all men and beaſts are in the Covenant with *Noah*, *Gen.* 9.11,12. Mr. *B.* himſelf ſaith thus in his *Appendix to his Aphoriſms, anſw to the 8th. object.* p. 48. *There is a Covenant betwixt God and every living creature. If I ſhould inſtance in all the promiſes made to* Ahab, Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus, Darius, *&c. it would be tedious.* The Jews not yet re-ingraffed, not of the viſible Church, are certainly in Covenant in this ſenſe, *Rom.* 11.26,27. *Iſaac*, *Jacob*, afore they were born were in Covenant, and ſo all elect infants in their mothers womb, and men of years yet in infidelity are within the Covenant of Evangelical grace, even the new Covenant, *Heb.* 8. though not in the viſible Church. The *minor* therefore of Mr. *Bs.* argument is ſo far from being juſt contradiction, that it is in my apprehenſion manifeſtly falſe. I grant *all mercies mentioned in any promiſe are Covenant mercies*; but for the mercy, *Exod.* 20.6. it ſeems Mr. *B.* cannot tell what it is, though he tell us on his word *it is more then corporal, if not ſpecial.* Now he ſaith, *Appendix*, p. 8. 1 *Sam.* 10.4,5,6,7. *The ſpirit of God and other favours are promiſed to Saul.* And ſure as much is promiſed to *Cyrus*, *Iſa.* 44.28. & 45.1, *&c.* as was to *Saul*. Wicked men in the viſible Church, continuing ſo to the end, neither are, nor ever were in the Covenant of Evangelical grace, or new Covenant, though they have been in the Covenants with *Noah*, and ſome other Covenants, in ſome of which alſo wicked men without the viſible Church have been. *The Covenants of promiſe* (not as Mr. *B.* reads it, *the Covenant of promiſes*, *Epheſ.* 2.12.) were as it is moſt likely the Covenants *Gen.* 17. *Exod.* 19. and the meaning of the Apoſtle in ſaying the *Epheſians were ſtrangers from them*, ſeems to be, that they were not acquainted with them, and therefore in appearance further from God, as in like manner their uncircumciſion and alienation from the policy of *Iſrael*, are alledged to the ſame purpoſe. And yet when they were made believers, and were in the viſible Church, they were in neither Covenant as there is meant, I mean, they were not in the Covenant made to *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. as it did contain ſpecial promiſes made to his natural ſeed, nor in the Covenant made at *Horeb* any more then they were circumciſed or in the policy of *Iſrael*. *Rom.* 9.1,2. hath nothing of Covenants or promiſes, but what is *v.* 4. is often before ſhewed to be meant of the Covenants and promiſes peculiar to the Iſraelites; and therefore, though the Covenant and ſuch promiſes go together, yet therein is nothing which pertains to the viſible church membership of our children, thoſe who are now in the Church being not in

those Covenants which were peculiar to the Israelites. 'Tis true the mercy meant *Deut.* 7. 9. was assured by Covenant, but that Covenant was *v.* 12. it which *God sware to the fathers*, which so far as it was Evangelical, belongs onely to the elect whether of Jews or Gentiles, so far as political to the *Hebrews* onely. The same I say of 1 *Kings* 8. 23. *Nehem.* 1. 5. & 9. 32. *Mic.* 7. 10. The texts *Luk.* 1. 50. 72. 1 *Pet.* 1. 10. are plainly meant of saving mercy, and of the elect or invisible Church onely. So that though I grant a conjunction between Gods mercy and Covenant, and that saving mercy is assured onely by the Covenant to the Church invisible onely, yet I deny that God is in Covenant with none but those of the visible Church, that God hath not promised such mercy as is meant *Exod.* 20. 6. to any but in the visible Church, that what continuance of mercy is assured *Exod.* 20. 6. to posterity is assured to believers children now as it was to the Israelites, that they are all visible Churchmembers to whom that mercy is assured, and therefore infer that the pretended ordinance of infants visible Churchmembership hath no footing in that text.

Mr. *B* takes upon him to answer some objections, but very lamely. *If any object*, saith he, *that this promise is to the children of them onely that love him and keep his Commandments; and wee know not who those be; I answer, it is true, but though God make the promise onely to such, yet quoad nos, it belongeth to others; that is, wee are bound to deal with all those that profess love and obedience by a serious probable profession, as if they were truly what they profess: This I shall prove afterwards. He that hath the face to say that God estateth here his mercy on the children of those that love, and obey him, and yet taketh them not for so much as members of the visible Church, hath too hard a forehead for me to dispute it with any further.*

Answ. Though wee are to take such professours by a judgement of charity to have such love, and title to the promise, and are to exhibit all such offices of love as we are bound to by such a love as is due to them that truly love God, yet we are not bound to take them for visible churchmembers by that judgment of charity, but by a judgment of certainty sensibly perceiving their profession; nor are we to take their children as visible Churchmembers now not by Pædobaptists own grounds, for they are not so but upon their parents real love, they being not visible Churchmembers but by the Covenant which belongs not to them except they do truly love God, and not in shew onely, which is to bee known by a judgement of certainty not of charity onely, and that being not attainable it is not by Mr. *Bs.* own grounds knowable that any infant is a visible Churchmember. What he saith he shall prove afterwards hath been examined already in the first part of this *Review sect.* 35. I am not moved by Mr. *Bs.* censure, but take it for a speech of a man who loves to talk confidently when hee disputes weakly, like those who set out weak members with much bumbast.

He adds, *Some may object*, 1. *That they know not what mercy it is that is here promised, whether common or special: To which I answer: what if they know not? yet it is mercy; and more then corporal if not spe-*

cial; what if God promise onely in general to bee to them a merciful God? sure it affordeth us ground of confidence and comfort: As it would do to a poor man to have a Prince promise to be merciful to him and his children.

Answ. That the mercy *Exod.* 20. 6. is *more then corporal, if not special* is said, but no proved by Mr. *B.* that he dare so confidently assert infants visible Churchmembership from a promise of mercy which hee cannot certainly resolve of what mercy it is, shews hee hath a bold face not fit for a man that seeks for truth. Especially if it be considered that no promise of it self doth make a man actually a visible Churchmember, no not of faith or profession, or visible Churchmembership. For a promise assures a futurity, puts not a thing in present being. 'Tis true a promise gives ground of confidence and comfort, that the thing shall be in its due time which is promised, but a promise of any mercy in general cannot assure the futurity of visible Churchmembership, no not though it were of more then corporal or special mercy, and therefore this argument his own words do sufficiently evince to bee onely added to make a number without strength.

2. Saith he, "They may object, that it is uncertain what is meant by "a thousand generations: whether it be the remote or the neareſt pro- "geny. To which I answer: 1. I judge it to be onely to the immedi- "ate children of godly or ungodly parents, that the promise and threat "in this Commandment is made to; else there would bee a contradi- "ction between them. For if the third generation of a wicked man "should have godly parents between, then the promise would belong "to them, and consequently not the threat; and so on the other side. "The meaning seems plainly to me to be this, that God will encrease "the punishment of the children of ungodly parents according as they "succeed their parents, remembring the sins of the grand-fathers in pu- "nishing their children (they being still the children onely of the wic- "ked.) And that he will multiply mercies on the posterity of the righ- "teous, the more still because they had righteous progenitors, suppo- "sing still that they are the children of such.

Answ. To interpret a thousand generations or the third and fourth by one onely, is such a piece of Arithmetick as I should conceive none but an Ideot or natural fool would use. The imagined contradiction is easily avoided by conceiving, that it is not a plain promise or threat of what God will constantly do, but a declaration of what hee doth often, or in some cases; which exposition is confirmed from hence, in that we see so much variation in Gods dealings, as necessitates us so to limit it. Though *Josiah* were a godly Prince, yet God would not shew mercy to his sons, and though *Manasseh* repented, yet for his sins wrath fell on his posterity and the whole people. But let Mr. *Bs.* interpretation, or mine, or any others be righter, yet the speech must needs have such limitations as wil disable it from yeilding a certain rule, whereby the children of all visible professors visible Churchmembership may bee proved, and therefore it is frivolously alledged by Mr. *B.* to that end.

2. Saith he, "But I further answer: What if this were not under- "stood

"stood? must wee therefore reject that which may bee understood?
"There is somewhat doubtfull in the text, viz. what mercy it is particularly? and to how many generations? if ungodly progenitors intervene? And there is somewhat beyond doubt in the text, that is, "that God estateth his mercy on the immediate off-spring of his people. "Now must I throw away that which is past doubt because of that "which is doubtfull? So we may throw away all the Scriptures.

Answ. We must not reject that which may be understood, nor must we wrest the Scripture to infer from it that which cannot be inferred, but omit the allegation of doubtful texts, and urge that which is certain. That which hee conceives undoubted is I conceive uncertain, *That God estateth his mercy on the immediate off spring of his people.* The instance of *Josiah.s* children is sufficient to shew it not to bee universally true. That which he acknowledgeth doubtfull is enough to shew, that nothing can be from this text certainly inferd for Mr. *Bs.* purpose, and therefore in the close of this Chapter Mr. *B.* confesseth that which is sufficient to shew, that the visible Churchmembership of all infants of godly parents much less of meer professors, cannot bee gathered from *Exod.* 20. 6. I pass on to the next.

Ch. 22. he saith thus. "The 17th. arg. is drawn from *Psal.* 37. 26. "[His seed is blessed] that is the righteous mans seed; whence I argue "as before: If God by his unchanged law and promise, have pronounced the seed of the righteous blessed, then certainly they are members "of his visible Church. But hee here pronounceth them blessed; therefore, *&c.* 1. I have proved before that hee hath so done by no society "out of the Church: They that say he hath pronounced any other society blessed, let them shew it. But it is absurd once to imagine that "God should pronounce a society blessed, and yet take them for none "of his visible Church. 2. That this promise is an unchangeable promise, I take for past doubt, till Mr. *T.* shew me where it is repealed "a little better then he hath shewed mee the repeal of infants Church-membership. It is made to the righteous and their seed in general, "and not to the Jews onely: it is writ en in the Book of Psalms from "whence Christ and his Apostles fetch many texts for confirmation of "their doctrine. And if it had been spoken but to the Jews, yea or to "one particular person, yet if it cannot be proved to bee restrained to "them as being from a reason proper to them, the Scripture teacheth us "to apply it to all the people of God, *Heb.* 12. 5. The Apostle applieth "that to all believers, which was spoken onely to *Joshua, I will never "leave thee nor forsake thee.* So *Heb.* 13. 6. from *Psal.* 118. *Heb.* 10. 16, "17, *Rom.* 10. 6.

Answ. 1. That the speech *Psal.* 37. 26. compared with *v.* 25. seems rather to be a narration of what the Psalmist found by experience, then a promise of God. Nevertheless sith there are promises to like purpose elsewhere, as *Psal.* 112. 2. *Prov.* 20. 7. I will not deny the speech *Psal.* 37. 26. to imply a promise, nor will I say God hath revoked (or as Mr. *Bs.* language is) repealed it. 2. Nor will I say that this promise was proper to the Jews, though I conceive that the promises to posterity have

more reference to the *Israelites* then other people by vertue of the national and legal Covenants made to that people, and I think Mr. *Br.* reason of no force, *that it is not made to the Jews onely, because it is written in the book of the Psalms*; for promises proper to them are there, as *Psal.*89.4,21,*&c. Psal.*132.11,*&c.* 3. I deny not promises to one particular person may be safely applied oft times to others. 4. I deny that when *Psal.*37.26. it is said *his seed is blessed*, and *Psal.*112.2. *the generation of the righteous shall be blessed*, this must be understood of every one of their seed, or at all times, as in their infancy, the speech being true onely of that which happens often, though not always. Mr. *B.* himself, p.149. saith, *Even as when he saith* [*the seed of the righteous are blessed*] *he doth not tie himself to make every one blessed with his special blessing, though he do it ordinarily.* And therefore it is most frivolously alledged to prove an ordinance of every infants visible churchmembership unrepealed, though the parent be no righteous person, but a visible professour, and very vicious, even an enemy to godliness. 5. There's not a word that intimates any society here pronounced blessed, much less the society of the Church. Nor doth the term [*blessed*] prove it must be meant of the Church. For others then the Church and churchmembers are sometimes blessed, as *Psal.* 137.9. *Psal.*144.15. Mr. *B.* here *ch.*24. *They that dash the children of Babylon against the stones are blessed, Psal.*137.9. *Luke* 23.29. 6. Mr. *B.* himself tels us, *p.*330. *That he affirms onely a certainty of churchmembership, and a strong probability of the justification of the infants of the righteous.* But if we urge the word strictly, they onely are blessed whose sins are forgiven, *Psal.*32.1. *Rom.*4.6,7. and therefore this Text may as soon prove justification of every righteous mans seed (which Mr. *B.* asserts not) as visible churchmembership. Yea, nowhere is any termed blessed by reason of his visible churchmembership, but many times for their outward prosperity, as *Psal.*144.15. *Deut.*28.2,*&c. Gen.*17.20. *&* 27.38,39. And that in this respect the blessing is meant, *Psal.*37.26. may be gathered 1. from the constant tenour of the promises made to the righteous and their seed, which either are altogether or for the most part in blessings of this life, and accordingly the performance: 2. Because in the New Testament in which spiritual blessings are assured, there is no promise of them to a believer and his seed, but to believers onely: 3. The occasion and *scope* of the Text, *Psal.*37.25,26. leads plainly to this sense, that the righteous is not so forsaken, nor his seed, as to be destitute of bread, that though he be mercifull and lendeth, yet his seed is blessed with sufficient provision of outward things: 4. The Texts, *Psal.*112.2. *Psal.*128. 1,2,3,4. *Psal.*144.15. lead us to this sense. From all which I answer by denying the consequence of the *major* in Mr. *Bs.* argument, and to his proof say, that it is no absurdity to pronounce persons blessed, and yet none of Gods visible Church.

Sect. 7.

SECT. LXXI.

Mr. Bs. 18th. arg. from the priority of infants churchmembership before Circumcision: His 19th. from Gods proneneſs to mercy: His 20th. from bleſſing and curſing, Deut. 28. are anſwered.

MR. *B.* proceeds thus, *ch.* 23. "The 18th. arg. is this: If infants were "churchmembers before ever Circumciſion was inſtituted, then cer-"tainly it was not proper to the Jews, and conſequently not ceaſed ac-"cording to Mr. *T.* his own Doctrine: But infants were churchmem-"bers before Circumciſion was inſtituted; therefore it was not proper "to the Jews, nor is ceaſed. Here at our Diſpute Mr. *T.* ſeemed to "yeeld all, if I would prove infants were churchmembers before Cir-"cumciſion.

Anſ. So far as I can diſcern by my memory and ſuch notes I have of the Diſpute, this was my conceſſion, That if Mr. *B.* would prove admiſſion of infants as churchmembers before Circumciſion, I ſhould yeeld to what he averred, that the law and ordinance of infants as viſible churchmembers was not repealed. Yet I confeſs, by reaſon of Mr. *Bs.* quickneſs of ſpeech, his unheeded altering terms, uſing often [viſible churchmembers] for [admiſſion as viſible churchmembers] which in that time in the conflict of Diſpute I did not always take notice of, or through wearineſs mention, it not to be unlikely I did ſay as Mr. *B.* ſaith I did. However by my writings it appears this is and was my conſtant judgement, that infants were viſible members of no Church but that of the *Hebrews*, nor ſuch till by Gods call of *Abraham* and his houſe they were taken to be his ſeparated people; and that infants were not admitted viſible churchmenbers, nor any law of admiſſion till that of Circumciſion, *Gen.* 17.

Mr. *B.* adds, *But in his Sermon ſince among much of the ſame ſtuff, he made the poor deluded people believe (I mean thoſe that will believe him) that by infants being churchmembers, I mean nothing elſe but that they ſuck of the breſts of godly parents, and are brought up in the family of godly parents; juſt as in our Diſpute he would have faced me down, before thouſands of people, that by churchmembership I meant nothing but Circumciſion; I told him I did not, and he told the people ſtill that I did. Is it any intemperance or harſhneſs upon ſuch dealings to ſay, that it is ſad that (I will not ſay eminent holineſs, but) a very little tenderneſs of conſcience, and fear of God, and love of truth or charity to a brother, yea or common modeſty ſhould not reſtrain this! but that Mr. T. durſt, firſt, take on him to ſearch the heart, and know a mans thoughts to be contrary to his profeſſion; ſecondly, and contrary to the plain ſenſe of his terms of ſpeech; thirdly, and perſwades multitudes of people that it is ſo. what hope can I have that ever Mr. T. ſhould be brought to the truth, when he hath not ability enough to underſtand what is the meaning of [a member of the viſible Church]*

and

and that after I had so fully told him! I was long before I could get him to confess, that Circumcision and Churchmembership were two things, and separable, till I gave him instance in women.

Answ. 1. In the Dispute I confess I did conceive that Mr. *B.* could mean nothing but the command of Circumcision by his ordinance of infants visible churchmembership, not imagining that he should magnifie such a toy, as he hath in his Letter to me devised from *Gen.* 1.26,27. & 3.15. *&c.* which, and not defect of truth, tenderness of conscience, modesty, or charity (in all which whether of us be defective the Lord will judge) made me so confident he did mean as I then said. 2. But that I ever said in my *Sermon*, that by infants being churchmembers he meant nothing else but that they suck the brests of godly parents, and are brought in the family of godly parents, I do not yet believe. This I might, and I think did say, and do say it again, That I knew no sign whereby infants are visible churchmembers, except those be signs which are mentioned. 3. That I was long in yeelding the separation of Circumcision and visible churchmembership, it was because I conceived that he meant infants of other people besides the circumcised, were visible churchmembers; but when I found he meant that they were distinct and separable in the people of the Jews, I yeelded it.

He proceeds thus. *And now must I be fain to shew, that churchmembership is neither sucking the brest of a godly woman, nor being brought in the family? what a hard word is this* [*Churchmember?*] *when I know not possibly how to speak it plainer. why, Sir, where is the difficulty? Is it in the word Church? I suppose we are agreed what a Church visible is? at least you understand it? Or is it in the term* [*member?*] *why, do you not know what a* [*member*] *is? How understand you* Pauls *discourse about the members and body? Do you understand what is* totum aggregatum & pars totius? *Do you understand what it is to be a member of a City, or of a family? and why not of a Church? If I say children are members of this Kingdome (or (to please you) Commonwealth) or if I say children are members of every City in the land, and of every family where they are, this is all true; and me thinks a man of your parts should understand it. And why not when I say, that infants are members of the Church? But if you will not understand, there is no remedy.*

Answ. That Mr. *B.* and *I* are not agreed what a visible Church is, hath appeared before in the 2d. part of this *Review*, *sect.* 17. *I* think *I* understand others when they speak of a visible churchmember, and *I* think *I* now understand Mr. *B.* But in the Dispute *I* confess *I* did not understand Mr. *B.* when he termed infants visible churchmembers, not because of the difficulty of the thing, but because Mr. *B.* had a language (as *I* then imagined, and now find) of his own, of a mediate Disciple and a visible Churchmember by anothers faith, without any note in their persons whereby they are discernable sensibly to be Christians more then infidels children: Nor did he in the Dispute or since clear it to me, that anothers faith could be a form or note whereby an infant might be denominated or discerned sensibly to be a visible Christian churchmember, or a Disciple of Christ. This if he shall yet do, *I* shall

not

not trouble him to shew that churchmembership is neither sucking of the breast, nor being brought up in a godly family, but shall (passing by his jeer at the Parliaments altering the term Kingdome into Commonwealth) confess infants members of the visible Church as of civil Kingdomes and Cities. Till then, I take Mr. *Bs.* language of infants discipleship and visible churchmembership by a promise and parents faith to be frivolous gibberish and false doctrine.

But Mr. *B.* attempts to prove his *minor*, 1. from *Mal.* 2. 15. where he would have [*a seed of God*] to be visible churchmembers. But 1. he no where shews this to be the sense: 2. this is not the sense: For here the proper end of marriage is expressed, which is common to believers and infidels. But it is not the end of the marriage of infidels to seek a seed which should be churchmembers visible or invisible, neither their nor any others marriage is to propagate godliness or the profession of it, but to propagate a legitimate posterity, who are called, *a seed of God*, because according to his institution. But of this interpretation I need say no more then what is said in answer to Mr. *M.* in the first part of this *Review*, *sect.* 13. and to Mr. *Bs.* exception against my interpretation here, in the 17th. *section*. 2. Because infants in *Abrahams* family were churchmembers before Circumcision. Which I grant after the time of *Abrahams* call, and Gods separating his house to be his people; and therefore if limited to the space of time between *Abrahams* call, *Gen.* 12. and the institution of Circumcision, *Gen.* 17. I should grant the *minor* in Mr. *Bs.* argument, and deny the consequence of the *major*. Nevertheless in the proof of his *minor* there are sundry things, which I think not meet to pass by without animadversion. 1. That which he saith *Circumcision did not not make infants churchmembers*, I grant it; yet it made them visible churchmembers, though not of it self alone, yet with other signs: So that although I deny not other signs also to have concurred, yet this sign in part made them visible members of that Church. 2. When he saith *the Covenant maketh churchmembers*, how far it is true is shewed above at large, and withal how Mr. *B.* is mistaken in making it the *sole efficient cause*. 3. If it be true that *Circumcision is but a sign of the Covenant* (as he saith) how is it a seal (as is commonly asserted and by Mr. *B.* himself) as somewhat more then a bare sign? 4. If it be not *a sign chiefly of that Covenant which maketh churchmembers, but which promised* Abraham *the extraordinary priviledges after his believing*, then it is some other Covenant which Circumcision was chiefly a sign of, then the Covenant which maketh churchmembers; which being as I conceive the Covenant of grace in Christ, it follows, 1. That the Covenant, *Gen.* 17. according to Mr. *B.* was not the Covenant of grace. 2. That it promised extraordinary priviledges to *Abraham*. 3. That Circumcision was chiefly a sign of this promise, and consequently the use of circumcising infants was not out of a reason common to believers infants, but peculiar to *Abraham* and his seed, which cross sundry of Pædobaptists prime *hypotheses*. 4. Neither doth the Apostle say, *Rom.* 4. that the *promise went before Circumcision*; nor doth it follow, if he did, that *churchmembership then went before it*. 5.

It

It may be, and by learned men is questioned, whether the infants or the parents be termed the *breakers of Gods Covenant*, Gen. 17. 14. and if they were, it follows not they were of that people and in the Covenant before, the breaking the Covenant being not a breaking off from being in Covenant, but a breaking of Gods command in that Covenant; and their cutting off from Gods people, might be by preventing from being Gods people, as well as by making them not his people who were. 6. Though the Scripture do not intimate, that *Abrahams family was then first made a Church*, yet in calling that Church *the Circumcision*, it intimates, that then when they were circumcised they were solemnly declared to be Gods people: And if the Scripture do not intimate, that then *infants were first admitted members*, as Mr. *B.* saith here, it will concern him to shew where the Scripture intimates their admission before, and how. I did conceive by Mr. *Bs.* words, p. 24. and elsewhere, that as he now avoucheth *no other way by precept or example of admission but by Baptism*, so he avouched formerly no other way but by Circumcision. I wish he had in the beginning told us his mind plainly, the concealing of which in the Dispute, and since, hath occasioned the misleading of many, and a great part of my trouble.

3. Mr. *B.* argues thus. *That infants were churchmembers before Circumcision, I prove most likely thus: If God had before the same tender love to the faithfull and their seed as he had after, and there be no mention in Scripture when the churchmembership of infants did begin (since the first infants) then we are to judge that it did not begin at the institution of Circumcision (but rather with the first infant of faithfull* Adam, *though he after fell off) because Gods love to the faithfull and their seed, was as great before as after: But the antecedent is true, therefore the consequent. He that will prove a beginning of infants churchmembership since the first infants; let him bring any Scripture or good reason for it, and I will believe him (which I never expect to be done.)*

Answ. 1. This reason, if it were good, might as well prove the invisible as well as visible churchmembership of all infants of believers, and the visible churchmembership of the seed unborn as well as born, and of the most open profane children of believers, as well as the youngest children born into the world. 2. The love of God was never to the faithfull and their seed universally, I mean the special distinguishing love of God, nor to any of them but according to his election of grace. 3. God might and did love the faithfull and their seed, and yet the infant seed were not visible churchmembers afore *Abrahams* time. 4. The reason of that regard God had to *Abrahams* inheriting posterity to take their infants for visible churchmembers, was from his peculiar design he had on that people, to make them the people from whom his sons comming should be expected, which he vouchsafed not to believers of other people, whom yet he loved and their seed in respect of Gospel mercies. 5. The beginning of infants visible churchmembership is sufficiently shewed before, in that it is not shewed to have been any where but in the Hebrew nation. 6. If *Adams* infants, he standing in integrity, had been visible churchmembers, yet they had been such onely in the

the Church by nature, which is nothing to the present point of visible churchmembership in the Church instituted by electing some to be of the Church, and some not. From hence I answer to the argument, 1. by denying the antecedent, that there is no mention in the Scripture when the churchmembership visible of infants did begin. 2. The consequence of the *major*, if it did not, it proves not the visible churchmembership of infants afore *Abrahams* time; much less from *Adams* creation, sith then there was no such Church to be as now we enquire of, and Gods love might be to believers seed, and yet they no visible churchmembers.

The last argument, whereby Mr. *B.* would evince infants visible churchmembership before *Abrahams* time, which he saith here he had not leisure to improve largely, he hath, in his Letter to me before recited, I think to the utmost he could, urged in, and the answer thereto is fully made here, *sect.* 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59. and thereby it may appear, not onely to a man of common sense, but of acute sense, that there is likelihood that infants should be visible churchmembers in *Abrahams* family, and yet not in the foregoing Patriarchs, and that from the Scripture, and yet Gods love as great to *Noah*, *Sem*, and their seed as to others. Nor is it true that *all these churchmembers are bestowed upon the standing Gospel grounds of the Covenant of grace entred with our first parents presently upon the fall*, but visible Churchmembership of infants was upon the special transeunt fact of God in taking the *Hebrew* nation to bee his people. And though the promise *Gen.* 3. 15. comprehend infants, yet not all infants; and I wonder how Mr. *B.* beeing a man of common sense, should not discern that if hee will have the whole seed of the woman comprized in the promise *Gen.* 3. 15. and that they are thereby Churchmembers, hee must baptize all the posterity of *Eve*, which hee makes a thing to bee avoided p. 110. and gives cautions against it. And it is to me a sign of his palpable inconsiderateness in this his hasty scribling, that he cites *Revel.* 12. 17. to prove *Satans enmity against the whole seed of the woman, against our infants no doubt*, when the woman, *Revel.* 12. 17. is not *Eve*, as *Gen.* 3. 15. but *the woman cloathed with the Sunne* commonly conceived to represent the Christian Church, and *the seed* are said to *keep the commandments of God, and to have the testimony of JESUS CHRIST*, which cannot bee said of infants. But I leave him to the Lord to give him either repentance for his abuse of Scripture and perverting the truth, or to let him fill up the measure of his iniquity, and proceed to the next.

"Ch. 24. arg. 19th. If God bee not more prone to severity then "to mercy, then hee will admit of infants to bee members of the "visible Church. But God is not more prone to severity then to mercy: "Therefore he will admit of infants to be visible Churchmembers. All "that needs proof here is the consequence of the *major* proposition, which "is made evident thus: God hath cut off multitudes of infants of wicked "men, both from the Church and from life (for the sins of their pro-"genitors) therefore if he should not admit some infants of faithfull men,

" ſo much as into the viſible Church, then hee ſhould bee more prone
" to ſeverity then to mercy: (except it bee proved that God giveth
" ſome greater mercy out of the Church, which is not yet proved:) All
" the children of *Dathan* and *Abiram* and their accomplices, were ſwal-
" lowed up with them for their rebellion, and ſo cut off both from the
" Church and life. *Achans* ſons and daughters were all ſtoned and bur-
" ned for his ſin, and ſo cut off both from the Church and life, *Joſ.* 7.
" 25, 6. Yea it was the ſtabliſhed law of God concerning any City that
" ſhould ſerve other Gods (by the ſeducement of whomſoever) that is,
" if they ſhould break the Covenant (for the Covenant is that they take
" God onely for their God) then that City ſhould wholly be deſtroy-
" ed, and not ſo much as the infants ſpared, *Deut.* 13. 12, 13, 14. &c.
" And God concludeth it in his moral Law, that he will viſit the iniqui-
" ty of the fathers on the children to the third and fourth generation of
" them that hate him. All the infants of *Amalek* are ſlain with the pa-
" rents by Gods command, *Num.* 31. 17. they that daſh the children of
" *Babylon* againſt the ſtones are bleſſed, *Pſal.* 137. 9. The children of
" *Daniels* accuſers are caſt unto the Lions, *Dan.* 6. 24. Yea God com-
" manded *Iſrael* to ſave the life of no one infant of all the nations that
" were given them for inheritance; the *Hittites*, *Amorites*, *Canaanites*,
" *Perezites*, the *Hivites* and *Jebuſites*, *Deut.* 20. 16, 17. (How all this
" is reconciled with that of *Eze.* [the ſon ſhal not bear the iniquity of the
" father] is ſhewed by our Divines that write on the 2d. Com.) And if
" God will not admit the infants of believers ſo much as to bee mem-
" bers of his viſible Church, or Kingdom, then hee ſhould not onely
" ſhew more ſeverity to the ſeed of the wicked, then mercy to the
" ſeed of the faithful; but ſhould even caſt out all infants in the
" world from being in any viſible ſtate of Church mercies. And how
" that will ſtand with the tenderneſs of his compaſſions to the godly
" and their ſeed, and the many promiſes to them, and the enlargement
" of grace in Goſpel times I know not.

Anſw. 1. The ſpeech of *Gods proneneſs to mercy more then ſeverity*, is according to my apprehenſion of Gods attributes not right, nor however it may paſs among the vulgar is it true in exact ſpeech, ſuch as ſhould be uſed in Diſputes. For though I acknowledge juſtice vindicative to be natural in God, and goodneſs; yet the term of proneneſs to ſeverity, intimates an inclination or deſire to it, which is ſtopped by a contrary inclination; whereas Gods attributes are all equally in him, nor hath he any propenſity of deſires to exerciſe one more then another, but he doth work all things according to the counſel of his own will. 2. It is falſly ſuppoſed, as if viſible Churchmembership were an act of remunerative mercy and not the taking of infants into viſible Churchmembership, were an act of ſeverity againſt the infant for the parents ſin, whereas the taking or not taking into viſible Churchmembership is as election to eternal life, or reprobation an act of ſoveraignty and li-berty, which God uſeth as hee pleaſeth without reſpect to any perſons or parents good or bad actions. 3. It is alſo as falſly ſuppoſed that by not taking infants into viſible Churchmembership they are call

out from being in any visible state of Churchmercies. For their being in the families of the godly though not visible Churchmembers, puts them into a visible state of Churchmercies, even as well as if they were taken to be visible Churchmembers and baptised. 4. That *God giveth some greater mercy then visible Churchmembership*, to wit, eternal life, *out of the Church visible* is easily proved in that he saves elect infants which die in the womb, are abortives, or still born. And if Mr. *B.* do deny it hee must hold a tenet like the Papists, that without his visible Churchmembership infants are damned. 5. *The grace of God in Gospel times is enlarged* in the extent of it to all nations, in the doctrine of the Gospel concerning the *Messiah* comen already, freedom from the bondage of the law, in the powring out of the spirit, in the new Covenant, *&c.* although infants be not visible Churchmembers. 6. *Gods tenderneß of compassions to the godly and their seed* may and doth stand with the non-visible membership of their infants in the Christian Church, it being not out of any defect of mercy in God, or deprivation of mercy to them, which they may not have without it, but because it is his good pleasure that the Church Christian should not bee by natural descent, but by faith, not national but of believers of all Nations. 7. How God is said to admit into visible Churchmembership infants needs explication, admission, as I have hitherto conceived it, beeing the act of the administratour of baptism, according to Mr. *Bs.* doctrine *pag.* 24. and therefore his conclusion seems to have this sense, that God will baptise some infants with water, which is a friolous conceit. 8. If Mr. *Bs.* suppositions on which his argument rests should bee granted him, the conclusion should bee rather, that God will not permit the infants of the godly to bee put to death, but will keep them alive from the hands of persecutors, for otherwise hee should be more prone to severity to the wicked, then to mercy to the godly and their seed. For all the instances hee gives of Gods severity to the children of wicked men is in the taking away of their natural lives; and therefore his inference if there were any force in it, would conclude not the visible churchmembership of the infants of the godly, but the preservation of their lives in common calamities and persecutions; which it is certain he doth not, but as the Wiseman saith *All things happen alike to alike to all*, *Eccles.* 9. 2. Which things being premised, though the *minor* of M. *Bs.* first syllogism may be well questioned, yet waving it, I deny the consequences of the *major* in both the syllogisms, which rest on such futile dictates as he hath not proved, except by saying he knows not how it should be otherwise, which seems to intimate this fond conceit of himself, as if none could know what he doth not.

He goes on in his frivolous arguings thus. *Ch.* 25. "The 20th. arg. "I draw from *Deut.* 28. 4, 18, 3. Those that keep the Covenant are "[blessed in the fruit of their body;] and of Covenant-breakers it is "said [cursed shalt thou be in the fruit of thy body; thy sons and thy "daughters shall be given to another people, and thy eys shall look, "and fail with longing for them, *&c.* Thou shalt beget sons and daughters, but thou shalt not enjoy them, for they shall go into captivity.

"The argument that I fetch hence is this. That doctrine which maketh "the children of the faithful to be in a worse condition (or as bad) then "the curse in *Deut.* 28 doth make the children of Covenant-breakers to "be in is false doctrine: But that doctrine which denieth the infants of "the faithful to be visible Churchmembers, doth make them to bee in "as bad or a worse condition then is threatned by that curse *Deut.* 28. "Therefore it is false doctrine. The *major* is undeniable. The *minor* "I prove thus: The curse on the children *Deut.* 28. is, that they go "into captivity: Now to bee put out of the whole visible Church "of Christ is a sorer curse then to go into captivitie: therefore "that doctrine which puts infants out of the Church, doth make them "in a more accursed state then those in *Deut.* 28. They might bee "Churchmembers in captivity as their parents were; or if they were "not, yet it was no worse then this; To bee in captivity is but "a bodily judgement directly; but to bee out of the Church is di-"rectly a spiritual judgement: Therefore to bee out of the Church, "is a greater judgement (which I must take for granted, having "before proved that it is far better to bee in the visible Church then "out.)

Answ. The *minor* of the first and second syllogism are both denied. For though to be put out of the whole visible Church of Christ, either by just excommunication or voluntary defertion is a heavie curse, yet to be put out doctrinally, that is, to teach that infants are not visible Christian churchmembers is not to put them under any curse at all, neither is it to be so, any judgement spiritual or bodily, nor are they in any better case by their being accounted visible Churchmembers and baptised then they are without both, nor hath Mr. *B.* proved any such thing before, but what he hath scribled to that purpose is before shewed to bee vain.

"Another argument, saith hee, this text would afford in that "the judgement on the children is part of the curse on the parents "(cursed shalt thou bee in the fruit of thy body) now GOD "doth not curse the faithful; but hath taken off the curse by "CHRIST (though corporal afflictions are left.) But I must "haste.

Answ. That non-visible Churchmembership of infants now is any part of judgment or curse for the parents sin hath not the least colour of proof from this text or any other. The purport of the whole chapter is quite besides the present businesse, it being to assure the Israelites of prosperity in *Canaan*, while they kept Gods Commandments and adhered to him, and curses on them and theirs, if they fell off from God; the curses are for the most part corporal and on the Israelites, and therefore the thing belongs not to the present point, nor is it true that always *the judgment on the children is part of the curse on the parents* neither in corporal nor spiritual evils.

And though the truly faithful are not cursed with the great curse of condemnation, yet those that are onely so visibly may bee so, yea and the faithfull themselves are not altogether free from some

curses

curſes both on themſelves and their children, as on the other ſide, wicked men may have ſome bleſſings on them and their children. Mr *B.* himſelf ſaid in the next *ch.* 24. before, *They that daſh the children of Babylon againſt the ſtones are bleſſed, Pſal.* 137. 9 yet were they Idolaters. Chriſt hath taken off the curſe oppoſite to the bleſſing of righteouſneſs, *Gal.* 3. 9, 10, 13. not every curſe from the faithfull. Out of all which I infer, that were it granted that the non viſible churchmemberſhip of infants were a judgement for the parents ſin, and that Chriſt hath taken off the curſe from the faithfull, yet it would not follow, that believing parents infants muſt be Chriſtian viſible churchmembers, ſith ſome curſes ſtill ſtay on the children for the parents ſin: Yea, Mr. *B.* before in his Letter tels me, that *it was determined in one of their private Diſputes* (by himſelf no doubt, the Dr. of the Chair in the Colledge of *Worceſterſhire* Miniſters at *Kidderminſter*) *that the ſins of nearer parents are imputed as part of our original or natural guilt.* I haſt after Mr. *B.*

SECT. LXXII.

Mr. Bs. 21*th. Arg. ch* 25. *from the abſurdity of my Doctrine making all infants to be members of the viſible Kingdome of the Devil, is anſwered.*

CH. 26. ſaith he, "The 21th. arg. That doctrine which mak th all "infants to be members of the viſible Kingdome of the D vil, is falſe "doctrine: But that doctrine which denieth any infants to be members "of the viſible Ch rch, doth make them all members of the viſible King-"dome of the Devil: Therefore it is falſe doctrine. Mr. *T.* taketh the "like reaſoning hainouſly from Mr. *M.* as if were injurious ſo to charge "him: And he ſaith, 1. Conſequences remote muſt not be faſtened "on men when they deny them, 2. Many unbaptized are not in the viſi-"ble Kingdome of the Devil; and asketh, whether children be in or out "of that Kingdome before Baptiſm: If out, then by not baptizing he "leaves them not in it, *&c.* To this I anſwer, 1. He that ſaith, infants "are all ſhut out of heaven, may well be charged for teaching that they "go to hell, becauſe the conſequence is not remote, but direct, among "thoſe that acknowledge not a third place. 2. I will onely lay a true "charge on the doctrine, and not the perſons: The doctrine ſure may be "charged with the conſequences, though the perſon may not. 3. *It is* "not your denial of Baptiſm directly, that leaveth infants in the viſi-"ble Kingdome of the Devil; but your denial of their churchmember-"ſhip: Therefore to thoſe vain paſſages I anſwer, That it's true, that "many unbaptized are in the Kingdome of Chriſt, and ſo many infants "alſo, and ſo not in the viſible Kingdome of the Devil: But that no man "who is known to be out of Chriſts viſible Church, ordinarily can be "out of Satans viſible Kingdome, I ſhall now prove; and ſo that your

doctrine

" doctrine is guilty of making (I mean not really but doctrinally ma-
" king) all infants to be members of Satans visible Kingdome, in that
" you deny any infants to be members of the visible Church.

Answ. 1. That which I said about remote consequences not to be charged on men as their sentence, was spoken not from his charge of leaving all the infants to have their actual standing in the visible Kingdome of the Devil, but of putting them all out of the Covenant of grace; and this was made the bloudy sentence of the Anabaptists, though no such thing can be proved of them by any of their sayings. And therefore the two answers here of Mr. *B.* are impertinent, my speeches being about another point, though perhaps somewhat like it, and charged on us with it. And to Mr. *Bs.* answers I reply, 1. Mr. *B.* seems to me to oppose ineptly a direct consequence to a remote, whereas a near consequence is opposed to a remote, not a direct; for a remote consequence may be direct, as well as a near. But it is frequent with Mr. *B.* to abuse words. 2. If a person acknowledge a third place they that shut infants out of heaven may not be charged with it as their sentence, that they go to hell, which Mr. *Bs.* limitation intimates he acknowledgeth. And then by like reason this is not to be charged on me, for that I deny infants visible churchmembership, that I leave them in the visible Kingdome of the Devil, sith I leave them in a neutral state, of which more anon. 3. I shall examine the charge on my Doctrine, which I deny by denying the *minor* of Mr. *Bs.* syllogism. 4. Though Mr. *B.* call the passages in my *Apology*, p. 64. vain, yet it will appear there's no vanity in any of them. 5. The argument by which I proved that unbaptized persons may be in Christs visible Kingdome, which (Mr. *B.* confesseth) did fitly oppose Mr. *Ms.* imputation of leaving them all in the Devils visible Kingdome to whom we denied Baptism, I think will serve against Mr. *Bs.* opinion. For if it be true that infants are admitted into the visible Church by Baptism (which is his position, *p.* 24, 25.) then they are out of it afore they are baptized, (for afore admission none is in, but without,) and if so, according to Mr. *Bs.* doctrine, infants are in the visible Kingdome of the Devil, sith he denies a third estate, and the horrid consequence is to be charged on Mr. *Bs.* doctrine, not on mine. 6. Mr. *Bs.* way of charging my doctrine is as vain as Mr. *Ms.* Thus it proceeds.

For if it be certain (as you say) that no infants are members of the visible Church, they are out of it: And then I argue thus. If there be no third estate on earth, but all are either in the visible Church of Christ, or in the visible Kingdome of the Devil; then that doctrine which puts them out of the visible Church of Christ, doth leave them in the visible Kingdome of the Devil. But that there is no third state, but that all the world is in one of the two Kingdomes, I prove thus. The common definition of the Church affirmeth them to be a people called out of the world, and Christ saith, he hath chosen them out of the world, and that they are not of the world, and in the same place divers times calls the Devil [the Prince of this world,] Joh. 12.31. & 14.30. & 16.11. & 15.19. & 18.36. & 17. 6, 16. And the Apostle calleth him the God of the world, 2 Cor. 4.4. So

then,

then, if the Devil be the Prince and God of the world as it is distinct from the Church, and out of which the Church is taken: then all those that are not taken out of the world with the Church, are still of the world where Satan is Prince: But the antecedent is before proved, therefore the consequent is true. The world and the Church contain all mankind according to the ordinary Scripture distribution.

Answ. 1. The world and the Church are not in all the places cited contradistinct. For *Joh.* 18.36. this world comprehends the Church as well as them without, Christs Kingdome was not from the Church by their weapons, or other procurement; but *this world* is opposed to heavenly power, and gift, from whence Christ had his Kingdome. 2. Nor in the rest of the places where the Devil is termed *the God of this world*, or *the Prince of this world*, or the Disciples are said *not to be of the world*, can the speech be meant of infants; for of them of whom it is said that the Devil is *the God of this world*, by *the world* are meant, 2 *Cor.* 4.4. those that *believe not, in whom he hath blinded their minds, that the light of the glorious Gospel of Jesus Christ should not shine unto them*; and so must the rest be understood, where he is said to be *the Prince of this world*, according to what is said *Ephes.* 2.2. which is not to be said of infants; and in other places, as *John* 15.19. *John* 17.14 16. they are said to hate the Apostles, which is not to be said of infants: And therefore from hence they are not proved to be in the Devils Kingdome, though they were reprobates. 3. The world is not in these places opposed to the visible Church, so that who ever are in the visible Church are not of the world, and they who are of the world are not of the visible Church. For 1. the world out of whom the Apostles were called, were the Jewish Church, which if Mr. *B.* do not (as I conceive he doth) make the visible Church of God when the Apostles were called, sure Mr. *Bl.* Mr. *Cobbet*, and others do, as I have shewed before, and therefore *the world* is not put as contradistinct to the visible Church. 2. *The world* is in the places cited so described by their actions of hating the Apostles, by their exclusion out of Christs prayer, *Joh.* 17.9. by their Prince Satan, by the Apostles calling and choosing out of them, that the world cannot be construed onely to note non-visible churchmembers, but a party that are obstinate enemies to Christ, and so reprobates, whether in the visible Church, or out of it; and if it stand in direct contradistinction to the Church (which I find not in any of the places cited) it is to the invisible, not to the meer visible Church: so that they who are without the visible Church, may be no part of the world therein meant; and they that are within the visible Church, may be part of the world. 4. The definition, that *the Church are a people called out of the world*, being expounded of the visible Church, is meant of outward call, which infants are not capable of, and so the definition excludes infants from being a part of the Church there meant, and yet they are not in the world in the sense in which it is taken in the Texts mentioned (except *Joh.* 18.36.) For they are not haters of Christ or his Apostles, nor recusant unbelievers, nor such as obey Satan as their Prince. But if it be expounded of the invisible Church, and the calling meant

of

of invisible operation of the spirit, I deny not but elect infants may be so called out of the world, and be part of the invisible Church.

These things premised, I answer 1. The conclusion is not in the latter syllogism the same with the *minor* in the former syllogism which should have been proved. 2. The antecedent or *minor* in the later syllogism, which is this, [*the Devil is the Prince and God of the world as it is distinct from the Church, and out of which the Church is taken.*] if it be meant of the visible Church I deny. For neither is *the world* in any of the Texts distinct from the visible Church, but the visible Church or some members of it are *the world* there meant, and the Devil the Prince of them, and the visible Church in respect at least of many perhaps most of their members not taken out of the world, but in it still; nor is the Devil the Prince of them that yet are uncalled by an outward call from the world, if as infants they be not by their choice and actions conjoyned to the world, but of them that voluntarily adhere to and act with the wicked world. Infants are neither in the world as it is there taken, nor without, that is, they are neither with them nor against them in their present state; but (as they say in Logick) a whelp till the 9th day is neither blind nor seeing, so an infant till it act is neither within nor without the world visibly, in which Satan is Prince. Nor are those dictates of Mr. *B.* true, or proved by the Scriptures cited, that *no man who is known to be out of Christs visible Church ordinarily can be out of Satans visible Kingdome, that the world and the Church visible contain all mankind according to the ordinary Scripture distribution.* But if [*the world*] be taken for reprobates, and the Church be taken for the invisible Church of the elect, I grant it is true that infants are in one part, and that Satan or God is Prince of them: But this is nothing for Mr. *B.* purpose, though it be most agreeable to some passages, as *Joh.* 17.9, &c. about the world and the Church.

Mr. *B.* proceeds thus. *If it be said, that yet they are not visibly in Satans Kingdome: I answer, If no infants be of Christs visible Church, and this be a known thing, then they are visibly out of it; and if they be visibly out of that Church, then they are visibly of the world which is Satans Kingdome, seeing the world and the Church contain all.*

Answ. Neither is it true, that if it be a known thing that infants be not of Christs visible Church, then they are visibly out of it except it be so known from their sensible action; nor do the world, taken in the sense opposite to Gods people, and the visible Church contain all, as Mr. *B* dictates. Mr. *B.* adds.

If it be said, they may be of the invisible Church, and yet not of the visible, nor of Satans Kingdome; I answer, 1. it is visibly and not invisibly that the aforesaid distribution is to be understood. 2. I shall anon prove, that the visible Church is wider then the invisible, and that ordinarily we may not judge any to be of the invisible Church, who are not of the visible.

Answ. 1. How far the former speech is true or false, is shewed before. 2. As for the later, though we may not judge ordinarily these or those particular persons to be of the invisible Church who are not of the

the visible, yet we may judge some infants at least are so, though non be of the visible Church.

"Again (*saith Mr. B.*) it appears that infants generally were of Sa-
"tans kingdome visibly till Christ fetcheth them out: Therefore those
"that are not fetcht out are in it still: And no man can say they are fetcht
"out except by some means or other it be visible or discernable, *Heb.*
"2 14. Christ destroyed by death him that had the power of death, that
"is the Devil. Satan had this power of death visibly over infants as well
"as others. Therfore seeing Mr. *T.* buildeth so much on this *Apol. p. 66.*
"That infants are neither in the kingdom of Christ, nor Satan, visibly
"till profession, either he must prove that God hath left it wholly in the
"dark, and not revealed that any infants are of Satans visible kingdom,
"or of *Christs* (the contrary whereof is abundantly proved) or he must find
"out some 3d. kingdom or society, and so find out some 3d. King besides
"the King of the *Church*, and the Prince of this world; and it's like he wil
"bee put to finde out a third place for them hereafter, besides heaven
"and hell.

Answ. It is a weariness to the flesh to write books, it is much more when a man is to answer such scriblings as this of Mr. *B.* which being so magnified as it hath been, and written with so much confidence and insolent provocations, is a monument of the boldness and shallowness of readers and writers in this age. What frivolous arguing are here? Christ destroyed him that had the power of death, Satan had this power of death visibly over infants as well as others, *Ergo* they were of Satans kingdom as it is contradistinct to Christs visible Church till Christ by death fetcht them out? If Satans power of death visibly over infants, shew them to be in Satans visible kingdome as contradistinct to the visible Church, doth not the same prove all the infants of believers to be in Satans visible kingdome, as well as the infants of unbelievers? yea doth it not prove the visible Church to be in Satans visible kingdome? For over them Satan had this power of death as visibly as over the infants of unbelievers. Yea wherein doth the power of death visibly shew a persons being in the visible kingdome of Satan more then *Jobs* smiting in his body by Satan, or the womans who was *a daughter of Abraham and bound by Satan 18. years*, shewed them to have been then in the visible kingdome of the Devil as contradistinct to the visible Church? Besides those that Christ is said to have fetcht out or delivered are those *who through fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage*, *Heb.* 2. 14. Doth Mr. *B.* interpret it is of infants? Besides if *it appear that infants generally were of Satans kingdome visibly till Christ fetcheth them out, therefore those that are not fetcht out are in still: And no man can say they are fetcht out, except by some means or other it be visible or discernable*, How can Mr. *B.* say any infants of believers are fetcht out of Satans kingdome visibly? By what means is it visible or discernable that a believers infant is fetcht out of Satans visible kingdome and not an unbelievers? Christs death was visible it's true, but that either *Christs* death did destroy visibly Satan, or visibly delivered those who were subject to bondage, or that by it is visible or discernable

that a believers infant and not an unbelievers is fetcht out of Satan's visible kingdom, is unknown to me. The ordinary meanes whereby it is visible that a person is fetcht out of Satans visible kingdom, is in that he hears, obeys, and professeth the Gospel. Surely by this means or any other it is not visible or discernable, that any infant of the most sincere believer is fetcht out of Satans visible kingdome, therefore by Mr. *Bs.* own suppositions hee cannot say that any believers infant is fetcht out of the visible kingdome of the Devil, and so his argument is retorted on him: That doctrine which leaveth all infants in the visible kingdome of the Devil is false: But such is Mr. *Bs.* according to his own suppositions. *Ergo.* As for what hee would impose on mee, it is false, that God hath left it in the dark, it is clear as light at noon, that infants are neither in Christs nor Satans visible kingdome, and yet they have Christ or Satan for their King, and are to bee in heaven or hell, as they are elect or reprobate; And therefore his talk of what I must finde out is but his prattle, and of what hee hath abundantly proved, is but his idle vapouring of himself.

3. Saith hee, *Sure the Apostle calls the world* [*them that are without*] *as distinct from the Church visible, who are within,* Col. 4. 5. 1 Thes. 4. 12. *And hee speaks it as the dreadfull misery of them, those that are without God judgeth,* 1 Cor. 5. 12, 13. *Now infants are either within or without, and to bee without is to bee of the world which the Devil is by Christ said to be Prince of.*

Answ. To *bee without Mark* 4. 11. is to bee without, not within Gods election; to *bee without Revel.* 22. 15. is to bee without the gates of the city the new Hierusalem, which I take to bee all one as to be cast into outer darkness as Christ terms it. Either of these ways all infants are within or without, but [*those without*] in the places cited by Mr. *B.* cannot bee said of infants, for they are not persons towards *whom wee are to walk in wisedome,* Col. 4. 5. or *honestly,* 1 *Thes.* 4. 12. this beeing required that our example may not harden them, but it were ridiculous to require this in respect of infants. The Apostle doth not *speak it as the dreadfull misery of them that are without that God judgeth them* 1 *Cor.* 5. 12. but onely mentions it as an intimation why they belonged not to his judgement, nor doth hee in any of the places term them *the world,* who are without the visible Church, or Christ say that Satan is Prince of all that are not visible Churchmembers, but of the world of reprobates, and such as are contrary to Christ and in whom he rules nor is the term [*those that are without*] in any of those places taken for *them that are without* privatively for want of capacity to understand, profess, and act for Christ, but for those who are positively without by the acts of their own will, not receiving Christ, nor embracing the profession of him, such as were unbelievers, fornicators, idolaters, *&c.* 1 *Cor.* 5. 10, 11, 12. Such as could observe and did stumble at the evil practises of the Christians, Col. 4. 5. 1 *Thes.* 4. 12. in which sense it is not true that infants are without, though they be privatively or negatively without the visible Church.

Sect. 73.

SECT. LXXIII.

Mr. Bs. 22. arg. Ch. 27. that my doctrine leaves no ground of hope of ſalvation of infants dying, is anſwered.

CH. 27. Mr. *B.* goes on thus. The 22th. arg. That doctrine which "leaveth us no ſound grounded hope of the juſtification or ſalvation "of any dying infants in the world, is certainly falſe doctrine. But "that doctrine which denieth any infants to bee members of the viſible "Church, doth leave us no ſound grounded hope of the juſtification "or ſalvation of any dying infants in the world; therefore it is certainly "falſe doctrine. No reaſonable temperate Chriſtian will deny the *ma*-"*jor*, I think. The *minor* I know will be paſſionately denied. Mr. *T.* "takes it hainouſly at Mr. *M.* and Mr. *Bl.* that they pinch him a lit-"tle in this point, as if it were but to raiſe an odium upon him: And "yet when hee hath done all for the mitigation of the odium (which "hee ſaith was his end *Apol. pag.* 62.) yet he doth ſo little towards the "vindication of his doctrine, that hee confeſſeth [it ſuſpendeth any "judgement of infants, wee can neither ſay they are in (the Cove-"nant of grace) nor out, *Apol. pag.* 62.] Hee labours to prove that "there is no ſuch promiſe or Covenant in Scripture as aſſures ſal-"vation to the infants of believers; but that God would have us to "ſuſpend our judgement of this matter, and reſt on the Apoſtles de-"termination *Rom.* 9. 18. yet that there is a hope, though not certain, "yet probable and comfortable, taken from ſome general indefinite pro-"miſes of the favor of God to the parents, and experience that in all a-"ges hath been had of his merciful dealing with the children of his ſer-"vants, *Apol. p.* 112.]

Anſw. What I took hainouſly at Mr. *M.* and Mr. *Bl.* I did juſtly; what I ſaid that there is no ſuch covenant or promiſe in Scripture as aſſures ſalvation to the infants of believers, I meant it of them as ſuch, or univerſally what I ſaid that God would have us to ſuſpend our judgment of this matter, I meant whether this or that particular infant be in the Covenant of grace. To Mr. *Bs.* arg. I ſay if his *major* be meant of ſuch a grounded hope as is certain from faith, believing a particular promiſe of God concerning believers infants dying in infancy (as Mr. *B.* ſeems to underſtand it) I deny the *major*, if very probable and likely from ſuch declarations and promiſes and experiments as we have, I deny the *minor*, and ſhall follow Mr. *B.*

I will firſt, ſaith he, *proſecute my argument and then conſider of theſe words. Underſtand therefore that* 1. *I do not charge their doctrine with a poſitive affirmation, that all infants do certainly periſh; but with the taking away of all poſitive Chriſtian well grounded hope of their ſalvation.*

Anſw. Yet by your charging us with this, that by our doctrine they are not ſo much as ſeemingly in a ſtate of ſalvation, you do charge

our doctrine with a positive affirmation that they all certainly perish. And it will appear by that which follows that with you no hope of their salvation is Christian and well grounded, but what is certain upon a promise of God apprehended by faith, in which is the chief difference between us.

You add, *That the question now is not of particular infants of believers, but of the species or whole sort that so die; not whether this or that infant be certainly saved, or we have any such hope of it but the question is, whether there be a certainty or any such hope that God will justifie and save any infants in the world or any infants of believers at all?*

Answ. Between whom the question is, as Mr. *B.* here saith, I do not understand: the question between me and my Antagonists is not as Mr. *B.* here sets it down. I have always asserted that there is a certainty and hope that God will justifie and save some infants in the world, some infants of believers, and have often acknowledged those that Christ prayed for, laying on his hands were elect ones, but the question is whether there be any such promise to a believer and his natural seed which assures salvation to them as the seed of believers, and consequently whether there be a certain hope of them all dying in their infancy that they shall be saved. This I have denied because I know no such promise in Scripture, and if there were it would prove the salvation of those at age though prophane as *Esau*: For if the promise belong to the seed as such, and it includes salvation, then it assures it to all the seed of believers, whether dying at age prophanely or in infancy. So that it is not true, that *the question is not whether this or that infant be certainly saved, or we have any such hope of it*, nor is it true that *the question is of the species or whole sort that so die, or whether there be a certainty or any such hope that God will justifie and save any infants in the world, or any infants of believers at all*, yea Mr. *B.* in the words next before would not charge our doctrine with a positive affirmation that all infants do certainly perish. But the question is whether there be a certainty from a promise that he will save them all dying in infancy, nor is the question of *the species* or whole sort of infants, but of the particular infants of believers.

Now, saith he, *I affirm*, 1. *that there is a ground of Christian hope left us in this, that God doth save some infants (yea and that particular ones, though that be not now the question.*

Answ. Now this I affirm too, though I assert not such a certainty by promise to infants of believers, as Pædobaptists do.

2. Saith he, *That they that put them all out of the visible Church leave us no such hope. I will begin with the later, which is the* minor *in the argument. And* 1. *I take it for granted, that to be a visible member of of the Church, and to be a member of the visible Church, is all one. He that denieth that, will but shew his vanity; And that the invisible Church, or the sincere part is most properly and primarily called the Church, and the body of Christ; and the Church as visible containing also the insincere part, is called the Church; secondarily and for the sake of the invisible, and so it is called the body, because men seem to be of the invisible*

Church, therefore they truly are of the visible: If we were fully certain by his own external discoveries, that any man were not of the invisible Church, that man should not be taken to be of the visible. Therefore the properties and priviledges of the invisible Church are usually given to the visible (as to be Saints, holy, all the children of God by faith, Gal. 3. 26. to be Christs body, 1 Cor. 12. 13. to be branches in Christ, Joh 15. 2, &c. because as the sincere are among them, so all visible members seem in the essentials of Christianity to be sincere; therefore if any converted Jew or Pagan were to be taken into the Church upon his profession, we ought not to admit him except his profession seem to be serious and so sincere; for who durst admit him, if we knew he came but in jest, or to make a scorn of Christ and Baptism? So that to be a member of the visible Church, or of the Church as visible, or a visible member of the Church are all one, and is no more but to seem to be a true member of the Church of Christ (commonly called invisible) or of the true mystical body of Christ. Therefore even Cardinal Cusanus calleth the visible Church, Ecclesia conjecturalis, *as receiving its members on conjectural signs. And our Divines generally make the unsound hypocrites to be but to the Church as a wooden leg to the body, or at the best as the hair and nails, &c. and as the straw and chaff to the corn: And so doth* Bellarmine *himself, and even many other whom he citeth of the Papists (*Aquinas, Petr. a soto, Joh. de Turrecremata, Hugo, Alex. Alensis, Canus.*) And when* Bellarmine *feigneth* Calvin *and others to make two militant Churches, our Divines reject it as a calumny and manifest fiction; and say, that the Church is not divided into two sorts, but it is a two fold respect of one and the same Church; one as to the internal essence, the other as to the external manner of existing as* Amef. *speaks.*

Answ. Though much of this passage be yeelded by me, yet I reject those speeches [*because men seem to be of the invisible Church, therefore they truly are of the visible; to be a visible member of the Church, is no more but to seem to be a true member of the Church of Christ (commonly called the invisible) of the true mystical body of Christ*] For to be a visible member of the Christian Church is not all one as to seem to be of the invisible Church. For, 1. a person may be *of the visible Church*, according to Mr. *B. who lives alone in America*, and therefore seems to no man to be of the invisible Church, no man knoweth or judgeth probably or certainly him to be of Christs mystical body. 2. A person may seem to be of the invisible Church, and yet not be of the visible, as an *Indian* while a Christian preacheth, who yet professeth not Christ, yet seems by his gestures to be affected with it, and sundry others. Therefore it is necessary to be a visible Churchmember, that his profession be visible, that is, be discernable to mens understanding through the sensibility of it. 3. To some a person may seem to be of the invisible Church, to others not, is he of the visible Church or not? or are both true? and if not, how shall we know which is true, which not? 4. To seem to be of the invisible Church is but accidental to the visibility of a Churchmember, though he should seem to none to be of the invisible Church, yea though through mens ignorance or uncharitableness the person should seem to be a reprobate or hypocrite, yet he might be nevertheless a

visible

visible Christian, and so a churchmember of the catholick visible, which Mr. *B.* avoucheth. Mr. *Bs.* reasons here go upon a gross mistake, as if it were all one to be a visible churchmember, and to be received or admitted as a visible churchmember: and that a person were denominated visible from what men apprehend or what seems to them, whereas the denomination is, as *Ames* saith truly in the place meant by Mr. *B.* *from the external form or manner of existing.* Though a person be not to be received as a visible member of the Church because he seems not to be sound, yet he may be a visible churchmember: Nor is he such because they pass a judgement on him, but because his profession is such as might shew him to be a Christian, if any did observe it, or would candidly interpret it. But how far Mr. *B.* errs from the true understanding of the main point of his book, what it is to be a visible churchmember, sometimes making it the same with a seeming to be of the mystical body of Christ, sometimes a right to a benefit, and how indistinctly he speaks of this thing (which if he had minded any exact disquisition of truth, he should in the beginning of his Dispute have first cleared) is shewed in the second part of this *Review*, *sect.* 17. at large pag. 128, *&c.* In this part, *sect.* 55, *&c.* And for want of observing this his mistake, I judge many learned men and others have been misled by him.

He saith, *Again, you must understand, that to be a member of the visible Church is not to be a member of any particular or political body or society, as* Rome *would have it. And to be a visible member, doth not necessarily import that he is actually knowne to bee a member; for hee may live among the blinde that cannot see that which is visible. But that he is one so qualified, as that bee ought to bee esteemed in the judgement of men to belong to the Church of Christ: therefore a man living alone in* America, *may yet bee a member of the visible Church. For hee hath that which constituteth him a visible member, though there bee none to discern it.*

Answ. 1. This passage doth overthrow Mr. *Bs.* definition of a visible Churchmember, which is, that *he is one that seems to the judgement of man to be of the invisible Church*: Now he that seems such, is actually known or discerned to be such; that seems so, which is thought to be so; *Videtur quod sic, videtur quod non*, in the Schools are expressions of a mans opinion; but according to Mr. *B.* to be a visible churchmember doth not necessarily import he is actually known or discerned, therefore he may be a visible churchmember who doth not seem to the judgement of man to be of the invisible Church, and then the definition is not right, as not agreeing to every thing defined. 2. His speeches *He may live among the blind who cannot see that which is visible, that he is one qualified so as that he ought to be esteemed in the judgement of men to belong to the Church of Christ, a man living alone in America hath that which constituteth him a visible member though there be none to discern it*, do plainly intimate, that visible churchmembership is constituted by some qualification which is visible, so that he ought thereupon to be esteemed in the judgement of men to belong to the Church of Christ

therefor

therefore visible churchmembership is from some qualification sensible, and is before the esteem in the judgement of men to belong to the Church of Christ; and though such esteem should not follow, yet the person is a visible churchmember: and therefore Mr. *B.* doth most unskilfully define a visible churchmember to be one that seems, or is esteemed to be of the invisible Church. For though this be, and ought to be a consequent upon the other, yet it is not the same; but as I have shewed, even according to Mr. *B.* they may be severed. And if that which constituteth a visible churchmember be a qualification visible, so as that he ought to be esteemed in the judgement of men to belong to the Church of Christ (which can be no other then his serious, sober, free, and intelligent profession of the faith of Christ) then my description of a visible churchmember is right, and infants that have no such qualification are not visible churchmembers. To say that their parents are visible professors, is insufficient: For there is no Scripture that makes the profession of the parent the childs qualification, nor any Scripture that for it makes it our duty to esteem him in our judgement to belong to the Church of Christ; nor is the parents profession any qualification of the child visible, neither is the relation of the child visible or sensible. (For relations, say Logicians, incur not into the sense) nor is the Fathers profession any more his own childes profession then any other mans childes profession. So that Mr. *Bs.* own words beeing well heeded, overthrow his tenet and confirm mine. I go after him in the rest.

These things, saith he, *explained, I proceed, and prove my* minor *thus. They that are not so much as seemingly (or visibly) in a state of salvation, of them so dying we can have no true ground of Christian hope that they shall be saved: But they that are not so much as seemingly or visibly of the Church, they are not so much as seemingly or visibly in a state of salvation: Therefore of them so dying, we can have no true ground of Christian hope that they shall bee saved.*

Answ. 1. Mr. *B.* makes here *seemingly and visibly in a state of salvation, of the Church* to be all one, whereas there is a great difference, seemingly being in order to the understanding, visibly to the sense, he may be seemingly in the state of salvation, and of the Church, who is not so visibly, there being many arguments which may make a thing seem to the understanding, besides that which is discernable by the outward sense. Therefore if Mr. *B.* mean by seemingly all one with visibly (as his words import) I deny his *major* as false; and to the contrary assert, that we may have true ground of Christian hope that they shall be saved, who yet die not visibly in a state of salvation, that is, do not any thing incurrent into the sense which may shew they are in a state of salvation, as infants born, abortives, still-born, children dying in the womb, natural fools, phrenetiques: Yea we conceive hopes of the salvation of persons dying raving, cursing by reason of their disease, destroying themselves, dying excommunicate justly from the Church, though visibly they are in a state of damnation. The *minor* is also false, they that are not visibly of the Church, may yet be visibly in a state of salvation,

vation, as an *Indian* yet not profeſſing Chriſt, nor baptized, being affected with the preaching of Chriſts love to man, ſo as to lift up his eys to heaven, knock his breſt, liſten to the preacher, weep, kiſs the preacher, follow him, keep company with him, *&c.* this man is not yet viſibly of the Church, yet he is viſibly in a ſtate of ſalvation, and ſo dying we have ground of Chriſtian hope that he ſhall be ſaved.

But Mr. *B.* tels us, "The *major* is evident; and confirmed thus: "1. Sound Hope is guided by judgement, and that judgement muſt "have ſome evidence to proceed on: But where there is not ſo much "as a ſeeming or viſibility, there is no evidence; and therefore there "can be no right judgement, and ſo no grounded hope.

Anſw. 1. Mr. *B.* doth ſtill unskilfully put ſeeming for ſeemingneſs, and confound it and viſibility. 2. Where there is no ſeeming, there may be evidence; he ſhould rather have ſaid, Where there is no ſeeming, there is no judgement; for where nothing ſeems to a perſon, he paſſeth no judgement or opinion. 3. I preſume Mr. *B.* takes evidence largely for any argument which ſhews a thing and not in that ſtrict ſenſe in which it is denied by learned men that faith hath evidence, and in the large ſenſe there may be and is in innumerable things evidence in which is no viſibility, as that corn will be ſown and reaped though we ſee it not, *&c.* And in this preſent argument, Mr. *B.* himſelf a little after reckons up many reaſons beſides viſibility of the ſtate of ſalvation, and of the Church, which he makes evidence for a judgement upon which there is a grounded hope of infants ſalvation, p g. 77, 78. as Gods declarations, promiſes, *&c.* And therefore I deny that ſpeech, where there is not ſo much as viſibility there is no evidence.

2. Saith he, "Again, to judge a thing to be what it doth not any "way ſeem or appear to be, is (likely actually, but alway) virtually "and interpretatively a falſe judgement: But ſuch a judgement can be "no ground for ſound hope.

Anſw. Yet a man may truly judge that to be which doth not viſibly appear to be.

2. Saith he. "The *minor* is as evident, *viz.* [that they that are "not ſeemingly or viſibly of the Church, are not ſeemingly or viſibly "in a ſtate of ſalvation.] For 1. if they that are not of the true Church "are not in a ſtate of ſalvation, then they that ſeem not to be of that "Church do not ſo much as ſeem to be in a ſtate of ſalvation: But the "antecedent is true; therefore the conſequent The antecedent might "be proved from a hundred Texts of Scripture. It is the body that "Chriſt is the Saviour of, and his people that he redeemeth from their "ſins, and his ſheep to whom he giveth eternal life, and thoſe that ſleep "in Jeſus that God ſhall bring with him, and the dead in Chriſt that "ſhall riſe to ſalvation, and thoſe that die in the Lord that reſt from "their labours, and the Church that Chriſt will preſerve pure and unſpotted, *&c.* He that denieth this, is ſcarſe to be diſputed with as a "Chriſtian: Even they that thought all ſhould at laſt be brought out "of hell and ſaved, did think they ſhould become the Church, and ſo be "ſaved. The conſequence is beyond queſtioning.

Anſw.

Answ. 1. Seemingly and visibly are still mis confounded by Mr. *B.* 2. If the antecedent bee meant of the visible Church (of which alone the conclusion is to bee) then it is denied, and the proofs are all impertinent sith they speak not of the visible Church as visible, but of the invisible.

2. Saith hee, *I next argue thus: If there bee no sure ground for faith concerning the salvation of any out of the Church, then there is no sure ground of hope (for faith and hope are conjunct; wee may not hope with a Christian hope for that wee may not believe) But there is no sure ground for such faith: (they that say there is let them shew it if they can) Therefore there is no sure ground of hope.*

Answ. 1. Mr. *B.* doth ill to change the term [*well grounded hope*] in his first syllogism, into [*a sure ground of hope.*] For there may bee a well grounded hope of many things, as that God will deliver from death in a battle, provide in a siege bread, *&c.* though there bee no sure ground of hope *cui falsum subesse non potest*, that God will do these things. 2. Wee have sure ground for faith concerning the salvation of some out of the visible Church, though not of all infants of believers. And this wee have from Gods declaration of the election of some not visible churchmembers and consequently of their salvation, as *Isaac* and *Jacob*. *Rom.* 9. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. which is urged by Mr. *B.* himself *pag.* 78.

3. Saith he, "Again, if there be no promise in Gods word for the "salvation of any without the visible Church, then there is no ground "of our Christian hope that they shall be saved: But there is no such "promise (as I think they will confess) Therefore there is no ground "for any such hope. That Christian hope must rest upon a word of "promise, mee thinks should not bee denied: It is plain *Rom.* 15. 4, "13. *Ephes.* 1. 18. *&* 4. 4. *Col.* 1. 5, 23, 27. 2 *Thes.* 2. 16. 1 *Tim.* 1. 1. "*Heb.* 6. 18, 19. *Heb.* 7. 19. 1 *Pet.* 1. 3, 21. *&* 3. 15. *Rom.* 4. 18. "*&* 5. 2. *Tit.* 1. 1, 2. *Heb* 11. 1, *&c. Ps.* 119. 43, 74, 147, *&c.* "In natural things wee may have a common natural hope upon natural "grounds: But in supernatural things, as are justification and salva- "tion, we must have the ground of a Divine revelation to support all "true Christian theological hope.

Answ. 1. I deny the consequence of the *major*, and to Mr. *Bs.* proofs I answer: 1. There is not one of all the texts that saith there is no ground of true Christian hope but a promise in Gods word, though there are that prove the promise of God to bee a ground of Christian hope: It would bee too tedious to shew the impertinency of each of them, it is sufficient to acquaint the Reader wherein the defect of proof is. 2. Wee may have the ground of a Divine revelation to support our hope, as of what God hath done, of his attributes and other declarations, although we have not a promise, which Mr. *B.* seems too unskilfully to confound with a Divine revelation which may bee the ground of Christian hope. 2. The *minor* is not confessed by me to *Isaac* and *Jacob* God promised salvation afore they were born, therefore to

them without the visible Church, the like to the Gentiles, to the Jews, *Rom.* 11. 26. afore they are called, or in being: to all the elect there is a Covenant or promise in Christ of salvation, whether they be of the visible Church or no.

4. Saith he, *Again, if God do add to the Church such as shall be saved, then we can have no true ground of Christian hope of the salvation of any that are not added to the Church: But that God doth add to the Church such as shall be saved, is the plain words of Scripture, Acts 2. last. Therefore we have no true ground of such hope of the salvation of those that are not so added to it. If any say that the text speaks of the invisible Church. I answer: 1. Then it would hold of the visible much more for the visible Church is far larger then the invisible, and contains the invisible in it. 2. But the Text expresly speaks of the visible Church: For it was such a Church. 1. As were baptised. 2. And as the 3000. souls were in one day added to; 3. And as continued in the Apostles doctrine, fellowship, breaking of bread, and prayers; 4. And were together and had all things common; 5. And sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to them that needed; 6. And continued daily in the Temple, and breaking bread from house to house did eat with gladness, &c. 7. And as did praise God and had favour with all the people. And doubtless this was the visible Church; to this such as should bee saved were added; yet not onely such: for many false teachers and others did after go out from them; and such as Simon Magus were baptised; and false brethren was one cause of their sufferings. So that I doubt not but it is clear, that they that deny any infants to be members of the visible Church, do leave us no true ground for any Christian hope of their salvation.*

Answ. The consequence of the *major* is denied, and the reason of the denial is because the speech is not simply convertible, bee added to the Church such as should bee saved, therefore all that shall bee saved are added to the visible Church. Yea Mr. *B.* by confessing that they were not onely the saved that were added to the Church acknowledgeth the proposition to bee particular, some were added to the Church which should bee saved, and this is convertible onely thus; *Ergo* some that shall bee saved were added to the Church, not universal, all that were added to the Church should bee saved. So that wee need not betake our selves to the answer of understanding it of the invisible Church. Nor is there a necessity to understand it of eternal salvation. For the word being σωζομένους in the present tense may bee translated *the saved*, that is as 2. 40. by relinquishing of that crooked or perverse generation, and if *Beza's* conjecture hold that τοὺς is put for τοιοὺς, the reading is to be, *and some bee daily added to the Church to bee saved.* Let the reading bee either way, it proves not that there are none to bee saved who are not added to the Church visible. And indeed such a proposition were false, so it is otherwise in the case of infants dying in the womb, still born, *&c.* Mr. *B's* inference, *if Acts* 2. 47. *bee meant of the Church invisible then the speech, they that are to be saved are added to the Church holds much more of the visible, is vain.* And the rea-

ſon is as vain. For it is uncertain whether the viſible Church be far larger then the inviſible, conſidering the number of dying infants and the uncertainty how far their election and ſalvation extends, and though there bee many of the viſible Church who are not of the inviſible, yet the viſible doth not contain the inviſible in it, there being many of the inviſible Church who are not in the viſible, and therefore it proves not that if they that are ſaved are of the inviſible then they are much more of the viſible. So that however it bee that Mr. *B.* doubt not of the contrary, I am aſſured that the denying infants viſible Churchmembership, leaves ſufficient ground for Chriſtian hope of their ſalvation.

"Next, ſaith hee, let us conſider how far their own arguments "will exclude all hope of the ſalvation of any infant. If it were true "which Mr. *T.* ſo much ſtandeth on, That the onely way now ap- "poin ed by Chriſt to make Churchmembers, is by teaching the per- "ſons themſelves; and that none elſe may bee members of the viſible "Church, but thoſe that have learnt: then 1. it will much more fol- "low that they are not of the inviſible, as I have ſhewed; or at leaſt "wee are not to judge them to be of the inviſible Church at all. 2. "And if from *Matth.* 28. 20. they may argue, that none but thoſe "that are taught are Diſciples and are to bee baptiſed; why may "they not as well argue from *Mar.* 16. 16. [Whoſoever believeth "not ſhall bee damned] that all infants are certainly damned? where- "in lieth the difference in theſe two arguments? Sure the later "ſeems to mee to have more ſhew from Scripture though but lit- "tle: I dare invite Mr. *T.* to prove to mee from Scripture that a- "ny infants in the world are juſtified and ſanctified, and try if I "ſhall not in the ſame way prove that ſome infants are members of "the viſible Church? Or let him anſwer the argument from *Mar.* 16. 16. "that is brought for their damnation, and ſee if it will not afford him al- "ſo an anſwer to that from *Matt.* 28. againſt their being diſciples and to "bee baptiſed.

Anſw. 1. He hath no where made good this conſequence, if infants be not of the viſible Church, it will follow much more they are not of the inviſible, or at leaſt that wee are not to judge them to bee of the inviſible Church at all. 2. It doth not follow whoſoever believeth not ſhall bee damned therefore infants, becauſe the text it ſelf ſhews the ſpeech to bee limited onely to thoſe unbelievers to whom the Goſpel is preached, *v.* 15. yet it followes none are diſciples and to bee baptiſed but the taught, *Matth.* 28. 19, 20. becauſe Chriſt firſt appointed perſons to bee taught by preaching the Goſpel, whom hee appointed to bee baptiſed and accounted diſciples. 3. Let Mr. *B.* take theſe arguments and try whether hee can prove infants viſible Churchmembership from them. They of whom is the kingdome of heaven are juſtified and ſanctified. But of ſome infants is the kingdome of heaven, *Ergo.* They who are elected to life, for whom Chriſt died, are juſtified and ſanctified ere they die. But ſo ſome are infants, *Ergo.* 4. The argument is anſwered from *Mark* 16. 16. Let M. *B.*

try how he can answer mine from *Matth.* 28. 19, 20. *Mark* 16. 15, 16, *&c.* as it is in the second part of this *Review*, *sect.* 5, *&c.* or as it is in my *Præcursor*, *sect.* 16. *pag.* 66, out of his words, which is shewed in the 2d. part of the *Review*, *sect.* 4. *pag.* 66, 67. not to be answered by him in his *Præfestinantis moratur*. Hee that nullifies that argument must make reformation of humane additions to the worship of God as part of it void.

Mr. *B.* adds, *But why do I expect this when hee suspendeth his judgement? If hee mean it of particular infants, it is not home to the question; for so hee must suspend his judgement concerning the salvation of every particular person, as certain, seeing hee is uncertain of the sincerity of any: And yet I hope he will not conclude it uncertain whether any man bee saved? But if hee mean it of all the species of infants, then I must say he suspendeth much of his faith, hope and charity; and that doctrine which suspendeth our belief of God and charity to our own children, shall be none of my Creed.*

Answ. The suspension of judgement which in my *postscript sect.* 4. I said God would we should have, was concerning the certainty of salvation of all infants of believers dying in infancy, which was meant of particular infants, to wit the infants of believers, and it was home to the question between me, and Mr. *M.* and Mr. *Bl.* whether there were such a certainty of salvation of every believers infant dying so, by vertue of the promise *I will be thy God and the God of thy seed Gen.* 17. 7? There was no such question as Mr. *B.* would impose on mee, as if I doubted whether any infant should bee saved? But this I did and do still conceive, that there is no promise of salvation to every believers infants, and therefore we are to suspend our judgement concerning this or that particular infant, not of all the *species* of infants as hee speaks. And though I am certain of every believers salvation, yet I am not certain of this or that professour that he is a sincere believer, and therefore concerning this I am to suspend any peremptory judgment of science, yet I am not to suspend my judgment of charity, which yet I am to suspend towards infants, there being no actions of theirs which may occasion such a judgment. Nor hereby do I suspend any act of faith, hope or charity which I ought to have towards God or my own children; and if what I hold be no part of Mr. *Bs.* Creed, yet it may be part of the Creed of as holy and learned a man as he is.

Hee adds, " And where hee thinks wee must take up with that " *Rom.* 9. 18. Hee will have mercy on whom hee will have mercy. I " answer: 1. This is no other ground of hope, then of any heathen " in *America* wee may entertain. 2. It is no ground of hope for in- " fants at all: For it neither directly nor indirectly promises any mer- " cy to them, nor saith any more of mercy then of hardning: and ra- " ther would afford such disputers an argument against mercy to any in- " fants, because it is mercy put in opposition to hardning, which infants " in that sense are not capable of.

Answ. I said God would have us to rest on the Apostles determination *Rom.* 9. 18. to wit concerning the salvation of all believers infants, and

and to this I was induced by the Apoſtles arguing, v. 11, 12, 13. concerning *Jacob* and *Eſau*. But this was not alledged by me as a ground of hope, and therefore though Mr. *Bs.* conſequences be granted, there is nothing againſt what *I* ſaid: which *I* think very agreeable with the words of *wickliff*, cited as an approved ſpeech by Mr. *B.* himſelf, *p.* 291. which if he like, he cannot gainſay my ſpeech.

But he ſaith, "Yet Mr. *T.* tels us [there is hope for all this, though "not certain, yet probable and comfortable] and he ſheweth us three "grounds for it: If this be ſpoken of the *ſpecies* of infants, as if there were "no certainty, but a probability that any of them ſhall be ſaved, then *I* "will prove it falſe and vile anon: If it be ſpoken of particular individu-"al infants, then 1. it is as much as can be ſaid of any men at age; for no "other man hath any certain, but a probable hope of their ſalvation.

Anſw. *I* have often ſaid, *I* mean it not of the *ſpecies*, but the individual infants of believers, and *I* appeal to Mr. *B.* himſelf whether he do not ſay as *I* ſay, *Plain Scripture, &c. pag.* 116. in thoſe words: *Though yet for my own opinion, I have reſolved no further then this, that we are to judge the remiſſion, juſtification, and ſalvation of particular infants of true believers moſt probable, till the contrary appear by them; and for the full certainty, I leave it as to me uncertain.* If we have but a probable hope of the ſalvation of men at age, it is no abſurdity, in my apprehenſion, to ſay we have but probable hope of their ſalvation; yet we have a greater degree of probability in our hopes of the ſalvation of ſuch as have in appearance ſpent their lives in a holy courſe, then of infants ſo dying.

2. Saith he, "It is as much as *I* deſire; for if their ſalvation be "probable, then they are viſibly or ſeemingly, or to our judgement in "a ſtate of ſalvation, and ſo muſt needs be viſible members of the "Church. How dare Mr. *T.* refuſe to take thoſe for viſible Churchmem-"bers, whoſe ſalvation is probable, when he hath no more but probabi-"lity of the ſalvation of the beſt man in the world.

Anſw. 1. *I* have often told Mr. *B.* that to be ſeemingly, or to our judgement in a ſtate of ſalvation, is not all one as to be ſuch viſibly, and that ſuch may be no viſible Churchmembers whoſe ſalvation is ſeeming or probable to our judgement. 2. Though *I* have but probability of the ſalvation of the beſt man in the world, yet *I* have a certainty of his profeſſion, by which *I* take him to be a viſible Churchmember, and not by the probability of his ſalvation; and this *I* dare do, and *I* wonder how Mr. *B.* againſt the current of all the N. T. dare do otherwiſe.

3. *But*, ſaith he, *doth not this contradict what went before? And I wiſh he do not contradict it again in his proofs. His firſt proof of the probability, is from ſome general indefinite promiſes; but what theſe promiſes are, he tels us*, Apol. pag. 64. *By general and indefinite promiſes he means ſuch as determine not the kinde of good promiſed, nor the particular perſon; and therefore are true, if performed to any perſon in any ſort of good; and conditional upon condition of faith and obedience. Anſw.* 1. *If it determine not the kind of good formally nor virtually, nor contain it generically,*

vically; then how doth it make it probable? 2. *And if it neither determine the person, nor give in ground to determine, how then doth it become probable to that person?* 3. *And how then can that promise give hopes to the faithfull of the salvation of their infants, which is verified, if performed to any person in any sort of good? as if it were but to one infant in a nation in reprieving him a day from damnation? If it intend more then this, then it is not verified or fulfilled in this much; if it intend no more, then how doth it make their salvation probable?* 4. *And sure the conditional promises which he mentioneth, requiring faith and repentance, are little to the benefit of infants, if these conditions are required of themselves in their infancy. And for his other two grounds of hope, viz. the favour of God to the parents, and experience, they are comfortable helps to second the promise; but of themselves without a word, would give us no ground of Christian hope in such matters as justification and salvation are.*

Answ. I perceive no contradiction in my words. 1. By putting in those words [*nor contain it generically*] he intimates as if I had denied the promises I mention to contain generically the good of justification and salvation; whereas I termed the promises expresly general, and cited *Psal.* 103. 17, 18. *Psal.* 112. 2, *&c.* which mention Gods righteousness and blessedness, and so may comprehend eternal righteousness and blessedness, and thereby the justification and salvation of infants becomes probable, though it be not certain, sith Gods righteousness and blessedness may be conferred in another kind. As if a rich King promise money to a mans children, it's probable he will give them gold, though it be not certain. 2. Though the particular person be not determined, yet sith the qualification of the person is expressed to be *the generation of the righteous*, it is probable that it is meant of each till the contrary appears; as if a man promise to make such a mans children heirs, this is probable of every one till it appear otherwise, and yet not certain. 3. I have shewed how, especially if we consider that favours are wont to be amplified to the most. Though Gods intentions are not fulfilled perhaps with so little, yet the words may be verified if no more but temporal blessedness be given. 4. The conditional promises I confess give us but slender hope of infants by themselves; yet with general indefinite promises, declarations of Gods favour to his people, and experience, they yeeld a strong ground of hope of the justification and salvation of infants of believers, though not certain and sure, as Mr. *B.* would have, but how short he is in proof will appear in that which follows.

Sect.

SECT. LXXIIII.

Mr. Bs. allegations, p. 76, 77, 78. ſhew not a ſtronger ground of hope of infants ſalvation, ſo dying, then mine: His 23d. Arg. ch. 28. his 25th. ch. 30. are anſwered.

HE tels us, "That he hath a ſtronger probabilty then I mention, of "the ſalvation of all the infants of the faithfull, ſo dying, and a "certainty of the ſalvation of ſome, in that God admitted them viſible "members of his Church. For Chriſt is the Saviour of his body, and he "preſent his Church cleanſed and unſpoted to the Father: And if God "will have them to be viſible members of his Church, then he would "have us take or judge them to be members of it: And withal, there is "leſs danger of miſtake in them, then in men at years; becauſe they "do not diſſemble, nor hide any hypocritical intents under the vizor of "profeſſion, as they may do. And it is certain alſo, that if God would "have ſome and many to be of the true body of Chriſt, and ſo be ſaved, "then hee would not have all to bee viſibly out of that body. That "he would have have them church-members is proved, and ſhall be, "God willing, yet more. If God add to the Church ſuch as ſhall be ſa-"ved, then there is a ſtrong probability of their ſalvation whom he ad-"deth to the Church.

Anſw. Mr. *B.* here, *p.* 74. in his arguments 2d. and 3d. intimated that he aſſerted a ſure ground for faith concerning the ſalvation of believers infants ſo dying, and that to be a promiſe in the word of the ſalvation of thoſe within the viſible Church; and here he aſſerts a ſtronger probability then I mention of the ſalvation of all the infants of the faithfull ſo dying, and a certainty of the ſalvation of ſome, in that God admitteth them viſible members of his Church. Yet *pag.* 78. he dares not ſay there's a full certainty of the ſalvation of all believers infants ſo dying: Yea, *pag.* 110. he ſaith, *Rom.* 9. 8. *the Apoſtle pleadeth that ſalvation is not by the Covenant tyed to all* Abrahams *ſeed.* Out of which I infer, 1. That Mr. *B.* hath no ſure ground for faith, to wit, a promiſe in the word concerning the ſalvation of all the infants of believers ſo dying. For the Apoſtle pleads, that ſalvation is not by Covenant tied to all *Abrahams* ſeed, and if not to *Abrahams*, then to none elſe; and the certainty of the ſalvation of ſome is acknowledged by me as well as by him. And ſure if the Covenant aſſure not ſalvation to all, and neither it nor any other revelation of God tell us ſalvation belongs to this infant of ſuch a believer or to that, there is no certainty concerning the ſalvation of this or that particular infant of a believer dying, nor is there a ſure ground for faith concerning it, nor is the hope of it certain, and we are to ſuſpend our judgement concerning it, which Mr. *B.* carps at ſo much in me to make me and the truth I hold odious, which is almoſt all the work he does (for he proves nothing he ſays in oppoſition to what I hold)

hold) and though his ſpeeches are inconſiſtent, yet when he ſets down his opinion he agrees with me, that he dares not ſay there's a full certainty of the ſalvation of all believers infants; nor dare he I think ſay, that he is certain of any one believer on earth his infant dying, that he is ſaved. 2. That *he hath a ſtronger probability then I mention of the ſalvation of all the infants of believers ſo dying, in that God admitteth them viſible members of his Church*, is ſaid by him: But 1. he ſhews not what degree of probability I deny which he aſſerts: 2. I never oppoſed the ſtrongeſt probability Mr. *B.* aſſerts, onely I declared my ſelf unſatisfied concerning the certainty, which Mr. *B.* dares not aſſert: 3. That God hath admitted them viſible members of his Church Chriſtian, is not yet proved by Mr. *B.* nor ever will be: 4. If he had, yet this proves the certainty of the ſalvation of none now exiſtent; for the ſpeeches, *Epheſ.* 5.23,27. muſt be underſtood of the Church which is ſo viſible, that it be alſo the inviſible. Now though it be certain, that ſome viſible Churchmembers are ſaved, yet it is neither certain that all, or any viſible Churchmembers or Churches now exiſtent ſhall be ſaved, and therefore no more then a probability of the ſalvation of all or ſome infants of believers now exiſtent can be inferred, though their viſible Churchmembership were granted. As for the ſtrength of the probability, I ſtick not to grant it as ſtrong as he would have it, ſo that he aſſert not a certainty. And therefore, did not Mr. *B.* mind to pick a quarrel with me, and to affright people from my doctrine, this Chapter of Mr. *B.* might have been ſpared.

Yet Mr. *B.* adds. *And the promiſes to them are fuller then Mr. T. expreſſeth, and give us ſtronger ground of hope. 1. God hath, as I have proved, aſſured that he will be merciſull to them in the general, and that in oppoſition to the ſeed of the wicked, on whom he will viſit their Fathers ſins: Now this giveth a ſtrong ground of hope that he will ſave them. For if the Judge or King ſay, I will hang ſuch a traytor, but I will be merciſull to ſuch a one, it is an intimation that he meaneth not to hang him. If your friend promiſe to be good to you and merciſull, you dare confidently hope he means not to deſtroy you.*

Anſw. This proves not Gods promiſes any fuller then I expreſs, for thoſe I alledge not excluding but including in an *&c.* this, are as full as this, *Exod.* 20.6. Nor doth this give a ſtronger ground of hope then I do, who yeeld as much as Mr. *B.* infers, though I like not Mr. *Bs.* inſtance, which intimates that God ſhould ſay, I will damn the children of the wicked to the 3d. and 4th. generation, *v.* 5. and ſave the children of them that love me to a thouſand generations.

He adds. 2. *God ſaith (as I have ſhewed) that the ſeed of the righteous is bleſſed. Now is not that a ſtrong ground of hope, that ſo dying, they ſhall not be damned? It is not likely that God would call them bleſſed whom he will damn eternally, after a few days or hours life in a ſtate of infancy, which is capable of little ſenſe of bleſſedneſs here.*

Anſw. What mercy is meant, *Exod.* 20.6. and what bleſſedneſs, *Pſal* 37.26. hath been conſidered before, and thence it may appear, that a certainty of ſalvation to all infants of believers, or to any definite-

ly

ly now existent cannot bee inferred. Yet I oppose not the inferring thence a strong ground of hope. Nevertheless that God should call them blessed in a sort and yet damn them, is no inconsistency, nor doth it appear much less likely then that hee should reprobate *Esau afore hee was born or had done good or evil, Rom.* 9. 11, 12, 13.

3. "God (*saith Mr. B.*) entreth Covenant to be their God, and to "take them for a peculiar people to himself, *Deut.* 29. 11, 12, 13. And "this giveth strong hope of their salvation. For as if the King promise "to bee your King, and to take you for his subject, it is likely hee "intends all the benefits of Kingly government to you: or if a "man promise a woman to bee her husband, it is likely that hee "intendeth to do the office of a husband: And so when God pro-"miseth to be their God.

Answ. Though I yeild that there is ground for a strong hope of the salvation of infants of Christian believers so dying, yet in the text cited there is nothing to that purpose. For 1. that Covenant was made onely with the people of Israel, and was a peculiar Covenant with that nation. 2. For the Covenant was of Gods being God to them while they owned him, and kept his Commandments and so was conditional. So that this Covenant is not a Covenant with every believer and his issue, nor did Gods promise to bee their God assure the salvation of all the Israelites infants so dying, much less the salvation of infants of Christian believers, to whom all the promises in the new Covenant are personal, none that I remember national or domestical as were to the Jews.

4. Saith hee, *And Paul* 1 Thes. 4. 13. *would not have the faithfull mourn for the dead as those that are without hope: now what dead are these? And what hope is it?* 1. *Hee saith the dead in general, which will not stand with the exclusion of the whole species of infants.* 2. *Hee speaks of those dead for whom they were apt to mourn. And will not parents mourn for their children? And for hope, it is evidently the hope of resurrection to life. For resurrection to damnation is not a thing to be hoped for. This seems plain to me.*

Answ. Though I oppose not a strong hope of the salvation of believers infants so dying, yet to shew how vainly he talks of his shewing more for it then I do, the reader may take notice, that if the Apostle be interpreted of the hope of the resurrection to life of the dead in general and those they were apt to mourn for, as Mr. *B.* arguing intimates his mind to be, then the Apostle would have them hope for the resurrection to life not onely of the infants of believers so dying but also of their ripe aged children though infidels and profane, yea for their wives, kindred, neighbours, servants; whereas the Apostles speech is plainly meant onely of them that are believers, who as they are said *v.* 12. *to sleep* so *v.* 14. *to sleep in Jesus, whom God will bring with Jesus*, v. 16. *dead in Christ*, that is for Christ, as M. *Mede* conceivs, applying it peculiarly to the martyrs, or as most in the faith of Christ, such as *shall be for ever with the Lord, v.* 17. From whence with many other instances in his writings it may appear how slightly and superficially Mr. *B.* opens and infers from texts of Scripture.

5. Saith Mr. *B. David comforteth himself concerning his dead child, because hee should go to the child, but the child should not return to him. To say that this was onely that hee should bee buried with it, is to make David too like a Pagan rather then a Christian: However it seems hee was confident that hee should not bee damned: or else hee would not say, I shall go to him. And to say David knew his salvation as a Prophet, is a groundless fiction that cannot be proved: Prophets knew not all things, not ordinarily things of another world by such revelation. Therefore what ever ground of hope David had, other faithfull parents have the like.*

Answ 2. That *David* in those words 2 *Sam.* 12. 22, 23. did express any ground of hope of the salvation of his child, and that thereby hee comforted himself concerning his dead child, is more then I think can bee evinced from the text. Rendering a reason of his not fasting any longer, hee doth not alledge any thing concerning the happiness of the childe, but the bootlesness of his praying and fasting sith the childes life could not bee recovered. And the whole speech considered, the words import no more then this, can I bring him back again to life? I shall go to him, that is to the state of the dead, as counterfeit *Samuel* is brought in, saying 1 *Sam.* 28. 19. *To morrow thou shalt bee with mee*, that is dead as I am, and as *Jacob* said *Gen.* 37. 35. *Hee should go down to his sonne into the grave*, or state of the dead. And in these speeches though no more were meant, yet there is nothing that relisheth of Paganism, not so much as other speeches seem to do, *Psal.* 6. 5. *Psal.* 30. 9. *Isai.* 38. 18, 19. *Job* 14, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14. For though they the express not the expectation of the resurrection or the present estate of happiness, yet it was not because they believed it not, but because it was sufficient to give a reason of his present action, in which hee gives first an account of what hee did before, *hee fasted and wept while the childe was alive, for hee said, who can tell whether God will bee gracious to mee that the childe may live*? In which words if wee may argue after Mr. *Bs.* mode, wee may as well say hee was too like a Pagan rather then a Christian, sith hee mentions no prayer for his childes happiness, but his natural life. 2. An account of his not fasting, because God had frustrated the end of his prayer and fasting. And yet in both hee shewed faith in GOD, in his prayer acknowledging GOD the authour of life and death, and in the other the sentence of death passed on himself, and his acquiescence in Gods will concerning both. All which hee understood as one acquainted with GOD and his word. So that wee need not assert that *David* knew the happiness of his childe by special revelation, sith hee expresseth not any thing of it. And if hee did, yet hee might speak this not as an assured thing, but as probably hoped for, and yet not upon common grounds to all believers, but out of special favour to him (of which hee had more then common experience) and Gods wont of hearing his prayers. So that yet Mr. *B.* hath brought no stronger grounds of probability of the salvation of

all

all believers infants ſo dying, then *I* have done notwithſtanding his cracks. Let's view the reſt.

6. Saith hee, *Again, if there were not farre more hope of their ſalvation, then fear of their damnation; it would never bee ſaid, That children are an heritage of the Lord and the fruit of the womb is his reward; And the man bleſſed that hath his quiver full of them, Pſal.* 127. 3, 4, 5.

Anſw. 1. Mr. *B.* pretended to ſhew a ſtronger probability of the ſalvation of the infants of believers then *I* have done, but wherein doth hee exceed mee in his aſſertion in this place or his proof? Did *I* ever ſay there is leſs hope of their ſalvation, then fear of their damnation? If *I* did not, why doth hee ſuggeſt as if in this concluſion hee aſſerted more then *I* do? If *I* have ſaid ſo, let him ſhew it, or elſe let him bee taken for what hee is, a calumniator. 2. For his proof, would any man alledge this text to prove more hope of ſalvation of infants of believers then their damnation, if hee had any heed to what hee writes? when the text expreſly makes the bleſſedneſs of the man hath many children to bee not at all in this place, in reference to hope of the ſalvation of the children, but in reference to his own ſafety and protection by his children, who may oppoſe enemies, and bee as arrowes or weapons to drive them back, or as helps to right his wrongs, and to embolden him to contend with them in the gate, which was counted a great bleſſing then, and agreeable to the promiſes of the legal Covenant, as *Deut.* 28. *Pſal.* 144. 12, 15, *&c.* may bee ſeen. But this is not meant of infants but of ſuch as were grown up and able to defend their parents, and chiefly if not onely of males, nor is the man ſaid to bee bleſſed by reaſon of the goodlineſs of them, but the multitude of them, and they are ſaid to bee an heritage as the land of *Canaan*, *Pſal.* 136. 21, 22. and his reward whether for their obſerving his law, or for other reaſon, ſuch as for which *Nebuchadnezzar* was rewarded with *Egypt*, *Ezek.* 29. 18, 19, 20. or as *Pſal.* 137. 8, 9. or as reward taken Catachreſtically for any gift. Bee it meant of true believers (though no words in the text evince it) yet the children are ſaid to be their heritage and reward not Gods heritage, nor is there any intimation of happineſs to the childe, and therefore not a word intimating more hope of their ſalvation then fear of their damnation, but of outward benefit to the parent ſuch as may bee common to infidels with believers, and conſequently not a word for a ſtrong ground of hope of the ſalvation of believers infants ſo dying, much leſs more then I bring to that purpoſe.

7. Saith Mr. *B.* "And why ſhould children be joyned in ſtanding "Church ordinances, as prayer, faſting, *&c.* if there were not ſtrong "hope of the bleſſing of theſe ordinances to them? 2 *Chron.* 20. 13. "The children that ſuck the breaſt were to bee gathered to the ſolemn "faſt, *Joel* 2, 16. (this will prove them alſo ſtanding Churchmem-"bers, ſeeing they muſt joyn in ſtanding ordinances;) ſo why recei-"ved they circumciſion, a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith, if there

" were not ſtrong probability that they had the thing ſealed and ſigni-
" fied? God will not fail his own ordinance where men fail not.

Anſw. There's nothing here endeavoured to bee proved but what I have alſo granted, that there is a ſtrong probability that infants of believers ſo dying are juſtified and ſaved, and yet I ſee no ſtrength in theſe allegations to prove it. For though the little ones and ſucking children were to bee preſent to ſhew an univerſal humiliation, as did the beaſts alſo, *Jonah* 3. 8. yet the infants did not joyn in prayer, nor was the end of their preſence any ſpecial bleſſing of the Ordinance to them, but the moving GOD to ſpare the whole people, invaded or in danger of periſhing by famine, nor were the prayer and faſting ſtanding Church-ordinances, any more then the Covenanting *Deut.* 29. *Nehem.* 9. but occaſional, nor doth this preſenting of infants prove them ſtanding Churchmembers any more then the like *Jonah* 3. 8 proves thoſe infants, or the *Ninivites* beaſts ſtanding Churchmembers. As for Circumciſion, that *infants received Circumciſion as a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith*, is no where in Scripture affirmed; and how much Pædobaptiſts are miſtaken in their inference of the nature of Sacraments in general, or Circumciſion in ſpecial, from *Rom.* 4. 11. hath beene often ſhewed before *Sect.* 31, *&c.* The ends of Circumciſing of infants, was to diſtinguiſh the Hebrews from other people, and to fore-ſignifie from what people CHRIST was to come, and to engage them to obſerve the Law of *Moſes* which they were to receive by reaſon of Gods command whether they hoped for their childrens ſalvation, or not, *Abraham* was to circumciſe *Iſhmael*, though hee knew hee was not a childe of the promiſe, and *Iſaac Eſau*, though hee were rejected by God. The ſpeech *God will not fail his own ordinance where men fail not*, is like the Popiſh Schoolmens conceit, that *Sacraments confer grace where no bar is put*, and intimates that Circumciſion was Gods ordinance to aſſure at leaſt rigteouſneſs of faith to each infant circumciſed, which is a falſe conceit.

8. Saith Mr. B. *why elſe doth God ſo oft compare his love to that of a mother or father to the childe?* 1 *Theſ.* 2. 7. *Num.* 11, 12. *Iſa.* 49. 15. *Pſ. l.* 103. 13.

Anſw. Though I grant a ſtrong probality of the ſalvation of believers infants ſo dying, yet to ſhew the vanity of Mr. *Bs.* ſcriblings, as if hee brought more for it then I do, I cannot but obſerve the ſlighty dealing of Mr. *B.* in this point. For firſt, whereas hee alledgeth theſe texts as if GOD did therein compare his love to that of a mother or father to the childe, in the firſt *Paul* (not God) compares himſelf to a nurſe; in the ſecond, *Moſes* ſpeaks of himſelf as if God had put an impoſſible burthen on him, as if he could as a nurſing father bears his ſucking childe, carry all that people to the promiſed land. In the third, God ſaith he, would not forget Sion, who had ſaid hee had forgotten them, though a mother ſhould forget her ſucking childe; and *Pſal.* 103. 13. the love of God as a father is ſpoken of them that fear him. So that the two firſt texts were

through

through heedleſneſs miſ-alledged groſly by him, the other two expreſs Gods love onely to his obedient and ſeeking people, mention nothing of his love to their infants. 2. God doth compare his love to a Fathers or Mothers, not becauſe he is engaged to believers infants to ſave them, nor becauſe he hath natural affection as they have, but to ſhew his gracious care and dealing towards his elect children. 3. Gods love is no more compared to a believing parents love, then to an unbelievers; and therefore if this prove a ſtrong probability of the ſalvation of a believers infant ſo dying, it doth prove the ſalvation of an unbelievers as probible. 4. Gods love and care is compared to an Eagles in carrying her young ones, *Deut.*32.11,12. Chriſts to an Hen, *Matth.*23.37. According to Mr. *Bs.* reaſoning, this ſhould prove then the ſtrong probability of the ſalvation of Chickens. But I am aſhamed that the world ſhould ſee the nakedneſs of theſe magnified reaſonings, though *I* be neceſſitated to uncover it.

The 9th. from *Matth.*19.14. is no more then *I* have alledged often for thoſe infants; and what Mr. *B.* here alledgeth to prove this a right of other infants, is anſwered at large in the ſecond part of this *Review*, *ſect.*17.

10. Saith he, *we read of ſome that have been ſanctified from the womb, and therefore were in a ſtate of ſalvation; and* Jacob *was loved before he was born, and therefore before he had done good or evil was in the like ſtate of ſalvation.*

Anſw. Have not *I* alſo granted this thing, and that upon the ſame reaſons? Why then doth Mr. *B.* ſuggeſt, to draw parents hearts from me to him, as if he ſaid more in this then my ſelf? Yet *I* cannot be very confident of the reaſon from *Jerem* 1.15. to which *Gal.*1.15. is parallel, ſith the ſanctification was to the office of a Prophet, which is appliable to infants ſo dying.

11. *we find promiſes of ſalvation to whole houſholds, where it is probable there were infants,* Act.16.34.

Anſw. 1. *Acts* 16.31. is no probability that infants ſhould bee meant, ſith in the next *v.* it is ſaid, *he ſpake the word to all that were in his houſe*, which is not to be ſaid of infants; and *v.*34. *he rejoyced with all his houſe, believing God.* 2. If they ſhould, yet this can be no more then a particular promiſe to him, unleſs this were true, that God will ſave every believer and his houſe: And Mr. *B.* overlaſheth in ſaying, *we find promiſes of ſalvation made to whole houſholds*, when there is no more but this one.

The 12th. is from 1 *Cor.*7.14. and it is built on Mr. *Bs.* interpretation of [*holy*] as if it noted *a ſeparation to God as a peculiar people.* But *I* have fully anſwered Mr. *Bs.* 29th. *ch.* and have ſhewed his miſtake in the firſt part of this *Review*, *ſect.*22, *&c.* and need to anſwer no more in this place.

Mr. *B.* goes on thus. *It cannot be ſaid, that theſe promiſes are verified according to their ſenſe, if any mercy be given to any infant: Here the perſons are determined, that is, all the ſeed of the faithfull; and we have large ground given probably to conclude, that it is eternal mercy that is*

intended

intended to all that living to age do not again reject it, but that either at age keep Covenant, or die in infancy before they break it. And we have certain ground to conclude, that this salvation belongeth to some infants, and visible Churchmembership to all the seed of the faithfull. And I think this is more then Mr. T. doth acknowledge them.

Answ. It is indeed, finding the argumen s frivolous which Mr. *B.* hath brought for the visible Churchmembership of infants, though I acknowledge salvation belongeth to some infants. It is before shewed how the promises may be verified according to the sense of the words if any sort of mercy be given to any children of the faithfull: Nor is it true, that in the promises brought by Mr. *B.* the persons are determined to be all the seed of the faithfull, and how the contrary is determined by the Apostle, *Rom.* 9.7,8. according to Mr. *B.* himself, is shewed before, and what reason there is to understand *Exod.* 20.6. of temporal mercies, is shewed above, so that here is nothing new to be answered.

He adds, "If that *Matth.* 18.10. be well considered, it may make "another argument full to the point. If little ones have their Angels "beholding the face of God in heaven, they shall be saved: For that is "a mercy proper to the people of God. And that the Text speaks of "infants, others have fully proved.

Answ. I grant the conclusion and argument, but deny that it is at all to the point in question between us, and that any one hath proved that by *little ones*, *Matth.* 18.10. are meant infants. Though the contrary be proved concerning *Matth.* 18.5,6. in the second part of this *Review*, sect. 15. where Mr. *Bl.* and Mr. *C.* are answered: Yet to shew the frivolousnes of Mr. *B.* talk, I add 1. that *Matth.* 18.10. cannot be expounded *one of these little infants*; for such a speech would shew that then there were more little infants before them: But it appears from *v.* 2,4. there was but one set before them 2. From *v.* 14,11. *the little ones* were such as *Christ came to save, and that it was Gods will none should perish*: But this is true onely of the elect and true believers, not simply of infants as such. 3. The words following, *v.* 15, *&c.* shew they are meant of a sinning brother, *ergo*, not of infants.

Mr. *B.* adds: *That though he dare not say there is a full certainty of the savation of all believers infants so dying, yet he professeth to think it better grounded then mine, who* (he saith) *shut them out of the Church.* But this I take to be and effect of that antipathy he hath against me, who still chooseth that opinion which is most opposite to me, and prefers it; as *p.* 141. the opinion *of the old and new Socinians*, who take away an ordinance, and whom he censures *pag.* 24. *as above obedience, and so Gods*; and the opinion of baptizers in infancy and at age too, *pag.* 143. and professeth he would have nothing to do with me when I offered assistance to him in another point, as if he were like *Maldonat* the Jesuite that could have liked an interpretation had it not been *Calvins*. But I leave him to the Lord to judge him and me; and do not despair but that he may yet live to see his errour, and perhaps wish he had been better advised then so disdainfully to have rejected a friends offer.

He

He saith, *He would urge another argument here from the universality of redemption, Christ dying for all, for every man, for the sins of the whole world, as the Scripture speaketh; but that it would require more time to explain himself in it then he could then spare. However he thinks no man should deny that Christ died for every sort of men, and every age, and so for some infants.* To which I reply, Did he ever hear me deny it? And if he did not, why doth he talk of proving it here where he disputes against me? But he is willing to pick what quarrels he can with me. However when he intends to urge this argument, I hope I shall be provided to answer it, if it oppose my *thesis*. That the *Scripture saith Christ died for every man, for the sins of the whole world*, is more then I find: If I mistake him not, his Universal redemption he holds is conditional onely, which I think to be a fiction, redemption and election in Scripture being absolute in respect of persons, and commensurate, redemption being as well from impenitency and unbelief as damnation: Yet were it granted him, that he should thence infer, not the salvation of all, but of believers infants so dying and never performing the condition, is yet a Riddle to me; and I cannot yet imagine it to be any better then a sick-mans dream in Mr. *B.*

Ch. 28. He urgeth his 23d. arg. from Christs being head of the visible Church in infancy, that infants may be members; which I deny not: Nor is it the thing in question what they may be, but what they are. But this argument is answered before, *sect.* 57. And what he saith here out of *Irenæus*, proves not what he would infer, That *Irenæus took them for visible Churchmembers, because he saith, Christ by the example of his age sanctifieth them.* For every one sanctified by Christ is not a visible Churchmember: Mr. *B.* saith before, *pag.* 78. *we read of some that have been sanctified from the womb*, were they visible Churchmembers in the womb? I know no absurdity in it to assert that Christ was head of the Church when an infant, and worshipped as such, and yet no infants should be visible Churchmembers. Mr. *Bs.* perswasion that they know not Gods will that think otherwise then he doth, is but an effect of his fond affection to his own brats. And yet when he himself saith, *pag.* 62. *I confess it is disputable whether Christ were ever a Churchmember properly*, he should not be very confident in asserting Christ in infancy to have been head of the visible Church. And for *Irenæus his* speech, it is so false, that were not Mr. *B.* willing to catch at any shadow for his purpose, he would have concealed it.

Mr. *Bs.* 20th. *ch.* and 24th. argument, is answered at large in the first part of this *Review*, *sect.* 22, *&c.*

Ch. 30. He tels us, that *his* 25*th. arg. is probable at least, that the Scripture doth frequently and plainly tell us of the ceasing of Circumcision; but never speaks one word of the ceasing of infants visible Churchmembership, therefore we are not to judge that it is ceased.* That the antecedent or *minor* in this argument is false, is proved at large, *sect.* 50, 51, 52. The consequence is shewed to be invalid, in that other things of which the cessation is certain, as the freeing of servants, the dedication of the first born, are ceased, and yet not expressed so much in Scripture as that

of

of Churchmembership. To this saith Mr. *B. The year of Jubile was one of their Sabbaths, and so a type, Col.* 2.17. But I reply, Though the year of Jubile were a Sabbath, yet this proves not that freeing servants then is any more said to be ceased then infants visible Churchmembership. 2. Saith he, *The dedication of the first-born was evidently a type of Christ, and the Church under him: Of both these many Scriptures are plain. But let it be proved, that the admitting of infants into the visible Church is a meer type, or a meer judicial law proper to the Jewish Commonwealth, any more then the admitting of men or women into the Church.* I reply, 1. Admitting of infants into the visible Church, was no other then by their circumcising, or presenting at the Temple; and these are ceased, as proper to the Jewish Church or Commonwealth. 2. A thing may cease though we cannot prove it a meer type, nor a meer judicial law, as the receiving tythes, and paying them; and things may remain though they were types, as mount *Sion*, the land of *Canaan*, the people of *Israel*, which were types, *Heb.* 12.22. *Gal.* 6.16. *&c.* 3. That the Jewish infant Churchmembership was not by a law, but by a fact of providence which took in the whole people of the Jews into the Church visible Jewish, and consequently the infants as part of that people; which by the breaking off that people, and taking into the Church onely believers, is now ceased, as is shewed before, *sect.* 50, 51, 52, 64.

What Mr. *B.* adds, *If all Nations should have become Churchmembers they should have been circumcised, and then it had not been peculiar to the Jews; and that Sichemites being circumcised, would not have been subject to* Jacob, *and that when in* Esthers *time the people of the land became Jews, they were not of the Jewish Commonwealth, and under their Civil government; is answered before,* sect. 54.

That which he saith, *p.* 108. *That he hath sufficiently proved that infants ought to be admitted visible Churchmembers,* hath so little truth, that if the Reader observe it, he shall find scarce any of his arguments so much as to conclude the admission of infants into the visible Church, much less to prove it, but that they are visible Churchmembers. Whereby it is evident now (which I could not observe in the Dispute) that Mr. *B.* did leave the point to be proved, that infants ought to be admitted visible Churchmembers; and prosecuted another point instead of it, that they are visible Churchmembers. But enough is done in answer to that also, which I pray the Lord to bless for the undeceiving of the people of these nations, who have been so shamefully misled by Mr. *Bs.* toy of an ordinance of infants visible Churchmembership unrepealed, no where extant, that were they not either willing to be deceived, or left to errour by God for their want of love to the truth, they could hardly have been deluded by such vain arguings as he hath vented.

SECT. LXXV.

My Arguments to prove the ingraffing Rom. 11. 17. *to be into the invisible Church by giving faith, are vindicated from Mr.* Bls. *exceptions* Vind. fæd, chap. 38. *and Mr.* Sidenham's *Exercit. chap.* 8, 9.

ALthough Mr. *Bls.* manner of diſputing hath been ſhewed to bee ſuch as requires not any full anſwer, and would learned men compare, as men that ſought truth, mine and his writings together, they would perceive the inſufficiency of his reply, yet becauſe I perceive ſome learned men do yet value his writings (without good reaſon) which oppoſe mine, I ſhall add ſomewhat more to ſhew how ſhort his writings are of weakening any thing of mine.

Vindic. fæd. ch. 18. ſect. 1. *Having made an analaſis of part of* Rom. 11. *from* v. 16. *he takes on him to ground ſeveral undeniable poſitions. The third is the root of this tree* (viz. *the firſt ſupreme univerſal root*) *is* Abraham, Iſaac *and* Jacob, *not* Abraham *alone ſo Iſhmaelites would bee of the body. Nor* Abraham *with* Iſaac *alone, ſo the Edomites from* Eſau *would have been taken in. But the Apoſtle in this Chapter* (*from Old Teſtament authority*) *excludes both of theſe,* Abraham, Iſaac *and* Jacob *are therefore joyntly the root.*

Anſw. 1. That *Abraham* onely is *the root* meant *Rom.* 11. 16, 17, 18. I prove from *Rom.* 4. 11, 12, 16. where *Abraham* onely and no other of the Patriarchs is termed *the Father of believers.* But to bee *the root Rom.* 11. 16, 17, 18. is all one with *the Father of believers.* That *the root* notes a Father Mr. *Bl* yeilds, that it notes not barely a natural father, is proved in that the Gentiles ſhould not be in that root, if it noted barely a natural father, and that believers onely are branches of that root is proved from the text. 1. In that *their ſtanding is by faith.* 2. That *by unbelief ſome were broken off, verſ.* 20. which do plainly prove that they who were branches were believers, who were unbelievers were not branches. 3. That *the partaking of the root* could bee no otherwiſe then by faith, nor any other way ingraffing can bee meant is manifeſt, in that the Gentiles (who had no other relation to *Abraham* as a father then by believing as hee did) partake of the root and are ingraffed into the Olive. Secondly, To Maſter *Bls.* Argument, I anſwer by denying that the Apoſtle doth in that Chapter or any other exclude the Iſmaelites or Edomites from the body. *Job*, and other believing Edomites were in the root and Olive. Yea if it were meant of the viſible Church and natural deſcent, *Iſhmael* and *Eſau* muſt be of the body who were of *Abraham* by natural deſcent and circumciſed, and ſo viſible Churchmembers. If Mr. *Bl* deny they were in the body, becauſe they were not of *Abraham, Iſaac* and *Jacob*, by this reaſon *Iſaac* and *Jacob* ſhould be excluded.

For they were not from *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*: they were not from themselves and yet were branches, and consequently they were not the root, but *Abraham* alone, the root noting such a Father as from whom all branches have descent.

His fifth position is, *the fatneß of this tree is the glory of ordinances, of which the whole Church partakes. Answ.* By *ordinances* hee means outward ordinances, as Baptism, the Lords Supper, preaching the word, *&c.* By *the whole Church* hee means the Church visible. For that is his tenet all along, that the olive tree is the Church visible, not the invisible. This is then Mr. *Bls.* position, that when it is said *Rom.* 11. 17. *and wast partaker together of the root and fatneß of the olive tree*, the meaning is, thou Gentile Church or believer art made partaker of outward ordinances, of which the whole Church partakes. Now under the whole visible Church he undoubtedly comprehends infants, and sure there is no ordinance of which infants are partakers according to Mr. *Bls.* tenet but Baptism, so that then the Apostle according to Mr. *Bls.* exposition, should mean no more by the fatness of the tree, of which the whole Church partakes, but Baptism. Which is of it self so manifestly frivolous an exposition, as that I shall not need of set purpose to refute it. Though, it is true, there is a glory and beauty in the ordinances of the new Testament: Yet first some of them, as the preaching of the Gospel (which is the most glorious) those that are out of the visible Church may partake of, and those which Mr. *Bl* counts within may not partake of, I mean infants and some others. Secondly, that fatness which is meant *Rom.* 11. 17. passeth from the root to the tree, and thence to the branches, and therefore he that is said to bee partaker of the fatness of the olive tree, is first said to bee partaker of the root, but be the root *Abraham* or as Mr. *Bl.* would have it *Isaac* and *Jacob* with him ordinances pass not from them. It is true Circumcision was first begun in *Abraham*, but all the rest of the Jewish ordinances are according to Scripture rather derived from *Moses* then *Abraham*, and to say they were partakers of the root, that is of Circumcision (which was the onely ordinance *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob* did partake of) is both false, for they were not circumcised; and being so empty a thing as that it's termed with all the Jewish ordinances, *a shadow Col.* 2. 17. *Heb.* 10. 1. it had no glory then at all. And for Baptism, the Lords Supper, *&c.* they passed not from *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*; nor were they partakers of them, but were instituted by Christ in the New Testament. Thirdly, the partaking of the root and fatness of the olive tree was by the ingrafting and consequent of it. But the ingrafting according to Mr. *Bl.* doth not make them partakers of outward ordinances. For the chief of ordinances, to wit, the preaching of the Gospel, was the instrument of their ingrafting, as his own allegation shewes pag. 278. from *Acts* 11. 21. and so was antecedent to the ingrafting, nor by the ingrafting were they partakers of the other outward ordinances. For though the heart were wrought to a professed subjection to the way of God in ordinances (which is Mr. *Bls.* ingrafting) and so ingrafted. Yet they might bee never partakers

takers of outward ordinances such as Baptism and the Lords Supper, if either sickness or death prevented the administration or want of an administratour, or the elements, &c. hindered. Fourthly, the fatness of the olive tree makes the partakers fresh and fruitful. But that is not outward ordinances, but the spirit of God, righteousness by faith, &c. of which I shall speak more in vindicating my fourth argument.

Mr. *Bl.* saith farther, *That the holiness* Rom. 11. 16. *is such as is communicable from parent to childe, that is, necessarily communicated, as a root communicates to branches. This is so plain, that if it be denied all the Apostles dispute falls.*

Answ. It is true, that if the holiness bee not communicated from *Abraham* to all his children by faith, who are believers as he was, the Apostles dispute fals, but the Apostles dispute holds though it bee not communicated to every childe of every believing father, which is Mr. *Bls.* conceit, as his following words shew. Yea hence is a good argument to prove the holiness not to bee meant of meer visible Churchmembership, nor the root of every parent professing faith, because many of their children are never Christian visible Churchmembers, as experience abundantly proves, and so have not this holiness communicated to them. Yea, Mr. *Bl.* saith, *who knowes not that holy fathers have unholy children? regenerate parents have issue unregenerate?* I may add, abortives, natural fools, still-born, bred up in Mahometanism, renegado's, unbaptised, excommunicated, and consequently not visible Churchmembers or federally holy. And it is most false in this holiness of visible Churchmembership, or as Mr. *Bl.* cals it *federal* that the proposition holds, *as is the Father so is the childe, the Father being without the childe is without; the Father being within the childe is within in regard of Church estate, Covenant holiness,* eo nomine, *because a branch of such a root, a childe of such a Father*; which Mr. *Bl.* dictates here, but proves not, and hath been often refuted by me, nor is there any thing in *Rom.* 11. 16. for it. Yea Mr. *Bls.* own interpretation overthrowes this position. For if *the root* bee (as his position is) *Abraham, Isaac* and *Jacob*] then it is not every believing Father, and if *the root* bee every believing Father then all the branches of the tree are natural, and they derive their holiness by descent of nature, whereas it is plain from the text (and Mr. *Bls.* fourth position is to the same purpose) that the Jews onely are natural branches, the Gentiles are all ingraffed branches.

Mr. *Cuthbert Sidenham* in his *exercit. ch.* 8. takes upon him to demonstrate holiness and Churchmembership of the children of believing Gentiles from *Rom.* 11. 15, 16, 17. and to answer my arguments *ch.* 9. Against my opinion of the ingraffing into the invisible Church he urgeth, *then persons may be broken off from the invisible Church*, and takes notice of my answer in my *Examen p.* 64. but saith nothing to my answer in my *Apology p.* 76. though he could not but know of it, taking on him to answer my arguments in the next pages before. The rest he brings is from Mr. *B.* and is answered by me in my *Review part.* 1. *sect.* 6. *&c.* I agree with him in the position, that *Abraham* is *the root* meant *Rom.*

11. 16. and that he is a root exemplary onely, nor do I deny that the Apostles arguing is from a special prerogative to *Abraham* to whom the promise was given *Gen.* 17. 7. and that the promise did comprehend the elect of his natural seed, and that God had a more special regard to his natural seed in that promise then to other mens natural seed: yet not universally to his seed, nor is it true *that the Apostle makes the branches holy* Rom. 11. 16. *by a prerogative of grace grounded on the promise of God made to believing Fathers and their seed: which is the same in the New Testament and the Old*, as hee urgeth out of Dr. *Willet*. For there is not that promise in the New Testament, or old. And therefore the Argument upon this conceit can have no strength in it.

Pag. 71. he layes down this position, *wee believing Gentiles are ingraffed into Abrahams Covenant in the room of the natural branches which were broken off.*

Concerning which I say, that though I deny not the believing Gentiles to have interest in *Abrahams* Covenant *Gen.* 17. 7. that is, God is their God, and they have righteousnes by faith as *Abraham* had; yet the Apostle doth not speak of their ingraffing into *Abrahams* Covenant, that's Mr. *Sidenhams* mistake, but into the olive tree, that is as Mr. *Bl. the whole body of the Church*, which he would have meant of the visible, I of the invisible. Now to Mr. *Sidenhams* arguments to that position; I yeeld the conclusion of the first, that *believing Gentiles and their children are graffed in*, but not all, or any as their children, and that *the ingraffing is sutable to the breaking off*, that is, that as the Jewes and their children were broken off from the invisible Church, in which the elect Jewes and their children who were elect in former ages were for the greatest part, so the Gentiles believers and their children are graffed in. Yet Mr. *Sidenham* himself pig. 75. confesseth a very great disproportion, taking it as he doth for ingraffing into the visible Church.

For, saith he, *there is this difference between the conveyance of priviledges of the Jewes as natural branches, and the engraffed Gentiles; That the whole body of the Jewes good and bad, were called branches; now onely believers of the Gentiles, who are called by the Gospel, with their children, are ingraffed into that root.* Which is enough to shew that the Gentiles were not ingraffed into the root or tree, as the Jews by natural descent, but by calling of the Gospel, and that the body of the Gentiles or any nation of the Gentiles is not ingraffed, but so many as are called. The ingraffing of the infant children with their parents into the visible Church by an outward ordinance is but his own dream, and is overthrown by this, that the Church Christian visible is not by descent but calling; not national but Congregational, by voluntary Covenant; nor can the Churches called Independent hold this, which Master *Sidenham*, and Master *Cobbet*, and others of their way hold, that *the ingraffing of the Gentiles into the visible Church is sutable to that of the Jewes as being in their stead*, but they must hold a national Church, which quite overturns the

frame

frame of their Churches, and the Reformation they contend for. To his second argument, the some that were broken off might be parents and children, or parents and not children, or children and not parents; and of these there might be infants broken off without their own sin, or their parents, according to Gods good pleasure onely. But of this I have said enough in answer to Mr. *Geree* and Mr. *Baxter*, in the first part of this *Review*, sect. 4, 6. The conclusion of the third argument is granted, understood of ingraffing into the Church invisible, not into the visible. To the fourth, that [*the fatnes of the Olive*] should note priviledges and outward advantages such as this, that the child should be visible Churchmember with the father in the Christian Church, or that any other parent then *Abraham* should have a seminal vertue to convey such Church priviledge or fatnes as the root mentioned *Rom.* 11.17. is a meer fancy; nor is there any thing *Ephes* 3.6. or any where else in Scripture for it.

To the objection, *That now believers are onely branches*, Abraham *onely the roote, and therefore the argument holds not, If the parent be holy so is the childe, being understood of other then* Abraham *and his seed*; hee answers, *That yet the branches well ingraffed become natural branches, and receive as much from the roote as those which grew naturally on it, so Gentile believers must have the same priviledge, and that there are sprigges which grow out of branches which may bee termed immediate rootes.* But hee doth not shew that the Apostle or any wise man ever termed greater boughes of trees rootes to lesser; neither dare hee say, the Apostle meant every believing Father by *the root*, *Rom.* 11. 16, and therefore all this is impertinent to answer the objection, which was to invalidate the interence concerning the holines of every believers infant, because the Apostle saith, *if the roote bee holy so are the branches*, because *Abraham* onely is the roote there. As for Mr. *Bls.* saying, I value it not, it being without Scripture. It's sufficient for present to shew the insufficiency of Mr *Bls.* and Mr. *Ss.* proofes. I pass on to vindicate my arguments from their pretended answers.

How the Dispute concerning the proof from *Rom.* 11.16,17. for infants of believing Gentiles visible Churchmembership and Baptism, was brought to this issue, Whether the ingraffing *Rom.* 11.17. into the Olive tree, be meant of joyning a person to the invisible Church of the elect by giving faith according to election, so that none are ingraffed but true believers or elect persons as I assert, is shewed in the first part of this *Review* sect 1. Mr. *Bl.* and Mr. *Sydenham* take on them to answer my arguments.

The first is, That act of ingraffing to the Church which is made Gods act by his sole power with such an *Emphasis* as implies it hopeless and impossible without the intervention of his omipotency, is, and can be no other ingraffing then into the invisible Church by giving of faith according to election. But such is the ingraffing *Rom.* 11.17. as appears from *v.* 23. *Ergo.*

Mr. *Sydenham* answers, that *to argue from Gods power to his will, or*

to election, or from his power in general to the putting it forth absolutely in such a determinate act, is strange, unsound in Divinity, and reason. But this is no answer. For there is no such arguing made by me. My arguing is none of those ways he mentions, but from the ascribing the act to God as done by his sole power, without which it were hopeless and impossible, to prove that it is more then man by his ordinary power can do, which can in this business be no other then the working of faith in the heart. And this the *Contraremonstrants* thought sound arguing in the *conference at the Hague*, and so do generally pleaders for irresistable conversion. And Mr. *Sydenham* makes it *like to the resurrection of the dead, from v.* 15. which sure no act of man can perform. But admission to the visible Church may be performed by men, therefore the ingrafting cannot be admission into the visible Church, but an higher act of giving faith according to election.

But saith he, *It is a work of mighty power to take away the prejudice against Christ, in Jews and Gentiles, to bring to outward confession.* To which I reply, it is no such work but may be done by moral suasion of Orators or Preachers, specially backt with the encouragement and commands of Kings and Emperours, as experience hath often shewed, therefore this cannot be all which is meant by the ingrafting.

But saith he, *It will require an act of power to gather them but visibly once again, and bring them into one entire body to make a visible Church, when they are so scattered up and down all nations.* To which I reply, 1. The gathering them together into one place, is not ingrafting them into the visible Church; for ingrafting them imports joyning them to others, but this gathering is a making them a distinct body of themselves; the gathering into one place is accidental to their ingrafting into their own Olive, he ingrafting may be without it; and if they go together, it is likely the ingrafting will be before that gathering, and therefore that gathering and this ingrafting cannot be the same. 2. That gathering may be by the power and favour of Emperors and Kings, as it was by *Cyrus* his Proclamation heretofore in their return to *Jerusalem*, and therefore is not this act of ingrafting which is ascribed to God by his sole power with such an *Emphasis* as implies it unfeasable but by his omnipotency.

Mr. *Bl.* saith, that *I do vainly make this engrafting to be in their sense no more then baptizing.* But 1. whether I wrong my Antagonists, may be perceived from Mr. *Ms* words in his *Defence, p.* 135. *To what I said, the Jews infants were grafted in by Circumcision; therefore ours are to be ingrafted by Baptism. You answer, by demanding whether in good sadness I do think the Apostle here means by grafting in, baptizing, or circumcision, or insition by outward ordinances; for if that were the meaning, then breaking off must be meant of uncircumcising, or unbaptizing. To which I reply, that in good sober sadness I do think that grafting in is admission into visible membership, or visible communion with the Church of Christ; and that the external seal of their visible grafting in was Circumcision, and of ours Baptism.* And he disputes against the ingrafting into the invisible Church, therefore he can understand it of no more then baptizing. 2. Nor

can

can Mr. *Bl.* conformably to his tenet. For if the ingraffing be such as is common to infants and parents, and it be admission into the visible Church of both, and infants are no way else admitted then by baptizing, the ingraffing is no other.

But, saith he, *we understand a discipling of Gentile nations, working the heart to a professed subjection to the way of God in ordinances tendered, and assent of heart unto all that is there promised, and acknowledge it a work above the power of man, and confess it to be solely in the hand of God, as* Gen. 9.27. Acts 11.21. *we do not speak of the bare admission of one that stands intituled, but the working of them to such a title; and if an outward profession bee in the power of mans will, yet to bring men or nations to such a profession cordially to embrace the Gospel. so farre as to assent to the truth of it, is above man, and a worke of no such ease.*

I reply, 1. If it be not bare admission, but such a work as he saith, then infants are none of the branches ingraffed, nor doth their ingraffing belong to them, sith they have onely bare admission into the visible Church by Baptism. 2. If the profession be onely from fear, or carnal hopes, this may be wrought by Teachers, Orators, especially the favour and power of Princes concurring, and then it is no act above mans power to ingraff. But if the heart be brought to assent cordially, and so to profess Christ in sincerity (as some of Mr. *Els.* words seem to mean) then it is by giving faith according to election, and the ingraffing into the invisible Church: And so Mr. *Bl.* while he seems to answer my argument, doth unawares confirm it, through the irrefragable force of the truth. Which might have been further cleared from the Text, *Rom.* 11. 23. where it is said, *they also if they abide not in unbelief shall be graffed in, for God is able to graff them in again.* Whence it follows, while they abide in unbelief they are not graffed in, when they believe they are; *Ergo*, God ingraffs by giving faith according to election.

My second argument was from *v.* 15, 16, 17. where the ingraffing is termed reconciliation opposite to casting away.

To this Mr. *Sydenham* answers, 1. *If I mean reconciliation in the strictest sense, as it denotes pardon of sins, and being made friends with God by Christs atonement and mediatorship, then many absurdities may follow:* 1. *That the Jews and their rejection was the ground of the Gentiles reconciliation unto God.* 2. *That no reconciliation was obtained for the Gentiles before the Jews were broken off.* 3. *That those which are reconciled and their sins pardoned, may be cast off; for so were the Jews and the Gentiles threatned with the same misery on the same ground.*

Answ. 1. If by [*ground*] be meant [*cause,*] I deny that to follow on the exposition of reconciliation in the strictest sense; if by [*ground*] be meant onely [*occasion*] I grant it follows, but count it no absurdity, it being the plain declaration of the Apostle. 2. I grant the second, if understood of the fulness or body of the Gentiles, and count it no absurdity; after the time of Gods separating of Israel to be his people, there were onely some proselytes reconciled to God, but no full and ample number, so as to make any numerous Church of themselves. 3.

The

The third I yeeld as no absurdity, understanding the casting off of the same people, not the same persons, from what their ancestors were, not themselves.

But Mr. *S.* answers 2*ly. by distinction of reconciliation into outward and inward, and he would have it meant of outward reconciliation, by bringing them in under the means of the Gospel and the outward dispensations of the Church, which is Gods common way to salvation, and is to some effectual to inward grace, unto others onely to outward* privi*ledges.*

Answ. 1. This reconciliation would exclude infants, for they are not so reconciled and consequently not ingraffed, and so the argument for their ingraffing hence is evacuated. if the reconciliation (which is confessed to be the same with the ingraffing) be such as agrees not to infants. 2. He doth noth not so much as offer to produce one place of Scripture in which reconciliation is so taken, nor one approved writer so expounding it. 3. Nor can it be expounded so. For it is no reconciliation at all which he describes. In reconciliation there is still taking away enmity, but in the bringing under the meanes of the Gospel there may be no taking away of enmity, either from them to God, for they may hate him as much, yea more then before; or from God to them, for he may hate them as much or more then before. 4. Nor in this place can it be the meaning. For *the reconciliation of the world*, *v.* 15. is *v.* 12. *the riches of the world, of the Gentiles.* But their riches imports something opposite to their fall, diminishing, or detriment; and their fall must be to damnation, for it is *v.* 11. opposed to salvation, their riches must needes therefore bee to salvation, so termed *vers.* 11.

But, saith he, "The body of the Gentile world (which I mean) are "not so reconciled as by election and saving grace, though the sound of "the Gospel hath gone through all the world.

Answ. The body of the Gentiles, that is a full ample part of them incomparably greater then the number of the proselytes to the Jewish Church is reconciled, and hath been for many ages to God by election and saving grace.

Mr. *Bl.* also answers *by distinction of reconciliation gradual, either to take in, or hold a people in visible communion; or total, to receive them with an everlasting delight in them.* The former he *exemplifies out of* Exod. 32. 10, 11 12, 13, 14. And thus applies it. "Reconciliation is "opposite to casting away. The Jews then by reconciliation are brought "into that state, out of which they were once cast; but they were not "cast out of the Church invisible; not out of election and justificati-"on, but out of a visible Churchstate and fellowship. Breaking off, as "Mr. *T.* well saith, is the same as casting away, and reconciliation the "same as ingraffing. Their reconciliation or ingraffing is then into "that condition from which they were broken, out of which they were "cast; now they were cast out of the Church visible, not out of the "Church invisible; when they were in a Churchstate they were nigh "unto God, *Deut.* 4. 7. *Psal.* 148. 14. *Ephes.* 2. 17. Their reconciliati-

"on

" on brings them into the ſame Churchſtate, which is a reconciliation " gradual not total.

Anſw. The caſting away *v.* 15. is the ſame with the caſting away *v.* 1, 2. which is oppoſite to Gods fore-knowledge *v.* 2. to the election of grace *v.* 5. which obtained, and the caſtaway were hardned or blinded *v.* 7, 8, 9, 10. which he that underſtands of any other caſting away then from the grace of election, and effectual calling, and the inviſible Church ſeems to me to pervert the Apoſtles meaning very groſly. Nor do I conceive it any abſurdity to ſay that the Jewiſh people in *Pauls* time were broken off or caſt away from that election, and ſtate in the inviſible Church which they never had in their own perſons, but their anceſtors had, and they in courſe had obtained but for their unbelief. As for *the reconciliation* in all places where he mentions it in his Epiſtles, hee means it of that reconciliation which is by effectual converſion, and juſtification, through Chriſts death, on which followes ſalvation, *Rom.* 5. 10, 11. 2 *Cor.* 5. 18, 19, 20. *Col.* 1. 22. and not of Mr. *Bls.* gradual reconciliation, of which hee hath not brought one inſtance for the uſe of the word in his ſenſe, nor is his example any thing like to the buſineſs in hand: For it was not a reconciliation ſo as to bring them to the priviledges of a viſible Churchſtate, but ſo to pardon the ſin of worſhipping the golden Calf, as not utterly to deſtroy that people, though the ſinners fell in the Wilderneſs: which was onely an abatement of puniſhment, not an eſtating in priviledges as Mr. *B.* would have it.

But Mr. *Bl.* to my urging any one to ſhew mee in Scripture or any approved Proteſtant Writer, ſuch uſe of the word reconciliation as his is, and my alledging Proteſtant approved Writers for my expoſition, thus ſaith.

1. *when Mr.* T. *pleaſeth, hee can heap up phraſes which are onely once uſed in a ſelect ſenſe in Scripture, and that to uphold his interpretation of holy and unclean,* 1 Cor. 7. 14. *when the context clearly evinces the contrary.* But that this is falſe, and that the text clearly evinceth my interpretation is fully proved in the firſt part of this *Review*, Section 22, *&c.*

Secondly, ſaith hee, *Maſter* T. *when hee pleaſes, dare undertake the defence of an opinion held unanimouſly by all Papiſts, and as unanimouſly oppoſed by Proteſtants, as in that of Covenant holineſs.*

But this alſo is another of Maſter *Bls.* calumnies and unbrotherly taunts which hee frequently uſeth inſtead of anſwers, and if there had been in him any candour of minde towards mee he had been ſatisfied with my anſwer in my poſtſcript, Sect. 13. But ſith hee writes againſt me in a Cynical humour, I paſs by his ſnarlings, and leave the cauſe to the Lord.

Thirdly, ſaith he, *Gomarus, Tom.* 1. *p.* 111. *obſerves that world is taken in that ſenſe, in* Rom. 11. 12, 15. *as in no other Scripture.* But I think this is not true, it is taken in the ſame ſenſe 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. and I think 2 *Cor.* 5. 18, 19. 1 *Joh.* 2. 2.

Fourthly, ſaith he, *if reconciliation in no other place be ſo uſed, yet little is*

gained; seeing as wee have seen there are paralel phrases that hold out the same thing to us.

Answ. 1. Those paralel phrases were never yet seen by me. 2. The thing is gained which is here contended for, if reconciliation still signifie total reconciliation in the Scripture when it speakes of Gospel reconciliation, and there is no cogent reason to move us to recede from that sense here, and reconciliation be the same with ingrafting, surely ingrafting is by giving faith according to election, and the Church into which the ingrafting is, is the invisible.

Mr. *Bl.* produceth a speech of *Ravanellus* (which I have not) for his sense. But the words as hee produceth them seem not to mee to have that sense which Mr. *Bl.* alledgeth them for, but rather my sense, and a passage in the *Annotations*, and another in Dr. *Featley* the Author of them on those Epistles. But in neither doth Dr. *Featley* say by the reconciliation to God *Rom.* 11. 15. is meant bare vouchsafing a visible Churchstate; and by casting away, and breaking off a loss of visible priviledges, nor do *Peter Martyr* or *Bucer* say so. And however I finde Protestant Writers do expound the ingrafting and breaking off in many of their writings of the visible Church, yet those speeches which I alledged out of Mr. *Ball* and Dr. *Ames* are full to prove *the reconciliation Rom.* 11. 15. to be saving, and they that understand by *breaking off* there, more then the loss of visible priviledges, may notwithstanding Mr. *Bls.* censure without any shift in that point be acquitted from Arminianism.

My third arg. was from *v.* 20. ingrafting must be by giving faith, because it is by faith that the branch stands in the tree. To this Mr. *S.* and *Bl.* both answer by granting the conclusion, that it is by giving faith. But this faith Mr. *S.* makes *profession of faith*, Mr. *Bl. a faith of profession.*

To which I reply. 1. If it were faith professed by which the branches stand in the tree, yet infants are excluded from being of the branches, for they stand not by faith professed. 2. That it is not profession of faith, or faith barely dogmatical which is meant *Rom.* 11. 20. I prove 1. thus. That standing which is a perseverance unto salvation is not by bare profession of faith, but true justifying faith. But the standing *Rom.* 11. 20. is that standing which is a perseverance unto salvation, *ergo.* The *major* is manifest; for it is not a bare profession of faith whereby a man perseveres to salvation, but that which is justifying. The *minor* is plain from the text. The standing which is opposed to falling in which God shews his severity, is standing by perseverance unto salvation. This I presume will be yeilded, direct opposite termes being according to Logick rules to bee understood in a direct opposite sense. But *the standing Rom.* 11. 20. is opposed to *falling* in which *God shews his severity vers.* 22. *Ergo.* 2. The standing which was to bee prevented by beeing *not high minded but fearing*, and the losing of which was to *bee feared*, is not a bare standing in the visible Church, nor by bare profession of faith, But the loss of the standing was to *be feared*, and to be prevented by not *being high minded but fearing*,

fearing, *v.* 20. For the loſs of ſtanding in the viſible Church needs not bee ſo much feared, and a leſs care would ſerve turn to prevent it. 3. That ſtanding which would not prevent *Gods not ſparing*, is not the ſtanding meant *Rom.* 11. 20. For that would prevent *Gods not ſparing*, *v.* 21. But the ſtanding onely in the viſible Church by profeſſion of faith, would not prevent *Gods not ſparing*, *Matt.* 7. 23. *Ergo.* 4. That faith and ſtanding are meant here, which in other places in that and other Epiſtles are meant by the Apoſtle, when hee ſpeakes of the ſame thing. But in thoſe places ſtanding ſo as to perſevere to ſalvation, and juſtifying faith are meant, as *Rom.* 5. 2. and 14. 4. 2 *Cor.* 1. 24. *Ergo.* 5. That ſtanding and that faith is not meant of which it may bee ſaid *the root beareth them not*, *verſe* 18. But of them who onely ſtand in the viſible Church by a profeſſion of faith, it may bee ſaid *the root beareth them not.* For the root is *Abraham*, and hee is a root or father to none but thoſe who have juſtifying faith, *Rom.* 4. 11, 12. *Ergo.* 6. By that faith the branches ſtand which is directly oppoſite to *the unbelief by which* others *were broken off*, *verſ.* 20. But that was unbelief of heart, and not of mouth onely, *ergo*, the faith is in the heart, and not in the mouth onely by which the branches ſtand. 7. That faith the branches ſtand by *v.* 20. by which *they are partakers of the root and fatneſs of the Olive.* But that is juſtifying faith, as ſhall be ſhewed in the vindication of the next argument, *Ergo.*

Mr. *S.* takes upon him to prove it meant of the viſible Church by profeſſion of faith by ſome of Maſter *Bs.* arguments, which becauſe they are anſwered already in the *firſt Part* of this *Review*, *Sect.* 6, &c. I let paſs: onely whereas hee ſaith, *Can any man conceive that they ſhould boaſt becauſe the branches the Jewes were broken from election and true faith, that they might be graffed in by a new act of Gods election, and by true and ſaving faith?*

I anſwer, though they might not thus boaſt, yet they might boaſt that God having broken off the Jews, had in their ſtead ingraffed them, by giving ſaving faith according to his eternal election.

And to what hee ſaith from *v.* 20, 21, 22, 23 *what, are they exhorted to look leaſt they bee cut off from Gods election*, &c? *will M. T. turn a downright Arminian, that hee may have any plea againſt the baptiſing of poor infants?*

I anſwer, 1. that I ſcarſe think that ſcribler did well know what *Arminianiſm* was, and that I have ſufficiently acquitted my ſelf from that which is indeed *Arminianiſm*, and better then his magnified Aurthor Mr. *B.* 2. That he might with as good reaſon impeach the Apoſtle of downright *Arminianiſm*, in that he exhorts us *to give all diligence that we make our calling and election ſure*, 2 *Pet.* 1. 10.

Mr. *Bl.* when he cannot untie this knot, endeavours to cut it aſunder by this aſſertion, after many words which need no anſwer; *That there is no ſuch thing in all Scripture as ingraffing into the Church inviſible by faith; all ingraffing is into the body viſible, and therefore by a faith of profeſſion.* And yet his three firſt arguments whereby hee would

prove this propoſition, do conclude no ingraffing but into Chriſt, and conſequently neither into the inviſible nor viſible, which is directly to contradict his own ſaying, *All ingraffing is into the body viſible.* But let's view his proofs about this poſition concerning which it pleaſeth Mr. *Bl. to enter into the liſts with me.*

1. Saith hee, " All ingraffing is into that ſubject, which immediately receives what is ingraffed, as the ſtock receives the " ſyens, but it is CHRIST, and not the Church inviſible that " receives the elect believer; Chriſt dwels in us by faith, ſo wee in " Chriſt, *Epheſ.* 3. 17.

Anſw. This argument is made by Mr. *Bl* as if hee on purpoſe meant to refute himſelf. For 1. he would prove there is no ingraffing of elect believers into the inviſible Church but into Chriſt, becauſe hee onely receives the elect believers; which if true it would follow; First, that elect believers are not ingraffed into the viſible Church, but onely non-elect profeſſours of faith who are hypocrites, and ſo the viſible Church ſhould have no elect ones in it, but all reprobates. Secondly, if the reaſon were good there ſhould bee no ingraffing of profeſſors of faith into the viſible Church contrary to his aſſertion, that *all ingraffing is into the body viſible.* For it is Chriſt that immediately receives, that is owns or acknowledgeth bare profeſſours of faith as viſible Churchmembers, as well as he receives, that is owns and acknowledgeth as his inviſible members, them who are ingraffed into his inviſible body. 3. If wee be ingraffed by that *faith by which Chriſt dwels in us and we in Chriſt, Epheſ.* 3. 17. then we are ingraffed into the olive by that faith which is juſtifying (for by no other faith doth Chriſt dwell in us nor wee in him, nor is any other meant *Epheſ.* 3. 17. as is apparent from the text, the prayer of the Apoſtle being not for a bare dogmatical faith, which they had already, but juſtifying, perſevering, *whereby Chriſt might dwell in their hearts by his ſpirit,* &c.) and the ingraffing is into Chriſt, and conſequently into the inviſible Church. But ſo it is by Mr. *Bls.* argument, *ergo.*

2. I anſwer ingraffing is a metaphor and it notes uniting or joyning, and this joyning is not natural but ſpiritual or moral, and may bee at a remote bodily diſtance, and without the knowledge of thoſe to whom the perſon is ingraffed, and may be to Chriſt, and to his inviſible body or viſible, without any act of the Church viſible or inviſible which may bee termed receiving; yea if Mr. *Bs.* poſition bee right, *Plain Script. proof,* &c. *part* 1. *ch.* 27. that *a man living alone in America may yet bee a member of the viſible Church. For hee hath that which conſtituteth him a viſible member though there bee none to diſcern it,* a man may bee ingraffed into the Church viſible though neither hee know any other Churchmember, nor any other know him, and therefore I deny Mr. *Bls. major* poſition in his argument, if underſtood (as it muſt be if it be to the purpoſe) of that metaphorical ingraffing which is *Rom.* 11. 17, &c.

2. Saith he, *All ingraffing is into that which gives ſap and juyce to the ingraffed, as the ſtock from the root to the ſyens; now Chriſt gives ſap to the*

elect

elect believing, not the Church; and therefore it is not into the Church, but into Christ.

Answ. 1. This argument also gainsays Mr. *Bls.* proposition, that *all ingrafting is into the body visible*; for it is not the body visible that gives sap to the elect believing, or professors of faith, but Christ; and therefore by this argument there is no ingrafting into the body visible. 2. Christ onely gives sap and juice effectively, *Abraham* exemplarily; the Church doth it onely as a vessel receiving it, as the stock receives it first, then the branch; the veins receive the bloud, then the other parts of the body: And if Mr. *Bls. major* be understoood of any other giving juice, it is denied; if of this, the *minor*.

3. Saith he, *If saving faith ingraff the branch into the Church invisible, then the Church invisible is the proper object of such faith; but the Church is no such object of faith, but Christ.*

Answ. 1. The same argument holds thus, If profession of faith ingraff into the Church visible, then the Church visible is the proper object of such profession: But the Church visible is no such object, but Christ; therefore there is no ingrafting by profession of faith into the Church visible, contrary to Mr. *Bls.* tenet. 2. To say the Church invisible is the object of faith, is no more then to say, to believe the Holy Catholick Church is an Article of the Creed, and this I think Mr. *Bl.* counts no absurdity. 3. The consequence of the *major* proposition is denied. Faith that saves hath the object Christ, and as it respects Christ doth unite or ingraff us to him as to our head, and to the invisible Church as his body.

4. Saith he, *That supposed ingrafting into the invisible Church, is either known to the body invisible, or unwitting; if known, then it is not invisible. They have no light to discern an invisible work; if unknown, then there could not be such a dispute about the new ingrafting of Gentiles, nor complaint of breaking off of the Jewes, all being done by an invisible translation, and so the subject of the question is taken away.*

Answ. It was known to some of the invisible, to others not; though it were known yet it might be invisible, they had light to discern an invisible work: Though the work were unknown to some, yet there might be a dispute about the new ingrafting of Gentiles, and complaint of breaking off the Jews, as there was *Acts* 11. though all were done by an invisible translation: So that there is no truth or strength in this rope of sand Mr. *Bl.* makes, and the subject of the question still remains. There is as much futility in the rest of his dictates. *Scheibler* saith in his *Topicks*, *A not-being cannot be a part dividing*; yet he saith, in case any defend that to be which yet is not, in controversies such a division is to be supposed. But how vainly Mr. *Bl.* hath disputed against an ingrafting into the invisible Church, may be discerned, and thereby how frivolously he compares it to a mountain of ayr. And what he saith, *that the acceß of the Gentiles in the Acts was an ingraffing into the Church visible*, may be granted, and it may be true that it was into the invisible Church also. *One new man*, *Ephes.* 2. 15. is true onely of the invisible

Church

Church; for the Gentiles were never one visible Church with the Jews, except some few proselytes of them. That *the visible Church communicates sap and juyce which is the fatness of the Olive in ordinances, and that faith dogmatical looks upon the Church* (meaning the visible) *as the partial object*, are dictates, which I need not refute, sith there is no proof brought for them. As I conceive he means them, they are false; so much for the vindication of my third argument.

My fourth argument is from *v.*17. thus, That ingrafting is meant *v.* 17. whereby the wild Olive is co-partaker of the root and fatness of the Olive tree: But such is onely by giving faith according to election; *Ergo.* I proved the *minor* by shewing that *Abraham* is there *the root* as the Father of the faithfull, and *the fatness of the Olive* not priviledges of outward ordinances, but righteousness.

Mr. *Sydenham* answers it by referring to Mr. *Bl.* and censuring my answer to him as *a poor evasion*, which I shall free from this censure in my reply to Mr. *Bl.* Yet Mr. *S.* scribles somewhat besides, which I shall reply to. He begins with questions, 1. *were not the natural branches which were broken off partakers of the fatness of the root?* Answ. No. *And were they all elected and partakers of saving graces, or outward priviledges onely?* Answ. None of the branches broken off were elected or partakers of saving graces, though some were of outward priviledges. *And why then should it be thought absurd for the Gentiles by ingraffing to partake of the fatness of the root onely in outward priviledges, seeing it was so with the natural branches, and they all grow on the same root?* Answ. The natural branches as natural did not grow on the same root with the ingraffed; *Abraham* was not a natural Father to the ingraffed branches, they descended not from him by natural generation, nor did the natural branches which were broken off grow on the same spiritual root with the ingraffed. *Abraham* was indeed the Father of the faithfull Gentiles, and they his seed spiritually; but so he was not to the Jews broken off, nor they ever in their own persons in the Olive tree, as it notes the Church of true believers, or in *Abraham the root* as is meant *Rom.* 11.17. nor were ever partakers of the fatness of it, but the Gentiles were; nor did the Jews fall from election and saving graces which they had in their own persons, but which they had in course been partakers of if they had believed, which I have cleared more fully in my answer to Mr. *Cobbet*, in the first part of this *Review*, sect. 10.

He tels me further, *It's improper to call a root an exemplary cause; there is no harmony between them; and example conveyed nothing; here is a conveyance of fatness.*

Answ. It is improper to term an exemplary cause a root, for it is a metaphor; but it is no more improper then to term an exemplary cause a Father, as the Apostle doth *Abraham the Father of believers*, *Rom.* 4.11,12. when yet the Text makes him only such by his exemplary believing; and if there were harmony between a Father and an exemplary cause, though *Abraham* conveyed not faith or righteousness, but as an example; there is harmony between a root and an exemplary cause, though

though it convey nothing but as an example: Nor *is it unsuitable to good language* to say, the ingraffed branches are partakers of the fatness or fulness of *Abraham* as an example. That fatness the Jews had from *Abraham* which is meant *Rom.* 11.17. they had not from him as a natural father, nor *did God make* the Evangelical Covenant *with him and his natural seed*, nor do the ingraffed branches ever become *natural branches*, though they partake of Evangelical benefits as well as the believing Jews, who were natural branches. What Mr. *S.* adds in answer to my objection, that if it were meant of outward priviledges it were false; for the Gentiles were not partakers of the outward priviledges of *Abraham*, that *Abraham is a root in the New Testament as well as in the Old*, I grant; but deny what he adds, *and still stands by vertue of the Covenant to believers and their children*: For neither is there such a Covenant, and if there were, yet *Abraham* could be a root onely to his natural seed, not to Gentiles by vertue of that Covenant. And what he adds, that *though old Testament ordinances were taken away with the Jews and that Church-state, yet the root is not taken away; but the New Testament priviledges grow on the same root; and our ingraffing in gives us to be partakers of the fatness of them, as well as it gave to the Jews the participation of former priviledges until they were broken off*; letting pass the vanity of the speeches, that *our ingraffing gave to the Jews the participation of former priviledges*, which they had not by our ingrafting, but their own propagation from the root, and that *the Jews had the priviledges till they were broken off*, whereas the persons broken off never had *the fatness* meant *Rom.* 11.17. all this answer avoids not the objection, but plainly grants the argument. For if *the Old Testament ordinances and the Jewish Churchstate were taken away* (which all that are against a national Church-frame must aver) then if by *fatness* be meant *outward ordinances and Churchstate*, the Gentiles cannot be said to partake of them, nor they be meant by *the fatness*, *Rom.* 11.17. Let's examine what Mr. *Bl.* saith to this argument.

1. *He denies that he ever said every believing parent is the root, a root he makes them, not the root.* But by his leave I charge him with nothing but what doth plainly follow from his words. For that is the root according to him which communicates Covenant holiness and Churchstate, and of whom it is verified if the root be holy so are the branches. But this is said by him in his *Vindic. Fæd. p.* 277. and elsewhere, of every believing parent; therefore if Mr. *Bl.* avouch his own arguings, he makes every believing parent *the root*, *Rom.* 11.16,17.

What Mr. *Bl.* speaks, that *other parents are roots to their posterity*, is granted, and needed not to be proved by Mr. *Bl.* But that *they being holy persons are holy roots communicating Covenant holiness to their children*, is not proved by Mr. *Bl.* That the Covenant or promise of God made to *Abraham*, *Gen.* 15.5. & 17.4,7. did assure and so constitute *Abraham* to be the root of the Church of true believers, is not denied, nor that Circumcision did seal to him *the righteousness of faith as a believer and the father of believers*, *Rom.* 4.11,12. But the form denominating him *Father of believers*, or *root of the Olive*, is propagating them by his exemplary

emplary faith: Nor was *David* by his Covenant, or *Jesse*, or any other believing parent a root or father in the sense *Rom.*4.11. & 11.16,17. Though they were natural roots to their posterity, and builders of the house of *Israel*, and *the Fathers* 1 *Cor.*10.1. by natural generation; yet none are said to build as *Abraham*, from whom *the fatness*, *Rom.*11.17. is derived, and not from any other intermediate father. For *Abraham* had been father though he had had no child by natural generation, *Mat.* 3.9. descending from him: Nor can it be true, that he is termed *the root* by reason of natural generation; For then the Gentiles had not been branches and children, and all the branches had been natural, contrary to *v.*21,24.

To this saith Mr. *Bl.* "He makes them wild onely at their first in-"grafting, and so was all *Terahs* race wild likewise, till that change of "faith wrought in *Abrahams* call, and the Covenant God entred with "him; we now are natural as they were, and cannot be called wild, but "in our first original.

Answ. They that were ingraffed were still branches of the wild Olive, and so are we that are believers of the Gentiles, for that title is by nature and natural descent, *Rom.*11.24. which is not changed by grace, though the fruit and sap be changed that is the qualities and actions by ingrafting: We that are believers of the Gentiles are not the branches according to nature, for that is plainly meant of the Jews onely, *Rom.*11.24. when it is said, *they that are according to nature shall be graffed in their own Olive.* Which shews that the term *they that are according to nature* is proper to the Jews: But if every believing parent should be *the root*, *Rom.*11.16,17. then every Gentile believers child should be a natural branch, contrary to *v.*24. for they are all *besides nature*, and no believing Gentile nor his child is now or hath been a natural branch in the sense the Apostle means, *Rom.*11.24.

But Mr. *Bls.* chief objection is this, "If the ingrafting be by a "saving faith onely, to derive saving graces personally inherent, as a "fruit of election from *Abraham*, then it must needs be that we are elect "in *Abraham*. *Abraham* may say, without me ye can do nothing, and "he that believeth in me, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living wa-"ter: And we may say, the life that we live in the flesh, we live by faith "in the son of *Terah*. This must necessarily follow, if *Abraham* be the "root, not onely respective to a conditional Covenant, but to the gra-"ces under condition covenanted.

Answ. 1. This objection may be thus retorted, If the ingrafting be by a faith of profession onely, to derive onely outward ordinances, outward priviledges, Covenant holiness, visible Churchmembership, as a fruit of the Covenant from *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob* the root, then we are in Covenant in *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*: They may say, without us ye cannot be visible Churchmembers, &c. he that professeth faith in us, shall have outward Church priviledges; the priviledges we have in the visible Church, we have by profession of faith in the son of *Terah*. This must necessarily follow, if *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob* be the root respective to the Covenant and Covenant holiness, as Mr. *Bl.* asserts.

When

when Mr. *Bl.* hath freed himself from these absurdities, I shall have somewhat more to answer him. 2. In the mean time my answer in my *Apology* is, that the absurdities follow not on my opinion, who make not *Abraham* a roo. as communicating faith by infusion or impetration mediatory as Christ, but as an exemplary cause of believing, in which sense he is stiled *the father of believers*, *Rom* 4 11, 12.

To this Mr. *Bl.* in his flirting fashion replies thus, *A root not by communication, but example; an ingraffing not to have any thing communicated from the root, but to imitate it, is such a catachresis as may well make all Rhetoricks ashamed of it; and if the Sun ever saw a more notable piece of non sense, I am to seek what sense is. A root is too low in the earth to have its examples followed, and a fyens sucks in juyce, but knowes not how to imitate.*

Answ. 1. Mr. *Bl.* grosly abuseth me by insinuating as if I mentioned a root *not by communication, but example: and ingraffing not to have any thing from the roo, but to imitate it:* But this I said, that *Abraham* is not termed *the root* as communicating faith by infusion, or impetration mediatory as Christ, but as an exemplary cause of believing, and the ingraffing I make to bee Gods act of giving faith after *Abrahams* example, whereby righteousness is communicated from *Abraham* as the precedent or pattern, according to which God gives both, though the branches do not themselves imitate *Abraham*. Now this is no more nonsense then to term him a father without any other begetting or communicating then as an exemplary cause, which the Apostle doth, *Rom.* 4. 11, 12. and (as I shew in the first part of this *Review*, *Sect.* 2. *pag.* 1.) Dr. *willet*, *Diodati*, *Pareus*, do so expound *the root* and *father of the faithfull*; so that if there bee non-sense, these learned men with the Apostle are to bee charged with it, as well as my self, which may redound more to Mr. *Bls.* then to the shame of Rhetorick. And *if a root bee too low in the earth to bee as an example*, so is a fathers begetting too hidden a thing to bee our example, yet *Abrahams* believing and justification may bee Gods example according to which hee gives faith and righteousness. 2. When Mr. *Bl.* makes *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, the root as communicating Ordinances, visible Churchmembership, *&c.* I would know how hee makes them communicating roots of these to believing Gentiles infants. Sure not by natural generation, for neither mediately nor immediately are they roots to them that way: not by teaching or example, for they are not things imitable, nor are they to them teachers, or visible examples: not by communicating to them the Covenant, that is, Gods act. What way soever hee make them the root according to his opinion there will bee as much non-sense and shame to Rhetorick, and less truth in his explication then in mine. What hee adds, that *whatsoever kinde of root I make it, yet it is a communicative root*, *vers.* 17. I grant it in the sense expressed, not of communication by infusion or mediatory impetration, but as an *Idea*.

And what hee saith further, that *the term Father and root are not full synonyma's, yet in the main they agree*; is as much as I need to shew

that it is no more non-ſenſe to term him a root who communicates ſap onely as a pattern, then it is to term him a Father who begets onely as an example.

And whereas hee ſaith, *both metaphors aptly ſet forth what the branches as from a root, the children as from a Father receive, namely their title to the Covenant from him; and therefore as to* Abraham, *ſo to all Iſrael pertained the Covenants and the Adoption, Rom.* 9. 4, 5. *And ſo to all that are become children and branches with them.* I grant the metaphors ſet forth what the branches and children receive from the root and father: But that the thing received is title to the Covenant in Mr. *Bls.* ſenſe, that is to be partakers of outward ordinances (which is more truly non-ſenſe then my expreſſion of a root by exemplarity, or that to *Abraham* and ſo to all *Iſrael* pertained the Covenants and adoption, *Rom.* 9. 4, 5. or that to the ingraffed branches or Gentile children of *Abraham*, belonged the Covenants and adoption and other priviledges which are there appropriated to *Iſrael* after the fleſh, though not imparted to all) there alledged, is denied. Title to the Covenant of grace is not communicated to Gentile believers any otherwiſe, then in that they are made *Abrahams* ſeed by faith, and this is communicated to them no otherwiſe from *Abraham* then as an example, and therefore he is a root no other way then I aſſigne, if there bee any other way it is more then yet Mr. *Bl.* hath ſhewed.

Yet hee adds, *the title Father is yet extended to a greater Latitude, as hee doth impart to his iſſue (as before) ſo hee is a pattern and example as even natural parents are likewiſe according as* Rom. 4. 12. *(quoted by Mr.* T.*) is ſet forth, yet that place is too palpably abuſed.*

Anſw. Though Fathers bee examples and patterns to their children in their actions, yet not all nor onely parents are ſuch, nor is *Abraham* called a *Father* there becauſe hee was a good pattern onely, but becauſe hee as the Archtype or primitive pattern begat Jews and Gentile believers as his ſeed to faith, nor in this or any thing have I abuſed the Apoſtle.

Mr. *Bl.* tels mee. "The ſteps of the faith of the Father *Abraham* "is the doctrine of faith which *Abraham* believed, or the profeſſion "of faith which hee made. All that were profeſſedly Jews, and all that "were profeſſedly Chriſtians, walk in the ſteps of that faith: All "circumciſed believers had not that faith that juſtifies, nor yet all "the uncircumciſed; and *Abraham* is a father of both. Hee could "bee exemplary as a pattern to bee followed, onely in that which "is external; his faith *quà* juſtifying could not bee ſeen to bee "imitated.

Anſw. I abhor it to abuſe the Apoſtle ſo palpably as Mr. *Bl.* doth here. For it appears not onely from the main drift of the Apoſtle in the whole Chapter precedent, ſpecially *v.* 9, 10. but alſo from the very words *v.* 11. *that righteouſneſs might be imputed to them alſo*, that the Apoſtle ſpeaks of that faith onely which is juſtifying, which is *believing with the heart*, *Rom.* 10 10. And therefore thoſe ſpeeches are palpably falſe, *that the ſteps of the faith of the Father* Abraham *is the doctrine of faith*,

faith which Abraham *believed* (which may be by a Teacher that neither believes nor profesſeth) *or the profeſſion of faith which he made* (which a *Judas* or *Simon Magus* might have, and ſo ſhould have righteouſneſs imputed to them as *Abraham* had) *that all profeſſed Jewes or Chriſtians walke in the ſteps of that faith, that* Abraham *is Father of thoſe uncircumciſed believers who had not that faith that juſtifies.* As for Mr. *Bls.* reaſon, it is againſt himſelfe; for *Abrahams* profeſſion could no more bee ſeene to bee imitated in the Apoſtles dayes then his faith as juſtifying: both might be known by Gods word, and be followed as a pattern, though I conceive the Apoſtle makes thoſe *to walk in the ſteps of* Abrahams *faith*, who do believe as hee did, though they never ſaw or heard of *Abrahams* believing, as he may be ſaid to write after a Copy who writes the ſame, though he never ſaw the Copy.

He adds, "And the like he hath *pag.* 78. I make *Abraham* onely "the root, as he is onely the Father of believers exemplarily; and "that which made him the Father of believers, was not the Covenant, "but his exemplary faith, as I gather from the words of the Apoſtle, "*Rom.* 9. 16, 17, 18, 19, 21. Did none but *Abraham* give an example unto "others of believing? The Apoſtle to the *Hebrews* ſets him out, *chap.* 11. "as one example among many; we find many that went before him, *A-*"*bel, Enoch, Noah*; and more that followed after him. And I ſhould "rather think that the Text by him produced, proves without any con-"tradiction, that the Covenant made *Abraham* the father of believers; "he is the called three Father of us all, and a Text quoted for it, which "is *Gen.* 17. 5. A Father of many nations I have made thee: And whe-"ther that be not by vertue of Covenant, let the context be conſulted, "together with the Apoſtles words, *Rom.* 4. 11. He cloſed with God in "Covenant, and accepted the ſeal of the Covenant, that according to "Covenant he might be the Father of all them that believe.

Anſw. 1. If *Abel, Enoch, Noah, be ſet out as examples of believing* with a faith juſtifying, *Heb.* 11. 4, 5, 6, 7. *by which* Noah *became heir of the righteouſneſs which is by faith*, then it is not true which Mr. *Bl.* ſaith a little before, *that* Abraham *could be exemplary as a pattern to be followed onely in that which is external.* 2. Many before and after did believe as *Abraham*, and they are examples to us, *Heb.* 6. 12. Yet we find not any whoſe faith was remarkably tried and approved as *Abrahams*, and therefore none denominated the Father of believers beſides him. 3. It is granted the promiſe or Covenant was the object of *Abrahams* faith, and that it did aſſure that he ſhould be the Father of believers both of Jews and Gentiles; yet the reaſon of the denomination of Father of believers is made onely his eminent faith, and the form denominating him is his relation to them, the foundation of which was his begetting believers exemplarily. 4. *Rom.* 4. 11. It is neither ſaid *Abraham cloſed with God in Covenant, nor that he accepted the ſeal of the Covenant*, nor is there in that *v.* any mention of the Covenant, or of the ſeal of the Covenant, but *v.* 16. the Apoſtle having termed *Abraham the Father of us all*, *v.* 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. he lets out his faith as moſt eminent, and that as the reaſon of his Fatherhood.

Mr. *Bl.* to what *I* said, *the fatneſs of the Olive tree*, *Diodati* ſaid truly, *it the bleſſing and promiſe made to* Abraham *and to his ſeed, and ſo the Apoſtle expreſſeth, Gal.* 3. 14. ſaith, *This we grant, and priviledge of ordinances contained this bleſſing and this promiſe; we know the Goſpel to be the power of God to ſalvation.* To which *I* reply, *The bleſſing, Gal.* 3. 14. is juſtification, v. 8, 9. and *the promiſe is of the ſpirit through faith*, which a man may be without, though he have the outward priviledge of ordinances, and therefore are not contained in it: Nor is *the Goſpel the power of God to ſalvation* without faith; and therefore if the ingraffing be onely into the viſible Church and a perſon have onely the priviledge of ordinances, he may be without the bleſſing and promiſe made to *Abraham* and to his ſeed, *Gal.* 3. 14. which is granted by Mr. *Bl.* to be *the fatneſs* meant *Rom.* 11. 17. and therefore *the fatneſs* is more then outward priviledges and ordinances, and *I* ſaid truly it is too waſhy and frigid an expoſition which doth ſo expound it, and this waſhes away the duſt Mr. *Bl.* caſts on *Rom.* 11. 17.

But he argues thus. "That wherein the Jews exceeded the Gentiles, "is the fatneſs whereof the Gentiles partake, when they are ingraffed "inſtead of the Jews; this none can deny, for this makes them their "equals and copartners: But it is priviledges of ordinances (how frigid and waſhy thing ſoever Mr. *T.* little better then profanely makes it) is the priviledge wherein Jews exceeded Gentiles, *Rom.* 3. 1. "*Deut.* 4. 7, 8. *Pſal.* 147. 19, 20. Therefore this is the fatneſs of the Olive.

Anſw. The *major* is not true, if univerſal: and Mr. *Bl's.* reaſon proves it. For the Gentiles when ingraffed, were not made equals and copartners in many things wherein the Jews before exceeded the Gentiles. All thoſe things mentioned *Rom* 9. 4, 5. were prerogatives of the Jewes never imparted to the Gentile believers, yea that priviledge mentioned *Rom.* 3. 1. *the committing the Oracles of God*, the Chriſtian Gentiles were never made equals and copartners with the Jews in, God did never give oracles and anſwers to the Chriſtian Gentiles, nor the Tables of the Covenant, and the Book of the Law to be kept, as hee did to the Jews. But that wherein the Jews and Gentiles were made equals and copartners, was juſtification by faith, and union with Chriſt by his ſpirit, as *Epheſ.* 3. 6. *Gal.* 3. 28, 29, *&c.* and therefore this argument is rightly retorted thus on Mr. *Bl.* That wherein the Gentiles ingraffed were equals and copartners with the Jews is *the fatneſs* meant *Rom.* 11. 17. But this is not the priviledges of Ordinances, but juſtification and oneneſs in Chriſt, *ergo* that is *the fatneſs* mean *Rom.* 11. 17.

To what I ſaid, that the Gentiles were not partakers of the outward priviledges and ordinances of *Abraham* and the Jews, they being taken away, hee ſaith, *if that of the Apoſtle bee true, that the Goſpel was preached to* Abraham, *Gal.* 3. 8. *then this cannot bee falſe. If the Rock and Manna in the wilderneſs bee the ſame, as that on which we feed,* 1 Cor. 10. 2. *the outward priviledges of that people may well then bee the ſame with ours.*

Anſw. 1. If the outward priviledges and ordinances of *Abraham* and the

the Jews be the same with ours, then not onely the preaching the Gospel, but also Circumcision, the Passeover, the Temple, High Priest, sacrifices, *&c.* must be the same to us as to them. 2. Though the Gospel be preached to us which was preached to them, yet not in the same manner; it was preached to them as future, to us as accomplished; nor by the same ordinances, not by the slaying the Paschal Lamb, the High Priests going into the most Holy place with bloud once a year, *&c.* 3. Nor is it true that *the Rock and Manna in the wilderness is the same as that on which we feed*, 1 *Cor* 10.3,4. though it be true the same Christ or spiritual meate and drinke was signified by the Manna they ate, and the water out of the Rocke which they dranke, which is signified by the Bread and Wine wee receive in the Lords Supper: But this doth not shew the same outward privileges of the Jews and us, but the same spirituall benefits signified to them which are to us.

He next tels me, *I have taken pains for my own full refutation; for if Abraham be the root, then the natural posterity of* Abraham *must of necessity be the natural branches which were cut off*: which he endeavours to prove from *Rom.* 9.2,3. *&* 11.1,14. though the conclution be not denied, but oft asserted by me; and then brings in *Paul* thus disputing, *Pauls kinsmen after the flesh were the Church visible, not invisible*: *But Pauls kindred according to the flesh were the branches cut off*; *Ergo*, the Church visible not invisible was cut off: Which conclusion doth not contradict any thing I assert, who never made the Church invisible cut off, but some branches broken off from the Church invisible which was formerly in that people. So that Mr. *Bl.* hitherto hath made no answer to my arguments, but talkd at randome quite besides the matter urged in them.

My 5th. argument was. If the breaking off the Jews were by blinding, then the ingrafting was by giving faith; but the former is true, *v.* 25. *Ergo*, the later.

To this Mr. *S.* saith, *There is not the same reason, seeing he takes it of giving saving faith; their blinding was judicial, a punishment for their unbelieving rejecting of the Gospel, though they had not saving faith to embrace the Gospel; the giving of faith is not in such terms; neither is saving faith so absolutely antecedent to make a man a member of the visible Church, as blinding to Gods final rejection.*

Answ. He saieth *there is not the same reason*, but shews not why if the breaking off be by blinding, the ingrafting should not be by giving a saving faith. Sure according to all the Logick I ever learned it is as clear an argument as can be in this case, that where opposite effects are put, the one effect being from one cause, the other should be from the opposite cause. Tis true, I take the inlightning opposite to blinding to be *the giving saving faith*: yet do not think the blinding *v.* 25. to have been *judicial a punishment for their unbelieving, rejecting of the Gospel*, but as it is *v* 32. *the veery shutting up in unbelief*, the antecedent to unbelief, consequent on reprobation opposite to election, as *v* 7,8,9,10. do plainly shew, not consequent to unbelief. What he means by *the giving*

ving of faith is not on such terms, I cannot readily divine; the speech seems to me to be either non-sense, there being no terms forementioned that I can perceive to which it may be referred, or else it is impertinent to the answering the objection, and so as that which follows. For though *the giving of saving faith be not on such terms* as Mr. *S.* means, or that *it be not so absolutely antecedent to make a man a member of the visible Church as blinding is to Gods final rejection*, doth it follow, that if the breaking off be by blinding, *v.* 25. the ingrafting is not by giving faith, *v.* 24? But Mr. *S.* adds.

2. *Blindness came but in part on Israel; it fell onely on the meer visible members, not the invisible and elect: therefore the ingraffi g must be onely of visible members into the visible Church, v.* 7. *The election hath obtained it, but the rest were blinded.*

Answ. There is no shew of consequence that I know in it, that if blindness fall not on the elect, therefore ingrafting is not of the elect onely; the argument is plain on the contrary even from *vers.* 7. alledged by him, the rest to wit the non-elect were blinded, therefore the ingrafted who obtained were onely the elect, and their obtaining and ingrafting was by such enlightening as wrought saving faith in them.

Mr. *Bl grants the conclusion, that the ingrafting is by giving faith, but a faith of profession into a Churchstate, as he answered to the* 3*d. arg.* To which I reply, 1. If it were giving of such a faith, yet infants would be excluded, sith they are not so ingrafted. 2. The ingrafting notes more then admission by an outward ordinance. 3. I proved from the Text *v.* 7, 8, 10. that the blinding was of those who are not elect; and therefore the inlightening by which *the election obtains*, or the Gentiles are ingrafted is that, as Dr. *Ames* saith *Antisynod. animadv. in art.* 1. *c.* 16. *whereby they obtain faith and salvation from election.* And I used these words, If the blinding be the effect of reprobation, and the breaking off be by blinding, then the ingrafting is by inlightening, and that inlightening is according to election, and so is all one with giving of faith, by which I mean justifying or saving faith.

At this passage Mr. *Bl.* lays about him thus, "Here is Divinity "which calls for patience in a degree above all that is Christian; which "one of the *Contraremonstants*, worthy the name of an adversary of the "*Arminians*, hath taught this Doctrine? It is that which their adversa- "ries indeed charge upon them, but that which they unanimously do dis- "claim. I have heard that reprobation is the antecedent of sin, but ne- "ver that it was the cause; and that sin is a consequent of it, but never "an effect. Reprobation is the act of God; and in case it be the cause "of blindness, then God is the cause: So that the *Contraremonstrants* "have got a sweet Advocate to cast that upon them, that none of their "adversaries (though they have turned every stone to it) could never "prove by them.

Answ. 1. I did onely use this expression [if the blinding be the effect of reprobation] which causeth all this insulting, which doth not positively assert it, onely Mr. *Bl.* gathers it from the assumption which he

supposeth

ſuppoſeth I would have put, which is not very candid dealing. 2. The aſſumption he ſets down thus, *then his aſſumption can be no other, but that blindneſs is the effect of reprobation*: But herein he doth greſly abuſe me. For I did not ſay, if blindneſs be the effect of reprobation, but if blinding be the effect of reprobation, between which there is a great difference. For blindneſs is mans ſin, but blinding is Gods act, aſcribed to God *v.*8. when it is ſaid, *God hath given them a ſpirit of ſlumber, eys that they ſhould not ſee.* And *Joh.*12.40. *He hath blinded their eys, and hardened their heart.* And this act being no other then the certain permiſſion of ſin, is commonly made by Proteſtants an effect and means executing the decree of reprobation, which is no other then blinding. *Potav. ſynt. l.*4. *c.*10. *Reprobationis effectus eſt permiſſio lapſus. Ames. med. Theol. l.*1. *c.*25. §. *Tertium reprobationis actus eſt intentio dirigendi media illa, quibus juſtitia poſſit in reprobas manifeſtari. Media hujus generis maxime propria ſunt permiſſio peccati, derelictio in peccato, Rom.*9 18. 2 *Theſ.*2.11,12. *Calvin. Inſtit. l.*3. *c.*23. §.1. *unde* (from *Rom.*9.18.) *ſequitur abſconditum Dei conſilium obdurationis eſſe cauſam.* Yea, § 4. he ſaith, *Cujus rei* (*defectionis Angelorum*) *cauſa non poteſt alia adduci quam reprobatio, quæ in arcano Dei conſilio abſcondita eſt. Vide Andr. Rivet. ſum. contro. tract.*4. *q.*6,7. And *Piſcat. obſerv.*9. *e Rom.*9.10,11,12,13. *Errant igitur qui putant prædeſtinationem pendere a prævisis operibus, vel a prævisa fide, vel incredulitate. Imo hæc omnia prædeſtinationis effecta ſunt: quomodo igitur poſſunt ſtatui prædeſtinationis cauſæ?* So that if I had taught (as Mr. *Bl.* miſreports me) that Gods reprobation cauſeth blindneſs; yet I had Authours worthy the name of adverſaries to the *Arminians* ſo ſaying: Nor have I done any *ſuch high diſ ſervice to the anti-Arminians* as in the Table at the end of his Book he chargeth me with. 3. If Mr. *Bl.* had not minded to pick a quarrel, he might have interpreted (as indeed I meant) the term *effect* not ſtrictly or rigourouſly, as *Scheibler* ſpeaks, but in the ſenſe in which Logicians call the Eclipſe of the Moon, the effect of the interpoſition of the Earth between it and the Sun, though it be rather a conſequent, then an effect; after which manner I explained the term *cauſe* in the ſame Book, *Review, part* 1. *ſect.*35. *p.*238. 4. Let the word [*effect*] be left out, and let the word [*conſequent*] be put in, my argumen hath the ſame force; and therefore this was in Mr. *Bl.* a meer wrangling exception.

Let's view what he ſaith in anſwer thereto. He ſaith, "Mr. *T.* lays "all upon God, Gods reprobation cauſes blindneſs, and their breaking "off is by blinding; here is no hand but Gods in their deſtruction. "And now the blaſphemy of the conſequence being denied, ſo that blind-"neſs is no effect of reprobation, breaking off being not by blinding; "what becomes of the rule of oppoſites here produced? And Mr. *T.* "ſhould not be ignorant, that election and reprobation in the work of "ſalvation and damnation do not *per omnia quadrare*, otherwiſe as e-"lection leads to ſalvation without any merit of works, ſo reprobation "ſhould lead to deſtruction without any merit of ſin; which *Contrare-"monſtrants* unanimouſly deny, though Mr. *T.* here will have them to "affirm, having before quoted *v.*8. & 10. of this chapter, he ſaith from

"which

"which *Anti-Arminians* gather absolute reprobation, and then explains "himself what this absolute reprobation in his sense is in the words "spoken to. And then in opposition to me cite *Gomarus* denying ab. "solute reprobation in my sense, that God absolutely reprobates any "man to destruction without subordinate means, to wit, sin; that God "doth not effect sin, or decree to effect it: And Dr. *Prideaux*, that sin "follows not on reprobation as an efficient, but deficient; is a conse- "quent, not effect of reprobation: And Mr. *Ball*, that Gods decree is "not the cause of mans sin.

Answ. In all this there's not a word that takes away the force of the argument; if that word [*effect*] had been left out, as it was left out in the first framing of it, and [*consequent*] had been put in, though the argument had been as strong if that word had been used, or, as it was in the first framing, neither used. He accuseth me of blasphemy here as asserting blindness to be the effect of reprobation, that I lay all upon God, no hand but Gods in mens destruction; that I make *Contraremonstrants* to affirm an absolute reprobation without any merit of sin; and that I explain absolute reprobation gathered by them from *Rom.* 11.8,10. in this sense, of all which charges there is not one true; so that here is nothing but a fardel of manifest calumnies. And as for what he alledgeth, that *breaking off is not by blinding, because blindneß was their guilt, and casting off their just sentence, and the guilt and punishment are not one*, it doth no whit intringe my argument. For these may well stand together, that Gods reprobation is executed by blinding, and yet blindness their guilt, and upon their unbelief or blindness God breaks them off by a just sentence; as on the other side, election is the cause of Gods enlightening, whereby the ingrafted branches believe, and through faith they are by Gods act of grace ingrafted in to the invisible Church of true believers: And in this manner the rule of opposites holds evidently, although election and reprobation in the work of salvation and damnation do not *per omnia quadrare*, nor there be any such absolute reprobation as leads to destruction without any merit of sin. Which kind of absolute reprobation I never asserted, nor ascribed to *Contraremonstrants* who onely make reprobation absolute, in that the reason why God in his eternal decree or purpose did choose one to life and not another, is not the foreseen belief and obedience of one, or the foreseen unbelief or disobedience of the other, but his own will, *Rom.* 9.11,12,13,18. Nor do I make sin in proper or strict acception the effect of Gods act; I never said, blindness is the effect of Gods reprobation, as Mr. *Bl.* misreports me, nor that God doth by any positive influx work it in man as an efficient; but I said, blinding was the effect of reprobation in a larger sense, as effect is taken for a consequent, and that it was by blinding, which doth not at all gainsay the sayings of those learned Writers alledged by Mr. *Bl.* And if *Gods severity in not sparing the natural branches were explicitely no more then what Christ threatned*, *Matth.* 21.43. yet my argument holds good. For *the taking away of Gods Kingdome* is not onely the taking away of the preaching of the Gospel, but also the being of the Church of true believers among them as heretofore; and so

the

the breaking off was by blinding, and the ingraffing into the invisible Church of true believers by giving of faith according to election, which was to be proved.

My 6th. arg. was, If reingraffing of the Jews produceth salvation, is by turning them from iniquity, taking away their sins according to Gods Covenant, then it is into the invisible Church by giving faith, but the former is true *v.* 26, 27. *Ergo*, the later.

Mr. *S.* saith, "To which I give a fair answer, that doubtless accor-"ding to those promises, when the Jews shall be called in to be a visi-"ble Church again, there shall bee abundance of more glory brought in "with them, then ever yet the world saw; and the new heavens, and the "new earth, the coming down of the new Jerusalem and all those glori-"ous things are fitted to fall in with that time. And from these consider-"rations many do interpret *v.* 26. litterally, And so shall all Israel bee "saved. But get 1. they shall be ingraffed in as a visible Church, else *A-"braham* and the Fathers would never be mentioned as roots. 2. They shal "be ingraffed as they were broken off: now they were broken off as a "visible Church. 3. All that can be gathered is this, that the fulnes of "salvation, and the vertues of the promises shall more fully and univer-"sally take effect on the Jews, even to the salvation of all of them; and "so the invisible & visible Church be more pure and as one in the earth; "but this fulnes shall be to them as a visible Church and on the earth.

Answ. 'Tis a fair answer, but such as hath nothing to weaken the argument, there being neither of the premises denied, but the *minor* granted expresly, that *the vertues of the promises shall take effect on the Jews even to the salvation of all of them*, which if true, then none are ingraffed but elect persons, and their ingraffing into the invisible Church, now the ingraffing of the Gentiles, was the same with the re-ingraffing of the Jews, if then the Jews re ingraffing were into the invisible Church according to election, so is the ingraffing of the Gentiles. What hee saith, *yet they shall be ingraffed as a visible Church, and this fulnes shall be to them as a visible Church*, taking [*as*] reduplicatively cannot bee true, for then every visible Church should have all in it saved, and for the reasons he brings to prove, they are answered before, the fathers are not mentioned as roots, but *Abraham*, who is a root not of the visible Church as such, but of the invisible of true believers, and they are ingraffed as the other were broken off from the invisible Church.

Mr. *Bl.* saith, "This arg. well husbanded, might have made three; "to the first I say, that a Churchstate in Scripture phrase is salvation, "*Job.* 4. 22. seeing Churchmembers are partakers of saving ordinances; "And the fruition of ordinances under Gospel dispensations is a great "salvation, *Heb.* 2. 3. And so that text *Rom.* 11. 26. And so all Israel shall "be saved, must be understood as I told Mr. *T.* p. 67. of my answer out "of the last annotations, and so *Diodate*.

Answ. This then is the meaning of *Rom.* 11. 26. *All Israel shall bee saved*, that is, *they shall be in a visible Churchstate partakers of saving (outward) ordinances under Gospel dispensations*. But can Mr. *Bl.* or any sober man think this to be the meaning, *they shall be saved*, that is, they

ſhall be in ſuch an eſtate in which they may bee damned, and in which many are damned? or that God where hee mentions the effect of his his great Covenant of the Goſpel, means no more but ſuch an eſtate? Is this all or any part of the new Covenant *Heb.* 8 10, *&c. Heb.* 10. 16, 17. to have a meer viſible Churchſtate? I did alwayes think the Covenant of Grace had promiſed the ſpirit of Chriſt, that the Miniſtery thereof was *of the ſpirit*, 2 *Cor.* 3. 6, 8. *of righteouſneſs*, *v.* 9. not of a meer viſible Churchſtate. And ſure if we look to the place whence theſe words are quoted (as Mr. *Bl* ſaith) *Iſai.* 59. 20. *Jerem.* 31. 34 there is an expreſs promiſe of the ſpirits continuance upon them, which is ſure much beyond a viſible Churchſtate. As for what he brings out of Scripture, it is ſhamefully wreſted. For *Job.* 4. 22. a meer viſible Churchſtate is not termed *ſalvation*, but whether by it bee meant by a metonymy, the doctrine of ſalvation, or the authour of ſalvation Chriſt himſelf, it is certainly another thing then a meer viſible Churchſtate, yea in that ſenſe the ſpeech were abſurd to term a meer viſible Churchſtate ſalvation, and falſe to ſay that the viſible Churchſtate was of the Jewes. And for the other text *Heb* 2. 3 it doth not term *the fruition of outward Ordinances under Goſpel diſpenſations great ſalvation*, but the great beneſit purchaſed by Chriſt termed *eternal ſalvation*, *Heb.* 5. 9. declared and offered in the Goſpel. *Diodati annot.* on *Heb.* 2. 3. *So great*] *namely everlaſting redemption, revealed and communicated by the Goſpel, and implicitely oppoſed by the Apoſtle to the temporal deliverance out of Egypt, for the contemning of which the Iſraelites were puniſhed in the wilderneſs.* And though the *new Annot.* and *Diodati* paraphraſe *Rom.* 11. 26. by [*put into the way of ſalvation*] yet they do not reſtrain this to a meer viſible Churchſtate; yea both add, that by [*all Iſrael*] may be underſtood *the Iſrael of God*, *Gal.* 6. 16. *of Jews and Gentiles*, which is the inviſible Church. And *Dicſon* thus paraphraſeth the words, *And ſo all Iſrael, that is, the multitude of Jews comprehending the body of the people diſperſed ſhall be converted.* And *Piſcator* in his *Scholie*, *The fulneſs of Iſrael ſhall be ſaved, to wit being effectually called by the preaching of the Goſpel, and juſtified by faith in Chriſt. But what is ſaid of all Iſrael, is not to be extended to each, but to be underſtood of the greateſt part, from which the denomination is wont to be made.*

Mr. *Bl* adds, "And ſuch men brought into a Churchſtate are turned "from iniquity partially, from their former way of iniquity; their con- "tradicting and blaſpheming; having eſcaped the pollution of the world, "2 *Pet.* 2. 6. of the world that remains out of the Church of God.

Anſw. 1. Were this the meaning, yet infants ſhould be excluded, who are not thus turned. 2. That ſuch *a partial turning* cannot be meant, is manifeſt, in that the term is ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακὼβ, *ungodlineſſes*, that is, all ſorts of ungodlineſs *from Jacob* that is, as *Piſca or* in his *ſcholie*, *by pardoning or remitting and juſtifying by faith*, and this to be done by *the redeemer which ſhall come out of Sion* who ſo *turns from iniquity as to bleſs them whom he turns*, *Acts* 3. 26. which doth not agree to Mr. *Bls.* partial turning. More rightly *Dicſon* thus paraphraſeth the words. *He foretelleth that ſo it ſhould be, that the true redeemer ſhould free his nation from*

the

the guilt and ſervitude of ſin, the iniquities of that people being pardoned; and that it ſhould be, that he would receive them into the Covenant of grace to the full aboliſhing of ſin.

But, ſaith Mr. *Bl.* " Their ſin is pardoned *quoad hoc*: and when *Moſes* prayed for the pardon of the ſin of *Iſrael*, *Exod.* 32. and God promiſeth it, 2 *Chron.* 7. 14. it is ſo to be underſtood of a national pardon.

Anſw. A partial pardon *quoad hoc* of ſome particular ſin, and releaſing onely of ſome particular evil, cannot be meant *Rom.* 11. 26, 27. ſith it is *a taking away of their ſins*, by the agency of *the redeemer that comes out of Sion*, and according *to Gods Covenant to them*; which is the ſame with that, *Jer.* 31 33. *Heb.* 8. 12. & 10. 16, 17. in which *eternal redemption and inheritance* are aſſured, *Heb.* 9. 12. 15. I grant it ſhall be a national pardon, underſtanding by nation the greateſt or chiefeſt part of the nation, but different from the pardon obtained by *Moſes*, *Exod.* 32. or promiſed, 2 *Chron.* 7. 14.

To what I ſaid in anſwer to Mr. *Geree*, that I thought at the Jews reſtauration there ſhall be ſome of them formaliſts and hypocrites, but none of the re-ingraffed, Mr. *Bl* replies, *The re-ingraffing here is in their ſtead that fell away by multitudes, and therefore were hypocrites and formaliſts, and the ingraffed ſuch as might fall, which is not ſpiritual Iſrael, but carnal.* But the text doth not ſay, *the Jews ſhall be re-ingraffed in their ſtead that fell away by multitudes*, but onely that the Gentiles be graffed into the Olive in ſtead of the Jews broken off, *v.* 17. and the Jews ſhall be re ingraffed *when the fulneſs of the Gentiles ſhall come in*, and both be ingraffed together, not the one broken off to make room for the other, as in the calling of the Gentiles, *v.* 19. Yet were it ſo as Mr. *Bl.* ſaith, how doth it follow, the re-ingraffing here is in their ſtead that fell away by multitudes, *Ergo* the re-ingraffed were ſome of them formaliſts and hypocrites? I conceive it follows rather on the contrary, thoſe that fell away were hypocrites, therefore they that are ingraffed in their ſtead are living branches, or ſincere believers. As for what he ſaid before about the falling away of the ingraffed, is anſwered before.

But Mr. *Bl.* yet adds, " There is a national pardon, and a perſonal: " pardon is oft applied to a national return, as 2 *Chron.* 7. 14. & *Jerem.* " 18. 7, 8. there it is the removal of drought, locuſts, peſtilence; here " their judgement was the vail of blindneſs, not aſſenting to the Goſ- " pel light; and they ſhall be ſaved from this blindneſs, as the text " expreſly hath it, *v* 25, 26.

Anſw. This blindneſs is no way removed but by giving of faith, as is proved before; and therefore this proves for me, the ingraffing to be giving faith according to election, and all the ingraffed to be elect.

Yet once more ſaith Mr. *Bl.* " The words quoted out of *v.* 26, 27. are " partly from *Iſa.* 59. 20. and partly from *Jerem.* 31. 34. as I conceive, " which in the Prophets are directly ſpoken of a national return, and na- " tional pardon, as Mr. *B.* of one of them hath well obſerved: but in New " Teſtament Scriptures variouſly applied, as all know that text of *Habak-* " *kuk* is, *ch.* 2. 4. That of *Jeremy* is applied perſonally: but here, as the con-

text is clear, it, must bee applied nationally to Israel according to the flesh. The vail shall be taken from them on whom it lies; it lies on Israel according to the flesh: what mystery had the Apostle revealed in case he had onely shewed that all elect believers should be saved?

Answ. Though that were no mystery, yet it was a mystery, that God should contrive it so that *Israel* Gods people formerly should now be blind, and the Gentiles see, and *when their fulneß is come in*, then *all Israel should be saved*, who were then broken off. And this salvation is to be national, and yet spiritual, there being a national effectual conversion to God, although all of the nation be not converted, as well as there is a national return from captivity, and yet not all return. The words being quoted from *Isai.* 59. 20. *Jer.* 31. 34. there being no reason to the contrary they should be applied personally here, as they are *Heb.* 8. 12. & 10. 16, 17. I shall close up the vindication of this argument with the words of Dr. *Owen of perseverance Ch.* 7. §. 24. *The force then of this promiſe*, Isa. 59. 20 *and the influence it hath into the eſtabliſhment of the truth we have in hand, the perpetual abiding of the ſpirit with the Saints, will not be evaded and turned aſide, by affirming, that it is made to the whole people of Israel. For be des, that the ſpirit of the Lord could not bee ſaid to bee in the ungodly re ected part of them, nor his word in their mouth, there is not the leaſt in text and context, to intimate ſuch an extent of this promiſe as to the ob ect of it, and tis very weakly attempted to bee proved from* Pauls *accommodation, and interpretation of the v. fore going in* Rom. 11.26. *For it is moſt evident, and indiſputable to any one, who ſhall but once caſt an eye upon that place, that the Apoſtle accommodates and applies theſe words to none, but onely thoſe who ſhall be ſaved, being turned away from ungodlineß to Chriſt, which are onely the ſeed before deſcribed. And thoſe hee cals all Israel; either in the ſpiritual ſenſe of the word, as taken for the choſen Israel of God, or elſe indefinitely for that nation, upon the account of thoſe plentiful fruits, which the Goſpel ſhall finde amongſt them, when they ſhall fear the Lord and his goodneß in the latter dayes.*

My ſeventh argument was, If the re-ingraffing bee by vertue of Gods election and love, his gifts of calling, then it is into the invisible Church, by election and giving of faith; But the former is true *v.* 28, 29 *Ergo*, the latter. Mr. *S.* anſwers, 1. "It's ſaid, that as touching electi-"on the Jews are beloved for their fathers ſake; hence it follows, God "hath a love of election to believers and their natural ſeed; for ſo the "Jews were the natural ſeed of *Abraham*.

Anſw. It followes not of believing Gentiles and their natural ſeed, for this is ſpoken peculiarly of the Jews. Nor doth it follow of all the natural ſeed of *Abraham*, the contrary is determined *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. nor of any at all times, as in the time of their great Apoſtaſie. Much leſs doth it hence follow, as it hath been pleaded for Pædobaptiſm, that becauſe God loved the Jews for the fathers ſake, therefore wee are to take in the parcels, all the infants of inchurched believers, to bee elect and in the Covenant of Grace, and thereupon to baptiſe them, this to my apprehenſion hath not a ſhadow of conſequence.

But,

But saith Mr. *S* 2. *It's granted that the calling of the Jews shall be according to Gods election and first love; and that Gods election shall more fully take hold of the Jews at their recalling, then of any nation: but yet still the argument is of no force to prove that their re-ingraffing and so ours is onely or firstly into the invisible Church; for they are elected as well to be a visible Church, as to be partakers of inward graces; and their re-ingraffing must be specially and firstly into the visible Church from which they were broken off, or else there will be no correspondence between their rejection and re-ingraffing.*

Answ. Yet the arg. is of force to prove it is into the invisible Church, so as none are re-ingraffed but the elect and partakers of inward graces, though it were granted that their re-ingraffing be specially and firstly into the visible Church: Yea, Mr. *S*s reason is against himself, to wit their re-ingraffing be not firstly and specially into the invisible Church by faith, there will be no correspondence between their re-ingraffing and rejection, which was firstly and specially from the invisible Church by unbelief.

Mr. *Bl.* answers thus. *His election, love, and gifts of calling, did at the first put them into a visible Churchstate and condition,* Deut. 7.7,8. *And the same love, election, and gifts of calling, now they are broken off, doth re-ingraff them; if this argument hold, it was an invisible Church that was brought out of the land of Ægypt.*

Answ. According to Mr. *Bl.* the Apostle should mean that *the election* and *love*, *Rom.* 11.28. are meant of such election and love as may be to them that perish, and such *a calling and gifts* as may be lost, for such the election into a meer visible Churchstate and condition, and calling, and love, and gifts are, which Mr. *Bl. p.*302. will have to be the meaning of the Apostle here. But this is not meant here, 1. because that election, love, gifts and calling are here meant, as are from the Covenant of the Redeemer, *v* 26,27. and whereby *all Israel shall be saved*; this is manifest from the connexion, the words *v* 28,29. being a confirmation of the proposition *all Israel shall be saved*, *v* 26. from *the Covenant to turn away impieties from Jacob, and to take away their sins*, for this reason, because *they are beloved according to the election and calling of God*, which are unchangeable. But such salvation, election, love, gifts and calling never happen to them that perish, the Covenant, turning away from impieties, and taking away sins, belong onely to them who are eternally saved; therefore they are not an election, love, gifts, and calling which put into a meer visible Churchstate and condition.

2. Such gifts and calling of God are not here meant which are revocable, or of which God repents; for to be *without repentance* is to be without revocation, or change: But the gifts and calling which are into a meer visible Churchstate, are revocable and with repentance, as both the Scripture and experience shews, therefore they are not here meant.

3. That calling and election are meant here which are ascribed to God in the passages where there is speech of Gods election and calling of persons before in the 8th. 9th. and 11th. chapters; for it is manifest, that the dispute about election and calling of the Jews and Gentiles, *ch.* 9,10,11. arose from the words of the Apostle, *Rom.* 8,28,29, *&c.* But

the

the election and calling in all the passages signifies such an election and calling as is to eternal life and righteousness, as is manifest from *Rom.*8.28,30,33. *Rom.*9.7,11,24,25,26. *Rom.*11.5,7. Therefore not an election or calling into a meer visible Church state.

4. That calling and election is meant here, which is usually, if not always, meant by the Apostles in their writings. For it's likely *Paul* would speak here in the sense in which the word is commonly used, there being no cogent reason to the contrary. But the words *election* and *calling* in the Apostles writings are taken usually, if not always, for election and calling to righteousness and eternal life, as may appear by these places, 1 *Cor.*1.2,9,24,26,27,28,29. & 7.15,18,20. *Ephes.*1.4,18. & 4.1,4. *Gal.*1.6,15. & 5.8,13. *Phil.*3.14. *Col.*3.12,15. 1 *Thes.*1.4 & 2.12. & 5.24. 2 *Thes.*1.11. & 2.11,14. 1 *Tim.*5.21. & 6.12. 2 *Tim.* 1.9. & 2.10. *Tit.*1.1. *Heb.*3.1. & 9.15. *James* 2.5. 1 *Pet* 1.1,15. & 2.9 & 5.10. 2 *Pet.*1.3,10. *Jude* 1. *Revel.*17.14. Therefore the meaning is in like manner, *Rom.*11.28,29.

That which Mr. *Bl.* alledgeth from *Deut.*7.6,7. doth not weaken this. For though it prove that which is not denied, that there is an election of a people to a visible Churchstate; yet it proves not such an election and love to be meant *Rom.*11.28. nor by my argument doth it with any colour of reason follow, that *the Church brought out of Ægypt was the invisible Church*, because they are said to be chosen, *Deut.*7.6,7. any more then because *Judas* is said *to be chosen* by Christ, *John* 6.70. therefore *election*, *Rom.*11.28. is into a meer visible Churchstate or Apostleship.

But Mr. *Bl.* after his calumny *of my disservice to the Anti Arminians* wiped away before, tels us *that the Apostle there delivers an universal proposition, and applies it to such election, love, and gifts that belongs to bodies or nations, yet it is a truth that equally holds, when it is applied to election to salvation, and with just warranty is applied by Divines to that purpose.*

Answ. It is not true that the Apostle delivers, *Rom.*11.29. an universal proposition concerning any election, love, calling, gifts, for then it would be false, there be many gifts and callings of God which are not without repentance in the Apostles sense; but a proposition of the gifts and calling which are to salvation, according to that love and election which are to everlasting salvation according to the Covenant mentioned *v.* 26 27. and therefore those Divines who understand it of election, love, gifts and calling to a meer visible Churchstate and condition, have no warranty to apply it to prove that election and perseverance which the Text, if they speak true, speaks not of; and the argmuent from thence for that purpose is utterly enervated by that interpretation, sith the assumption is by it made confessedly false, if the argument be thus framed, That decree is immutable, and that gift and calling of God do certainly continue which the Apostle saith are without repentance. But the Apostle saith the decree of election to eternal life, and the gift of taking away sins and the calling which is inward are without repentance. *Ergo.* As for *Pareus* his forming it as from the less to the greater, it

is

is, as for the moſt part ſuch arguments are, liable to many exceptions; and in this matter hath no ſtrength; for then it would follow, that if Gods gift and calling to viſible Churchſtate is without repentance, calling to the office of a *Presbyter*, which is more, is without repentance. I deny not but Commentators do ſpeak ſome of them as Mr. *Bl.* alledgeth, and ſome doubtfully of which election and calling to underſtand it, and ſome ſpeak diſjunctively as if it were meant of either; and ſome one while means it of the one, and another while of the other. But it is not worth while to ſearch into or ſet down their words. It is ſufficient that I have demonſtrated that it muſt be meant of ſuch election, love, gifts and calling as are to ſaving holineſs, and righteouſneſs, and eternal life. Yet thoſe which I alledged as writing againſt the *Arminians*, and underſtanding it of the decree of election unto life and perſeverance in ſaving grace, Mr. *Bl.* denies not that I have rightly cited them, onely he will not have *Ames* ſo peremptory as I am, by reaſon of ſome words of his, from which Mr. *Bl.* doth moſt falſely inter thus, [*ſo that it appears according to him that they ſpake truth in the denial of this to be meant of the unchangeable decree of eternal election,*] which they who read *Ames* his words in his *Coronis*, *art.* 5. *cap.* 4. may eaſily diſcern. I add to thoſe I cited in the firſt part of this *Review*, *ſect.* 2. *pag.* 15. Dr. *Owen*, *of perſeverance*, *c.* 2. §. 7. *&c.* Dr. *Kendal*, *of redemption*, *ch.* 8. *pag.* 20, *&c.* The reaſon why ſome will not have it meant of election and effectual calling to ſalvation is their miſtake, that particular perſons may not be ſaid to fall away from ſuch election and calling. For though it be true, that the particular perſons never fall away from their perſonal election and calling, yet they may fall away from that election and calling to eternal life which they in their anceſtors had; which ſenſe I have ſhewed to be agreeable to the Apoſtles meaning, in the firſt part of this *Review*, *ſect.* 3. And Dr. *Twiſs* in his *Vind. Grat. l.* 3. *err.* 8. *ſect.* 3. *acknowledgeth that when the Apoſtle ſaith*, *Rom.* 11. 23. *they ſhall be graffed in, he means it not of thoſe individuals in their perſons, but their poſterity.*

But Mr. *Bl.* argues thus. *The Fathers for whoſe ſake they are beloved are the ancient Fathers from whom after the fleſh they did proceed, ſpecially* Abraham, Iſaac, *and* Jacob, *the word is for the Fathers: Then election muſt needs be underſtood of an external grace of the Covenant, whereby God choſe this nation to himſelf, according to that of* Moſes, Deut. 7. 6. *unleſs we are elect in* Abraham *to ſalvation and not in Chriſt. And* Abraham, Iſaac, *and* Jacob *are our mediators of reconciliation: and when the Apoſtle ſaith, we are accepted in the beloved,* Epheſ. 1. 6. *it is to be underſtood of acceptation in* Abraham: *and we are to conclude our prayers, not in and through Chriſt, but* Abraham, Iſaac, *and* Jacob; *we are not for their ſakes beloved to ſalvation.*

Anſw. 1. That the election, *Deut.* 7. 6. muſt be underſtood of an external grace of the Covenant, needs better proof then Mr. *Bl.* brings. For God may be ſaid to chooſe a nation, and yet not chooſe every one of the nation, it being uſual, as Mr *Cobbet* obſerves, *Juſt. vindic. part* 2. *ch.* 2. that things ſaid of a people collectively are meant of the greater or better part diſtributively. 2. The abſurdities will preſs Mr. *Bl.* as

well

well as me. For if, as Mr. *Bl.* saith, the election and love be to a meer visible Churchstate and condition, we may say by the same reason which he useth, We are elected in *Abraham* to Churchstate, and not in Christ; he is our mediator of reconciliation; we are accepted in *Abraham* the beloved; we are to conclude our prayers not in and through Christ, but *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, which are absurd: We are not beloved for their sakes in the sense in which we are beloved in Christ, to visible Churchstate, any more then to salvation. 3. Though we are not for their sakes or for them beloved to salvation, yet the Jews are. 4. We are elect in Christ as *the first-born among many brethren*, *Rom.* 8.29. as the head of many members, as the mediator the second *Adam*, by whom the life we are elected to is conveyed, in which sense we are said to be accepted or favoured, he is the mediator of reconciliation by his bloud, we conclude our prayers in and through him as the High Priest of our profession: But they that say, the Jews are beloved to salvation for the fathers sakes or for *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, need not, nor do mean it in these senses; but thus, they are beloved to salvation by reason of Gods Covenant to them, *Exod.*32.13. *Levit.*26.42. their fidelity to him, *Nehem.*9.8. so that *Abraham was called the friend of God*, *James* 2. 23. which are no whit derogatory to the prerogative of Christ, in whom alone we are elected, reconciled, favoured, heard, as the onely begotten son of God, and the alone mediator between God and man.

What Mr. *Bl* desires me *to consider that* Moses *interceded for the whole body of* Israel, *Exod.*32.13. *and that God promiseth to remember the whole nation under suffering*, *Levit.*26.42. is nothing for Mr. *Bls.* purpose. For if it were granted, that *Moses* interceded for the whole nation, yet it follows not, that Gods promise was to every individual of that nation, *Levit.*26.42. And if it were, yet it follows not that it must be so *Rom.*11.26,27,28,29. Nor if it were granted (though the contrary is to me more probable) doth it follow, that the election, love, gifts, calling, cannot be to salvation, but must be into a meer visible Churchstate and condition, or, as Mr. *Bl.* terms it, *external grace of the Covenant*, sith there is no absurdity, that I know of to conceive, that at the calling of the Jews every individual Jew shall be a true believer, and saved. Nor doth my opinion impute any errour to *Moses* or *Paul*, but Mr. *Bl.* doth in this as in other things, egregiously trifle as one that writes without heed of what he saith.

My 8th. argument is this. If the ingraffing both of Jews and Gentiles be the fruit of Gods mercy, the breaking off by shutting up in unbelief, then the ingraffing is into the invisible Church by election and giving faith: But the former is true, *vers.* 30, 31, 32. *Ergo*, the later.

Mr. *S.* rather slights then answers this argument. For he takes no notice of that part of the *medium*, [the breaking off by shutting up in unbelief,] which shews what mercy it was by which they were ingrafted, to wit, converting and reconciling mercy proper to the elect, as the very opposition of the terms shews. *v.* 32. they were before shut up in unbelief by severity, now by mercy they are brought to faith and favour,

but

but tels me, *this proposition is unsound on which the argument is built, what ever is a fruit of Gods mercy is from election and ingraffing into the invisible Church, because that health, &c. are fruits of Gods mercy.* But it is not true, the proposition on which the argument is built is as hee saith, but thus; That mercy which doth take away the shutting up in unbelief, is converting reconciling mercy from election, whose effect is the ingraffing into the visible Church by giving saving faith, *ergo*, if the ingraffing, *&c.* And this Mr. *S.* hath not disproved, nor do I think can be disproved.

Mr. *Bl.* saith, *He hath answered this before, and onely desires meet give him a Comment on* Hos. 1. 6, 9.

But first if he have answered this before, then his answer is also refelled, and it is shewed that the mercy here is more then the priviledge of a visible Churchstate. 2. Mr. *Bls.* desire I shall not refuse to yeild to, when I finde any argument drawn by him from *Hos.* 1. 6, 9. to make void my argument from *Rom.* 11. 30, 31, 32.

But to my additional confirmation of my arguments in my Apology p. 73. that the whole scope and series of the Chapter and the frequent mention from *v.* 1. to 13. of termes importing election, reprobation and their consequents, with the Apostles exclamation *v.* 33. do fully shew the ingraffing to be into the invisible Church, by election and giving faith; Mr. *Bl.* replies thus.

Mr. T. might do well to tell us what ingraffing is by election: I take that to be an immanent act in God, which is terminated in himself, and not on the creature; such expressions do not sute with Mr. T. his high pretendings to scholastical learning.

Answ. Where and when I made high pretendings to schol stical learning, if Mr. *Bl.* had informed mee it might have done mee good to humble mee for such folly, but this dealing of Mr. *Bl.* by quips to mis-represent me as an arrogant man, hath no better appearance then a shew of a malevolent minde in him towards mee. I hope I have so much scholastical learning as to vindicate my own writings, from his and others Cavils, and sure I am that what ever my learning bee, Master *Bl.* hath shewed more of a surcosticall bitter spirit in his writings against mee, then of scholastical learning, in which how much hee is defective, I had rather Mr. *B* and such birds as are of the same feather should tell him then my self. As for this exception it's so frivolous, as that it deserves not a reply.

I did not say the ingraffing is by election alone but by election and giving faith, which sometimes I do express suitably to *Ephes.* 1. 4. thus [by giving faith according to election] and even in the first part of this *Review*, *pag.* 14. where I repeat this very thing, and do often tell what the ingraffing is which is by election, to wit effectual calling, converting, reconciling, giving saving faith, so that Mr. *Bl.* were hee not disposed to quarrel, might have omitted this exception. As for that hee takes election to bee an immanent act in GOD, so do I, and conceive that the will or counsel of God *Acts* 13. 36. is an immanent act in God, and yet it is said that

David having served his generation by the will or *counsel of God fell a-sleep*, and though election as the will of God be not in another subject then himself, yet it is terminated on the creature as the object, it being one of those acts of God that are *ad extra* though not *extra*, which mee thinks Mr. *Bl.* should understand, if age and disuse have not worn out his Logick and Theologick notions.

Mr. *Blake* saith of me, *To have made up his argument he should have taken in by way of assumption*; *The Jews in their fall from Church-fellowship, cannot bee said to be rejected, hardened, given to a spirit of slumber, or that their eyes are darkened, or that they have stumbled*; *And that for their call into Church-fellowship, neither election or grace shall have any hand in it*: *This must bee his reasoning if there bee any shew of reason in his heap of words, and then all men will admire Mr. T. while he is in his admiration of Mr. M. I shall say no more but that hee is very weak both in Divinity and Logick, that cannot presently upon the first sight discover the weakness, and return a satisfying answer to this flourish of words.*

Answ. The words were as few as the matter would bear, without any flourish at all. The assumption would not have been as Mr. *Bl.* makes it, but thus, that the Jewes by bare fall from visible Church fellowship, cannot bee said to be rejected, hardened, given to a spirit of slumber, or that their eys are darkned, or that they have stumbled. (For a person may fall from visible Churchfellowship onely by excommunication, putting out of the Synagogue, and yet bee neither rejected by God, nor hardened, nor given to a spirit of slumber, or his eys darkened, or he stumble, as in the case of the man born blinde, *Joh.* 9. 34, 35.) and that the election and grace mentioned *Rom.* 11. 5, 7. are meant there or in any part of the Apostles discourse of these things, *Rom.* 8, 9, 11. ch. of election into meer visible Churchfellowship, or grace that extends to no more then outward priviledges of Churchstate is not likely. And if any do take this reasoning to bee weak, I must needs say that I or hee are stark blinde in Divinity and Logick, and omitting my admiration of Mr. *M.* who I think after his edition of his *Defence* gave over the dispute, I admire not that Mr. *Bl.* (whose superficialness I perceive plainly enough) but that any man that accurately studies *Rom.* 11. should interpret the ingraffing there meant of the bringing of persons into a meer visible Churchstate by a dogmatical faith, or outward ordinance without giving saving faith according to Gods election.

Mr. *Bl.* proceeding to vindicate Mr. *G.* recites the words of the first part of this *Review pag.* 14. and then saith, *It is well that Mr. T. yeilds so much, and being now imbarqued in this business, if hee did not* plus consulere famæ quam conscientiæ, *hee would yeild more, and freely confess that the mercy here is no other, nor no more then that which is general, and that the faith here is historical and not saving*; *I am sure there is enough to convince, but it is God alone that must perswade.*

Answ. If Mr. *Bl.* had never known me, this censure might have been the more excusable, but his many criminations and censures, and misreports of me in his preface to his Book of the Covenant and

throughout

throughout his Book do fully assure me he hath an evill eye towards me, and that he is indisposed to put any fair construction on what I do or write. Of which malignity in him I know no reason, but my opposing his dabling of infant perfusion, for sprinkling it seems he owns not, and baptism he useth not. As for what hee here saith of me, if this reply of mine acquit me not, I have no remedy but to appeal to my witness in heaven. I do again protest, that I see no reason to convince me of that Mr. *Bl.* here saith, but abundant reason to the contrary, if Mr. *El.* or any other shall detect my errour, I am willing to be convinced and perswaded; but such flirting, quipping answers as Mr. *Bl.* makes, I shall hereafter pass by as the froth and some of an angry satyrist, not the dispute of a scholastique.

He saith of me, *His reason to assert it to bee meant of saving faith, is worthy of consideration, being opposed to their former hardning*, &c. *And is there not a hardning that reaches so high to hold men from so much as faith historical and dogmatical, as well as there is an hardning to hold men from that which is saving?*

Answ. There is, but no hardning meant *Rom.* 9. or 11. which doth not deprive of saving faith together with historical, and consequently the shewing mercy opposite must bee not a giving an historical faith onely, but also a saving faith.

Mr. *Bl.* adds, *The vail is (as the Apostle tels us) on the heart of the Jews to this day, when* Moses *is read* 2 Cor. 13. 15. *And does not this vail so far blind their eyes that they see not so much as with faith historical? That which the Jews to this time want, is that from which they fell, let Mr. T. take that into consideration; But to this day they want even a faith historical, had they kept faith in Christ so far as an assent in their whole nation, so that they had past in name and dignity for Christians, and had yet wanted among them that faith that was saving, then there had been colour for what Mr. T. saith. But their being as it is, and as it is here affirmed, I cannot but wonder as the vail before Mr. T. his eyes, that what is thus clear, should be thus held from him.*

Answ. I shall forbear wondering hereafter, forasmuch as I discern the reason of Mr. *Bls.* wrangling, prejudice out of his affection to his brat termed *Birth-priviledge*, makes him imagine a vail over mine eyes, which is indeed over his own. What colour or proof rather is for my saying is shewed before. My argument is no whit infringed though the state of the Jews were such as that they wanted both historical and saving faith, hardning being opposed to giving saving faith, and no person said to be hardned but he that wants saving faith, and he that wants being hardned though hee should have historical, so that if hardning be a privation of both, yet it hath its denomination onely from the privation of saving faith. And for Mr *Bls.* reason hee would have me consider, first the conclusion of it is not to the present point. For if the Jewes might not bee said to fall from a saving faith, yet their unbelief mentioned *Rom.* 11. 30. might bee and was a privation not onely of historical faith but also a saving (else Mr. *Bl.* must say they had a saving faith though not historical, which is a palpable absur-

dity, for then a perſon may have a ſaving faith and not an hiſtorical, and the unbelieving Jewes had a ſaving faith) and conſequently the ſhewing mercy muſt bee not onely a conferring an hiſtorical faith, but alſo a ſaving. 2. The *major* is not true univerſally taken. All *that which the Jews to this time want is that from which they fell*; For they want their Temple, ſacrifices, Prieſthood, *&c.* and yet they fell not from them. Third the argument is thus retorted, That which the Jewes to this time want, is that from which they fell, let Mr. *Bl.* take that into conſidera ion. But to this day they want even a ſaving faith, *Ergo*, they fell from a ſaving faith. Such ill hap hath Mr. *Bls.* arguing: yet as one whoſe fingers did itch to bee dealing with mee he ſcribbles further.

Whereas I alledged *Epheſ.* 2. 12. to prove the unbelief of the Gentiles in times paſt mentioned *Rom* 11. 30. was not onely a privation of hiſtorical, but alſo of ſaving faith, Mr. *Bl.* puts theſe frivolous queſtions to mee, *were they not without a dogmatical faith? were they not aliens and ſtrangers ſo much as from the Commonwealth of Iſrael?*

To which I anſwer, they were; and ask him, Whether they were not without a ſaving faith? And if ſo the ſhewing mercy is oppoſed to the no. giving a ſaving faith, and Mr. *Bls.* poſition moſt abſurd, that *the faith here* (to wit *Rom.* 11. 20 where alone the word faith is uſed in that Chapter) *is hiſtorical and not ſaving.*

Mr. *Bl.* adds, " And though in ſome ſenſe every regenerate " profeſſing Chriſtian is without CHRIST, without God, with- " out hope, reſpective to ſaving fruition, and acceptable communi- " on with him, yet that text is manifeſtly abuſed when it is applied " to any of Chriſtian profeſſion. The whole muſt be carried on in a " due application of it, Gentiles in the fleſh, aliens from the Common- " wealth of Iſrael.

Anſw. Though I finde no emendation of it in Mr. *Bls.* Table of *Errata*, yet I do conceive [regenerate] is printed for [unregenerate] otherwiſe the ſpeech were more groſly falſe then I ſhall imagine Mr. *Bl.* would thus deliver. And it beeing ſo, I conceive no abuſe of it to have applied it to meer viſible profeſſors of Chriſtianity among the Gentiles, if the words were added to it which Mr. *Bl.* would have joyned. For they were Gentiles in the fleſh, aliens from the Commonwealth of Iſrael, without Chriſt, without God, without hope. Nevertheleſs I know not what this makes to infringe my inference from *Epheſ.* 2. 12. to prove the unbelief *Rom.* 11. 30. to have been a privation of ſaving faith.

Maſter *Bl.* denies not this ſenſe of the words, that the Epheſians in their infidelity were without Chriſt, without God, without hope, reſpective to ſaving fruition and acceptable communion with him, and ſure they that were thus were without ſaving faith, except Mr. *Bl.* imagine they had a ſaving faith, who had not ſo much as an hiſtorical: Nor is it denied the ſame ſtate to bee deſcribed *Rom.* 11. 30. which is deſcribed *Epheſ.* 2. 11. and therefore my inference ſtands notwithſtanding this paſſage of Mr. *Bl.*

He further saith, *And for his observation, that it occasioned the Apostles exclamation, O altitudo! O the depth, &c. v.33. Sure the goodness of God bringing the Gentiles who were dogs,* Matth.15.26. *unto the glory of children, and the severity of God in casting out the children of the Kingdome,* Matth.8.12. *might well occasion this exclamation in the Apostle, as he had called to behold the goodness and severity of God, on them which fell severity, but towards the Gentiles goodness. He might well cry out upon the greatest turne of providence that ever the world saw (which in ages past had beene hid, and the Angels desired to looke into) O the depth! &c.*

Answ. True: but was this goodness or severity in respect of a meer visible Churchstate? or was it not also in respect of their state in the invisible Church? Sure the thing had not been so admirable, if it had not been in respect of the later as well as the former; and Writers and Preachers usually apply it to silence the objection against absolute election and reprobation concerning their everlasting state, as if it imported unmercifulness and injustice incompetent to God; and it seems so like the passage, *Rom.*9.19,20,21,22,23,24. that me thinks if Mr. *Bl.* did compare them, he should judge both places meant of the same thing: and which is an irrefragable argument, it is clear *Rom.* 11.33. hath reference to what he said before, *v.*11,12. which is manifestly meant of their estate of salvation and reprobation, and therefore must be so meant *v.*33.

What Mr. *Bl.* adds concerning my speech about Mr. *G.* and the Assembly, is through mistake, as if I had censured Mr. *G.* as like *Plautus* his *miles gloriosus* in his disposition; whereas I censured him onely in respect of those words there used, which was right, however in other things he were without gall, from which nevertheless that in his writings against me he was not altogether free, is shewed in my *Apology, sect.*6. And for Mr. *Bls.* conceit, that where one degree of boasting is ascribed to Mr. *G.* one hundred will be ascribed to me by them that read our writings, it is not unlikely, if they see through Mr. *Bls.* spectacles, which make things seem black that are white, and make small hillocks seem hills: But I find cause to make it part of my Letany, From the unrighteous and hard censures of Mr. *Bl.* Mr. *B.* and others of my Antagonists, good Lord deliver me.

What *I* said of the *Assembly* shewed no more boldness then was meet; It is too apparent by the dealing with Mr. *Coleman*, my selfe, and others, that the stream of voices in the Assembly went to establish all after the *Scottish* mode, without a through examination of what was alledged to the contrary, except what was objected were backed by a very considerable party in Parliament, or Army, or City of *London*. It is no more boldness in me to assault such an *Assembly*, then it was in a particular dissenting brother. My weapons *I* assault them with, are such as the Holy Scriptures yeeld, and my interpretations such as my adversaries themselves give, and my arguments and answers are the very same which they use in other disputes against Prelates and Arminians; and with these weapons which M. *Bl.* disdainfully like a *Goliath*, scorns

reeds or *bulrushes*, I am no more afraid to assault the *Assembly of Divine at Westminster*, then to assault *Bakewel*, *Hussey*, and such like scriblers.

To my 9th argument from parallel places, Mr. *Bl.* tels me, *Mr.* Hudson, *pag.* 132. *hath not onely affirmed, but proved, that the Text* 1 *Cor.* 12.13. *is meant of the Church as visible.*

Answ. I have viewed the place, and find Mr. *Hudson* speaking thus in answer to the objection: *But this is meant of the invisible company of believers* he saith, *it is true, but it is spoken of them as visible.* So that Mr. *Hudson* affirms the same with me, that 1 *Cor.* 12.13. must be understood of the invisible Church, yet in respect of that which is there said of them, something is spoken of them as visible.

To my allegation of *Ephes.* 3.6. that *the Gentiles were made fellow-heirs of the same body, and co-partakers of the promise of God in the Gospel*; not by an outward ordinance, but by giving of faith according to election: *Ergo*, the ingrassing *Rom.* 11.17. parallel to it, is not by an outward ordinance, but by giving faith according to election: Mr. *Bl.* thus in his flirting fashion answers, *Ob that Mr. T. spake truth; then (as the Apostle saith of Israel at their restauration, all Israel shall be saved, Rom.* 11.26.) *All England* in statu quo, *should be saved in the sense that Mr. T. would understand salvation, whether we be by descent* Brittains, Saxons, *or* Normans, *we are Gentiles, and consequently by his Divinity partakers of the Gospel by faith according to election.*

Answ. Not so, unless by Gentiles were meant every Gentile, which a fresh man in the University would correct Mr. *Bl.* in, who knows *an indefinite proposition not to be equipollent to an universal incontingent matter.* It is said, *Acts* 11.18. *then hath God given to the Gentiles repentance unto life*; yet it follows not, he hath done so to every Gentile. Mr. *Bl.* adds: *Sure I am this Text is meant of Gospel glory in ordinance dispensed by the Apostles ministery. Answ.* Sure I am, that *to be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers together of his promise in Christ by the Gospel*, imports more then a meer visible Churchstate, even an estate of righteousness, union with Christ, and inheritance of eternal life: And I doubt not but many of his Auditors would correct Mr. *Bl.* if he taught otherwise at any Lecture of Christians of ordinary understanding.

Yet he he saith further, "And as to the Jews appertained the glory "and the promises, *Rom.* 9.4,5. so now the glory and promises belong "to the Gentiles: And as many Jews as fell not off, still enjoy "this glory with the Gentiles, and so both make one new man, E-"*phes.* 2.15. The visible state of the Jews was a distinct body from "the Gentiles: Now upon this glorious call they are one new man, or "new body.

Answ. The glory and promises meant *Rom.* 9 4,5. did never belong to the Gentile believers in the Christian Church, nor do the believing Jews still enjoy that glory with the Gentiles, though both *make one new man*, yet not the meer visible Church is that one man, or body, but the Church invisible reconciled to God by Christs death, as the Text it self shews, *Ephes.* 2.15,16,17,18,19.

Mr.

Mr. *Bl.* tels me, "The ingraffing is not by giving faith of election, "nor is it an act of admission into the visible Church by an outward "ordinance; but it is by Gods giving of faith in and by Gospel ordi- "nances, to give assent to Gospel mysteries, and make profession of "them.

Answ. I have proved before it is more then the giving of an histo- rical faith, however this concession in the close serves my purpose. For if this be the ingraffing, then they onely that thus do assent and make profession, are ingraffed: But infants do not thus assent and make profession; *Ergo*, they are not ingraffed, and consequently the Text *Rom.* 11.16,17. alledged by the *Assembly*, Mr. *G.* Mr. *M.* &c. for admis- sion of infants with parents as with the Jews, is brought *obtorto collo* plainly against the meaning of it.

What Mr. *Bl.* adds, that *Gal.* 3.14,26,28,29. *there is an ingraffing into Christ mentioned, but none into the Church*, is as vain as the rest, there being no ingraffing into Christ by faith, but it is also into the Church invisible, who is Christ mystical, 1 *Cor.* 12.12. The Scriptures I have produced are proved to be meant of the Church invisible, because the things said in those Scriptures are such as agree to none other; and they appear to be parallel by the indentity of the matter, all expressing the state of Gentile believers upon their effectual calling. It is Mr. *Bls.* false charge, that *the Reader will hereafter find me reasoning with my full strength against the force of all arguments* a pari: This calumny is refelled in the 2d. part of this *Review*, *sect.* 3.

As for my 10th. argument, whether the faith in the testimonies cited be meant of justifying, and the election to eternal life, needs no other decision then the very words, which I took from *Marlorat* without sear- ching into the Authors own books because I had them not of my own, and I saw it needless to look further. If the words be ambiguous, the Au- thors intended to deceive; if elsewhere they speak against me, they gainsay themselves: neither of which Mr. *Bl.* should charge them with, if he regarded their credit.

In Mr. *Bls.* arguments, *sect.* 3. the first is answered before in vindi- cating my 4th. argument. I deny the *major* of the 2d. which is answered in the 2d. part of this *Review*, *sect.* 6. *pag.* 66,67. In the 3d. the *minor* is false that *the priviledge of ingraffing is the priviledge of every member of the visible Church*: in that which is added to prove it to be the pri- viledge of ordinances, if the *major* be universal, it is false; besides, the argument may be retorted. In the 4th. I deny the *major*, and have of- ten answered the inference [that then I must maintain falling away from true faith] that by my exposition the falling away of particular persons from the true justifying faith they had in their own persons, is not main- tained; but the falling away of the people of one age from that which their predecessors in a former age had. In the 5th. if the *minor* be meant of a casting onely out of a visible Churchstate, it is denied; nor is it proved, *Matth.* 21.43. For *the Kingdome of God* not onely notes the outward Churchstate, but also the rule of Christ in their hearts, and pro- tection of them by his spirit. In the 6th. the conclusion is granted. That

which

which Mr. *Bl.* saith, that *the body of believing Jews and Christian Gentiles, called by the Apostle one new man*, Ephes. 2. 15. *are capable of no other ingraffing then that which is visible, and the body of them entitled new, as the Jews before, onely to priviledges of ordinances*, is not true. Nor is it true, that in my speech recited by him *pag.* 312. *is taken for granted*, 1. *that the whole visible body of Christian nations are truly ingraffed into the Church invisible*, if by whole body be meant all the parts, or every part. 2. Nor is it true, that it *is taken for granted by me, that in after ages the same body, though not the same persons, may be cast off, and yet no particular person rejected*, without this explication, that no particular person who was an elect person or true believer, is rejected.

But against this 2d. imagined grant of mine, Mr. *Bl.* thus argues. "The 2d. must be examined; this Church thus cut off, either continues "in the invisible body as before, or else is degenerate by the death of "those numerical persons, that made up a body invisible, and succession "of others that are no more then visible members. If it continue in "the invisible body till the time of breaking off, then Mr. *T.* is not holpen with his distinction of a consistent and a fluent being, nor with "his similitude of *Euphrates*; for so a Church invisible is still broken "off and rejected, and falling away is maintained. If it be degenerate, "then 1. they fall off themselves, and are not broken off by God; "their own sin then should be noted, not Gods act as their punishment: "But their breaking off, or rejection is the act of God laying waste his "Vineyard, *Isa* 5. taking away his Kingdome, *Matth.* 21 43. removing the Candlestick, *Ephes* 2. 5. (it should be *Revel.* 2. 5.) All noting the act of God punishing upon the peoples act of sinning, which "is of the Church, not invisible, but visible. 2. For the similitude of "*Cyrus* his turning of *Euphrates*, that he turned the same River that "God created, this will not serve Mr. *T.* his purpose; for *Euphrates* "continues a River of the same kind and nature as it was at the first "creation, and the Church in his expression is changed from the invisible body of Christ, to a visible company of bare professors. The "Church had changed her own channel. 3. Mr. *T.* indeed grants the "question, for he confesses that the Church is visible that God breaks "off; and whatsoever it had been, now it hath no more then a visible "interest; so that a visible Church falls off, and Gentiles are ingraffed into that which is visible. *Sect.* 4. *M* Bl. *adds these words* "That "wild assertion *pag.* 19. That the branches were broken off from electi"on and true faith, and the invisible Church in which they were, with "this limitation; understanding it not of the same singular persons, "but the same people or nation, is a thread that runs through almost "the whole, and enough *I* suppose is spoken to it: And when he shall "shew me an invisible nation (of which he speaks) from which there "may be a breach; *I* will either yeeld it all, or he shall hear more. "Till then *I* shall look on his words as such a ——— unworthy the pen "of such a Writer; an invisible nation it must be, a visible nation cannot "be cut off from the Church invisible.

Answ. Speak out man, let me know the worst you can say, I expect no

no favour from you having found neither charity nor equity in your writings against mee. The assertion is such as will endure your strongest battery, what you say here is merre wrangling, like a Sophister perverting my words when they are truly repeated, though thy are very plain. The Argument is quite from the matter. The Conclusion is, that *the Church cut off is not the invisible Church but visible*, which is not contradictory to my assertion; who never asserted that the Church cut off was the invisible Church, but often asserted the contrary, alwayes making the Olive tree the invisible Church to abide the same, though some branches were broken off, others were ingraffed, as in the first part of this *Review* Section 9. page 83. with this explication page 66. yet not as a rock that abides the same, but as a river which is in flux, and I often deny in expres termes, as pag. 21, 74. that my meaning was that the Church of God is broken off from the invisible Church; but this I say, that the Nation of the Jews, of which the body or most part in some ages were in the invisible Church as branches in the Olive in a continued succession, in the time of the Apostle that people, to wit the most part of that nation were broken off from the invisible Church or Olive tree, in which that people in the individual persons of a former age did stand. Which thing having been so often and so plainly expressed by mee in that book which Mr. *Bl.* takes on him to answer, it is an extremely shamefull abuse hee offers mee in going about to refute that as my assertion which is disclaimed by mee. Now this being premised and the term [*this Church*] (as it should be) being changed into [this people or nation] that is a great or the greatest part of them, I answer they are broken off from the invisible Church, in that the numerical persons that made up the invisible Church in a former age being dead, the successors degenerated from their faith, and were neither visible professors nor invisible believers in Christ: which not believing was their own act from their own will, yet consequent on Gods act of reprobation, and the breaking off, to wit the deprivation of them from the membership and priviledges of his invisible Church, was Gods act of punitive justice for their unbelieving. And thus the similitude of *Cyrus* his turning *Euphrates*, serves my purpose, to shew how I am free from holding *Arminian* Apostasie, the same people like that river beeing turned from their old channel, though not the same persons; not as Mr. *Bl.* falsly chargeth mee, *that in my expression the Church is changed from the invisible body of Christ, to a visible company of bare professours*, or that *the Church had changed her own channel*. Nor do I grant the question, *or confess that the Church is visible that God breaks off. and whatsoever it had been, now it hath no more then a visible interest; so that a visible Church falls off, and Gentiles are ingraffed into that which is visible*; but what I say is of the Jewish people, who had not so much as a visible interest when God brake them off, or they fell off, and the Gentiles are ingraffed into the invisible Church in their stead. Nor need I *shew an invisible nation broken off*, it being neither true that *I spake of an invisible nation*, nor that *a visible nation cannot bee cut off from*

the Church invisible, but these are Mr. *Bls.* dotages for want of heeding mine and his own words (as I conceive) through hast to insert some thing against me in that book ere it was printed. Which is so far from being enough to answer me, that as *Solomon* said of him *that answered a matter afore he heard it*, so it may be said of Mr. *Bl.* answering me afore he had studied my writings, he hath said enough to shew his folly and to work his shame. My *Candour p.* 23. *is ordinary* where there is the like cause: I conceive *the election of bodies, societies, or nations*, in the sense I have often given, may bee as well into the invisible Church of true believers, as into the visible Church of true professors, and that the election of the Gentiles, by which they were ingrafted, was into the invisible Church of true believers. Of *Calvins* and *Bucers* words I shall say no more having not the books. Mr. *Bl. p.* 314. adds.

Mr. G. syllogistically concluding that the seed of Christians by a pure Gospel Covenant should enjoy outward Church privileges, Mr. T. sect. 4. *replies, that it is not either formally or equivalently the thing to be proved, which is, that the Christian Jews and their seed were in infancy to be baptised. But by his favour, he that concludes the whole; concludes the parts of the whole. Outward Church-priviledges is the whole, baptism is a part of the whole; concluding Church privileages he concludes baptism, as hee that can conclude Mr. T. is at* Lempster *or* Sudbury, *concludes also that his head and shoulders are. And if any priviledge bee concluded, then baptism is concluded, which is the leading one among Church-priviledges.*

Answ. Omitting Mr. *Bls.* snarling at my dwellings in *Lemster* and *Ledbury* (for so hee means) I observe how well he pleads for Mr. *G.* who would have him conclude, that the seed of Christians by a pure Gospel Covenant should enjoy in infancy outward Church-priviledges as a whole, and consequently Baptism as a part. Which if it were Mr. *Gs.* arguing, hee should by the same reason have concluded their enjoying the Lords Supper, and Church office. Nor is the other plea much better: For some priviledge may be concluded, as laying on hands for a sign of prayer as Christ did, and yet not baptism. For though baptism be the leading priviledge after a person is brought to the faith, yet afore a person is a believer, if there be any leading Church-priviledg competent to infants, it must be laying on of hands, the Scripture giving no hint of any other.

The distinction I give in the first part of my *Review, sect.* 4. *p.* 28. *is handsome*, being set down as it is by me there, though Mr. *Bl.* carp at it, for those priviledges which Mr. *G.* termes Gospel priviledges, and I term so in answer to him as keeping his term, I may say of them (if they may be so called, and not rather legal.)

Mr. *Bs.* words, *the breaking off from the Church is an unavoidable consequence of the revoking of the gift of Churchmembership, and the repealing of the ordinance: therfore where there is no breaking off from the Church, there is no such revoking or repealing*; do justifie the title of the 6th. *sect.* of the first part of my *Review*. That the breaking off *Rom.* 11. 17. was not by repeal of an ordinance concerning infants visible Churchmembership

bership as Mr. *B.* conceives, which Mr. *Bl.* opposeth with me. And his first reason, *the deserving cause of that breaking off is unbelief, now unbelief is not in infants, much less proper to infants*, serves to prove that the infants of unbelievers are not broken off, for unbelief is not in them, and that infants of believers are not grafted in. For as the deserving cause of breaking off is unbelief which is not in infants, so the means of graffing in by the rule of opposites is faith, which is not in infants. And when in his 2d. reason he saith *this breaking off was of the general body of the Church of the Jews, that is the major part. Now infants were not the generality, they made not up the major part of that body*, this serves to answer what Mr. *Bl.* before *p.* 307. and elsewhere would infer, that if the Gentiles or the body of them be elect then all must be so, whereas the body according to himself may stand for the *major* part or generality, which he denies infants to be, and therefore the body and generality may be ingraffed and not infants.

Mr. *Bls.* exceptions against my distinctions of breaking off *because breaking off implied a former union* are vain, for there may be a breaking off from that union which they had not in their own persons, specially when the breaking off is of a people, nor is it usual to term those acts privations of habits which take not away habits that were, but might have been, as when we are said to be redeemed, delivered from hell, to be cast out into outer darkness, *Matth.* 8. 12. though never in heaven. But were not this right but non-sense, yet Mr. *Bls* exceptions against the distinctions is frivolous. For in those distinctions I do not set down the wayes of breaking off that were actually, but such as are imaginable, which is necessary when we go about to argue by a disjunctive syllogism, as all Logicians know.

Yet what Mr. *Bl.* saith, *excommunication is not the breaking off meant* Rom. 11. 17, 20. *For that is the act of the Church on some particular member; But this here is the act of God, which is by taking away the Kingdome, by removing their Candlestick, departing with his presence*, is right, if understood of the subtracting of the presence of his spirit, as well as his word. Which is to be conceived, for the word was offered and preached to them when they were broken off, and therefore they were not broken off barely by subtracting that. Besides the ingrafting is not by bare outward ordinances, for they were vouchsafed even to the broken off, and consequently the fatness of the Olive is not the bare priviledge of outward Ordinances. And if it be not the Churches act, but Gods by which there is ingrafting, then infants are not ingrafted, who have no act of God to ingraff them, but onely that of the Church or administratour of Baptism.

Mr. *Bls.* talk of the Ordinance of infants visible Churchmembership, begun in the great Charter of heaven, and continued, is but vapourings; Mr. *Bl.* mis recites Mr. *Bs* antecedent which was not as hee repeats it, *That the Jews were cast off for unbelief*, but *that none of the Jews were broken off but for unbelief*, which I denied, and Mr. *Bls.* exceptions is frivolous. *But the text assignes unbelief*, Mr. T. *assignes no other cause, then that must stand.* To which I reply, and so it doth by my answer, and yet I do assigh another cause, Gods act of executing his decree of reprobation.

To what I ſaid, that the unbelief being poſitive *Rom.* 10. 21. if none were broken off but unbelievers here meant, no infants no not of infidels that never heard of Chriſt were broken off, he ſaith *we eaſily yeild his concluſion, if he frame it in a ſyllogiſm; thus the infants of infidels that never heard of Chriſt were never broken off. They could never be broken off that were never taken in, A branch of a bramble was never broken off from a vine or olive. Anſw.* 1. They may be ſaid to be broken off who were never taken in in their own perſons, ſure the abortives and ſtil-born were never taken into the viſible Church of the Jews, and yet if other infants were broken off ſo were they, and if they were broken off though they were never taken in in their own perſons but their anceſtors, then the infants of infidel *Edomites* might be ſaid to be broken off, who were in *Eſau*, *Iſaac*, and *Abraham* taken in: But they were not poſitive unbelievers, therefore other then poſitive unbelievers are broken off, which oppoſeth Mr. *B.* 2. If infants of infidel *Edomites* be not broken off, then according to Mr. *B.* the ordinance of viſible Churchmembership is not in reſpect of them revoked and repealed, and conſequently they are viſible Churchmembers according to the tenour of Mr. *Bs.* arguing. 3. If *God will not puniſh the children for the fathers ſins* (as Mr. *B.* ſaith) *much leſs for a ſtrangers*, then he would not break off the unbelieving Jews infant children, then they are viſible Churchmembers if Mr. *Bs.* arg. hold. 4. Mr. *Bls.* reaſon is anſwered before, by ſhewing how there may be privations of habits not in being; And if his reaſon were good, and unbelieving Jews infant could not be broken off, for that it was never in the viſible Church Chriſtian, and is the branch of a bramble. To my words, that the breaking off is not revoking of an ordinance about viſible churchmembership, but the execution of the decree of reprobation in excluding them from the inviſible Church, M. *Bl.* replies 1. By *demand; Is there any ſuch decree as to caſt out of the Church inviſible? I am ſure that chapter hath no ſuch thing. Anſw.* There is a decree of breaking off from the Church inviſible, and that decree is plainly expreſt in that chapter, *v.* 7, 8, 9, 10. For what comes to paſs in time that God decrees. But they were broken off in time from the inviſible Church of believers, *v.* 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 17, 19, 22. 2*ly.* Saith he, *I demand did they continue in the Church viſible, when upon execution of ſuch a decree they were caſt out of the Church inviſible? or was their ſtation in the viſible Church loſt, and that of the inviſible Church never gained, and therefore they were not broken off from it. Anſw.* They continued in the viſible Church Jewiſh in oppoſition to the viſible Church Chriſtian, which they perſecuted when they were caſt away and broken off from the Church inviſible of true believers, according to Gods decree of reprobation, though they never gained a ſtation in the inviſible Church in their own perſons. Mr. *Bl.* adds 3*ly. The Jews adhering to circumciſion, &c. though God changed the rites* Moſes *gave them, refuſed the way of God, re ected the counſel of God in not being baptiſed, doting upon elements beggerly, and ſo their eys are held, that they ſee nothing into glorious Goſpel myſteries; And this their unbelief is their breaking off from that viſible Churchſtation, in which they ſometimes ſtood, upon which account they are kept out from intereſt in the Church inviſible. And when this blindneſs ſhall be removed, they ſhall then be ſaved.*

Anſw.

Answ. Their unbelief was the means of their breaking off, but not of their breaking off from that visible Church station in which they sometimes stood; the visible Church-station in which they stood, is, as Mr. *Bl.* himself describes it, their station in the Jewish Church visible in the way of Church ordinances, Circumcision, Sacrifices, *&c.* changed by God; yet, as he himself saith, the Jews stuck thereto, and therefore stood still in their former visible Church-station. Besides, their unbelief was not their breaking off from it. For 1. as Mr. *Bl.* said before the breaking off was Gods act, so was not their unbelief. 2. According to Mr. *Bl.* breaking off was Gods act of punishment, but it was no punishment but a mere to be broken off from that visible Church station. Nor upon the account of their breaking off from that visible Church station in which they sometimes stood, were they kept out from interest in the Church invisible, but for their unbelief, and their keeping that Church station. However, if they were kept out from interest in the Church invisible, their breaking off is more then depriving of a visible Churchstate, yea the same which I assert, a breaking off from the invisible Church.

If there be any mazes in my 8th. and 9th. *sections* of the first part of my *Review*, Mr. *B.* led me into them, whom I was necessitated to follow: Mr. *Bs.* arguments are answered without confusion, and with so much strength, as neither Mr. *Bl.* nor Mr. *B.* are able to refute.

Mr. *Bl.* asserts contrary to me, that *the Christian visible Church and the Jewish are one and the same, 1. because* Japhet *dwells in* Shems *Tents, which are the Church visible, and this he saith needs no proof.* But I require proof that by *Shems tents* are meant, *Gen.* 9.27. the visible Church Jewish or Christian.

2. *Because they are one sheep-fold, Joh.* 10.16. and to the objection that it's meant of the invisible Church, because Christ gives notes of those that were indeed his sheep, he saith, "Christ speaks to those that "were Disciples onely according to profession, and gives notes, *Joh.* 8. "31. of Disciples indeed; and it is against all reason, that Christ should "in discourse point out the invisible Church with the demonstrative "*This*, and that to those that were malignant enough in the Church visi- "ble, the Pharisees, as appears in the close of the former Chapter. And "the mention of thieves creeping into it, hirelings employed in it, doth "contradict it. The visible Church of the Jews and Gentiles in which "Christ hath true sheep for whom he dies, and others that thieves and "hirelings do deceive, makes up one sheep-fold.

Answ. The Text rather proves the contrary as Mr. *Bl.* expounds it. For if *the fold* be the visible Church, and the other sheep are not of that visible Church, then there is not one fold or Church of Jews and Gentiles, but some sheep are of one fold, or visible Church, and some of another. As for Mr. *Bls.* arguments, they are of no force. For Christ might well enough in his discourse point out the invisible Church with the demonstrative [*this*] it being usual to point out invisible things by it, as *Joh.* 6.29, *&c. This God is our God*: And yet I do not think [*this fold, John* 10.16.] notes the invisible Church, but the people or nation

of

of the Jews, as *Piscator*, *Grotius*, &c. expound it, or rather the place. For the fold, αὐλὴ, notes not the sheep, and therefore not the Church, but the place or country where or whence they are. Nor were deceivers, hirelings, thieves, or wolves, in or of the Church meant *Joh.* 10. 15, 16. though they might get into the place and company of them. Nor is it truly translated by our Translatours [*there shall be one fold,*] though (which I somewhat marvel at) they follow therein the vulgar Latine: For the *Tigurine* Divines note, ποίμνη *in Greek signifies the flock, not the fold.* And *Beza excepts against the vulgar for it, and against the Romanists, who would have that one fold to be Rome.* And *Grotius observes that the speech is proverbial, One flock one shepheard,* to which he makes *Ezek.* 37. 24. to be like. Now that the one flock is not the meer visible Church, but the invisible, it appears from many things in the Text, that *Christ laid down his life for them, that they follow him, hear his voyce, his Father and he knows them distinguishingly from others who do not believe because they are not of his sheep, that he gives them eternal life, none can pluck them out of his Fathers hands,* v. 14, 15, 16, 26, 27, 28, 29. out of which many Protestant Divines gather absolute election, particular redemption, effectual conversion and perseverance, against *Arminians.* And *Diodati* in his *annot.* on *Joh.* 10 16. hath it thus. *Other sheep*] *namely, the elect among the Gentiles, who are to be called by the Gospel, and incorporated into the Church with the elect of the Jewish nation. One body,* 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. *one new man, Ephes.* 2. 15. are the invisible Church as is shewed before. *Matth.* 8. 11. *The Kingdome of heaven* is the Kingdome of glory. *Matth.* 21. 43. *The Kingdome of God* is either the Gospel by a metonymy, or the rule of God in their hearts, which was taken from them, that is that people, with whose ancestors it was, though not in those persons from whom it was taken. The visible Church cannot be meant by *the Kingdome,* for *the fruits of the Kingdome* are not the fruits of the meer visible Church, they are not bare profession, but real faith, holiness, and obedience, which are fruits of the Spirit, not of the Church; or if of any Church, of the invisible, not the meer visible. And though *all invisible members bring forth fruit,* yet that nation which had invisible members bringing forth fruit in a former age, may in an after age not bring forth fruit, and for that reason the Church invisible may be taken from them, with whom it was in respect of their ancestors.

To what I said, If the Christian Gentiles were grafted into the same visible Church with the Jews, then they should have been circumcised, &c. contrary to the determination *Acts* 15. Mr. *Bl* replies, "That is "of no force, as though we may not be in the same Kingdome, and yet "under a new way of administration. Law-givers on earth are some-"times pleased to change their Laws, and so doth the Law-giver of Hea-"ven; or if he will limit his instance to Circumcision, taking in no "other Laws. The same house may have a new door or porch. Let "Mr. *T.* then know that he is in the same visible Kingdome as *Abra-"ham, Isaac,* and *Jacob,* and their posterity after the flesh in *Israel* "were."

Answ.

Answ. That which Mr. *Bl.* saith of the sameness of a Kingdome under a new way of administration, of Law givers changing their laws, of Gods doing so, the identity of a house with a new door, is all granted; but doth not take away the force of my reason, unless he could shew that any were grafted or to be grafted into the visible Church Jewish without Circumcision, if he were a male. Doth not Mr. *Bl.* maintain here in answer to my 4th. argument, that we are partakers of the same outward priviledges and ordinances with the Jews, as he expounds *Rom.* 11.17. which opposeth his speech here of a new way? Doth not Scripture term the Jewish Church or people, the Circumcision, because those that were in that Church, if male, were circumcised? Was not *Cornelius* taken for unclean, and not of that Church, because uncircumcised? or was he ever in the Jewish Church after his Baptism? God might admit into the Jewish Church another way then by Circumcision, but Mr. *Bl.* cannot shew he or the Jews did so. We are in the same invisible Kingdome of true believers, and elect persons, with *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*: but I do not yet know by any thing Mr. *Bl.* hath hitherto said, that *I am in the same visible Kingdome with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and their posterity after the flesh in Israel.* Every one in the visible Kingdome of *Israel* after the flesh, did partake of the Passeover; the Apostle saith, 1 *Cor.* 10 18. *Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the the sacrifices partakers of the altar?* Which intimates that *Israel* after the flesh did then when he wrote eat of the sacrifices, which Christians did not, and therefore were not adjoyned to *Israel* after the flesh, but in that very place, *v.* 16,17. distinguished from them. I take Mr. *Bls.* assertion to infer Judaism: and if he or any other be not satisfied by my answer to Mr. *Cobbet*, I have more reason to impute it to their prejudice, then to defect in my answer.

SECT. LXXVI.

My sense of matrimonial holiness, 1 Cor. 7 14. is vindicated from Mr. Blakes exceptions, Vindic. Fæd. ch. 39. and Mr. Sydenhams Exercit. ch. 7.

MR. *Bl. ch.* 39. avoucheth, still his sense of federal holiness, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. I proceed to view what he saith. *Sect.* 1. he sets down the Apostles resolution and the reason of it rightly, which because it will tend much to the clearing of the sense which I give, I shall here transcribe it. *Let him not put her away, let her not leave him, unbelief breaks not the marriage band, renders it not a nullity, Religion being not of the substance of marriage.* But what he saith, that *their scruple and ground of their fear was the condition of their issue, lest that they should not be reckoned with the Saints, but of the fellowship of the unclean Gentiles*, is fictitious. For the resolution of it rightly given before by Mr. *Bl.* himself, shews that their scruple arose not from fear of their childrens condition, but the nullity

nullity of their marriage, or unlawfulneſs of continuing in it by reaſon of the unbelief of the one party; elſe the Apoſtle had not made his reſolution appoſite to the removing their ſcrup'e. Yea, Mr. *Bls.* own ſpeech is againſt his own conceit, when he ſaith, *Reaſon is ſtrong for this, for they well knew, as it is with the parent, ſo it is with the child for Church ſtate and condition, being a priviledge communicable and deſcendable from parent to child. If the parent were without, and of the Gentiles, the child was ever ſuch; and in caſe they were of the people of God, their children were reckoned ſo in like manner: Now parents being divided, the one holy, the other unclean, they feared that the iſſue would follow the worſer part, a ſtain would lie upon them, they would be accounted unclean with the unbelieving parent. In a like caſe it had been ſo determined, Ezra* 10.3. For if *they well knew as it is with the parent ſo it is with the child for Churchſtate*, they knew that the believing parent being a Churchmember, notwithſtanding the yokefellows unbelief, their children were Churchmembers, and ſo made no ſcrup'e of that, nor did *Paul*, or need he to reſolve that ſcrup e aboue their childrens condition. Yea, the very form of the Apoſtles reaſoning, *elſe were your children unclean*, doth plainly import, that they took the uncleanneſs of their children as an abſurdity deprehended by them, and the contrary out of doubt; as when, 1 *Cor.* 15. 29. the Apoſtle ſaith, *Elſe what ſhall they do that are baptized for the dead, if the dead riſe not?* he ſuppoſeth they took it for an abſurdity, and the contrary out of doubt, that they that are baptized for the dead do it in vain. And though that *the parents being divided they might fear that the iſſue would follow the worſer part, a ſtain would lie upon them*, yet that this ſtain ſhould be in reſpect of their Churchſtate, could not be, if *they well knew*, as Mr. *Bl.* ſaith, *as it is with the parent ſo it is with the child for Churchſtate*, their own ſtate in the Church being manifeſt and certain. That *the caſe of the Corinthians and thoſe, Ezra* 10.3. *is not like*, is ſhewed in the firſt part of this *Review*, *ſect.* 17, 18. and will come into further conſideration in that which follows.

What Mr. *Bl.* adds, *That the Apoſtle tels them, that the unbelieving party doth not (as they fear) defile the iſſue, but is ſanctified as to iſſue by the believer*, is a meer fiction. For the Apoſtle onely tels them they did not defile each other, but were ſanctified to each other, by reaſon of their marriage ſtate, not the faith of one party. And it is as falſe, that by *reaſon of the parents faith the Apoſtle tels them the child is not reckoned with the unbelieving parent who is a Gentile*, or that *by unclean is meant a ſinner of the Gentiles*, for the child of both parents Gentile believers is ſtill a Gentile; and if *unclean* be *a ſinner of the Gentiles*, by *holy* ſhould be meant *a Jew by nature*, which is a ridiculous conceit of Mr. *Bls.* as *if the parent being a believer, the child were a Jew by nature, and not a ſinner of the Gentiles.* What he adds, that *by believer in that place*, 1 *Cor.* 7.14. *is meant a profeſſor of the true faith*, is vain, when the word *believer* is not uſed in that *v.* or any *v.* of that Chapter about that matter, nor in that ſenſe there. If to *be ſanctified*, 1 *Cor.* 7.14. *be not to be ſet apart for God*, as Mr. *Bl.* determines, then the term *ſanctified* is not uſed in the common if not onely uſe of the word in Scripture and pro-

phane

phane writers, and by him conceived here, as Mr. *B.* asserts *Plain Script. proof, &c. part.* 1. *ch.* 29. *p.* 81.

In answer to the 2d. sect. of the 39th. ch. of Mr. *Bls. vindic sad.* I say first, that I do not yeild that the *Corinthians* had any scruple at all about their issue. 2. That my waving the examining of the occasion of the doubt resolved 1 *Cor.* 7. 12, 13, 14. was not because of any strength I found in Mr. *Bls.* allegations, but because I conceived neither of our opinions any other then a conjecture, and therefore the thing not material, nor in the framing my *postscript* had I time enough to do what I did after, not out of a mind to quarrel, but to shew the invalidity of Mr. *Marshals* 4 h. arg. for his interpretation from his conceit of the occasion of the doubt, to have been by reading the fact mentioned *Exr.* 10. 3. Mr. *Bl.* here endeavors to confirm his exceptions against my allegation of 1 *Cor.* 5. 9. as the occasion of the doubt resolved 1 *Cor.* 7. 12. Yet replies nothing to my answer to the two first, but to the 3d. saith. *If their scruple was concerning conversing with their idolatrous yoke fellows, upon occasion of those words not to keep them company; they must needs scruple their conversing with covetous, and extortioners, husbands or wives upon the same account; and the Apostle being silent in his answer, it is clear they were silent in their letter, and moving no scruple, they had no scruple; when it is impossible for them to scruple one upon those words and not scruple all. Here is the wildest of fancies, when hee names four evils respective to civil social converse; they should startle at one (respective to their marriage society) and question no more.* To which I answer, it is neither impossible nor very unlikely, much less a wild fancy to imagine it of them, that the *Corinthians* either did not scruple at using their covetous husbands, from 1 *Cor.* 5. 9, 10. though they did their idolatrous, if they did not heed the explanation after added *v.* 10. but onely the precept *v.* 9. and understood by fornicators idolaters, which they might easily do; or if they did heed the explanation, yet did not conceive the like reason of relinquishing covetous yoke-fellowes as idolatrous, which they might well do, finding precepts against marriages with idolaters, none against marriages with them that were onely covetous and not idolaters, or they might not put the doubt of any other to the Apostle then the idolatrous, because there were none that had covetous yokefellows who were not idolaters, and they would put the case onely about that which was the chief cause of their scruple, or because they could easily resolve themselves, that coveteousness and extortion from men do not so defile or are so inconsistent with marriage society as idolatry, and going a whoring from God, or they might put the case about the covetous as well as the idolaters, yet the Apostle resolve the one onely expresly, because the resolving the one would resolve the other; for which and for other reasons which might occur, though not discernable now, they well either startle at one onely, or not seek for resolution of any more, or if they did, yet *Paul* resolve no more. And this being understood, the Apostle needs not write to them as Mr. *Bl.* imagines he must, if my conjecture hold, and he took in every part of their scruple, though not what Mr. *Bl.* conceivs must be their scruple upon my conjecture.

And hereby Mr. *Bls.* replies *of wonder of my thoughts, of the Apostles need of resolving both scruples, of the same evident ground of scruple concerning each*, as one are plainly answered without reply to his taunting quips. The rest also is answered concerning B. *Hewson*, *Bunney*, my Uncle *Whately*; for it goes upon this supposition, that if the *Corinthians* took occasion to doubt, from 1 *Cor.* 5. 9. then they must doubt whether they must live with fornicating yoke-fellows, and the Apostle must resolve them, that *if any brother have a wife that is a fornicator let him not put her away*, which may not follow if by fornicators they understood onely idolaters and so doubted of them onely, or chiefly doubted of them, or resolving themselves otherwise propounded the doubt onely of them, or the Apostle thought it needful onely to resolve concerning them, knowing that they might from his resolution of them be resolved of the rest, especially if the words *let him not put her away*, be not a prohibition forbidding him to put her away, but as a permission allowing him not to put her away, which hath its likelihood. But of this enough, if not too much about a conjecture not very material. My words in my *Postscript* page 111. *have not Mr.* Bl. *in hand* of any further answer then hath been given him, my censure of his absurd glosses, dictates, flirts incoherent, impertinent passages, little solid nervous disputing is delivered in language meet to express the truth.

If Mr. *Calamy* and Mr. *Vines* in their Epistle used not vain crackings of Mr. *Marshal*, and Mr. *Bls. answer to my Letter* besides their misrepresentations of my *Examen*, I never met with any. Were their worth far greater then it is, and mine far less, I shall take liberty however *my ingeny be questioned*, as freely to censure Mr. *Calamy* and Mr. *Vines*, as I did in this, if they shall hereafter by their names and big words disparage the truth as they did in this. *Who of my nearest friends have told mee to my face, that they have been ashamed of that which I have written in my Apology, whose honesty and judgement Mr.* Bl. *hath seeen attested under my own hand*, I do not yet know, nor by ghess yet imagine. I know I have had censures hard enough of persons afore this controversie arose taken for my friends, and have laid them more to heart then I hope I shall do hereafter, finding upon the *Review* of this Dispute how unequal they have been, and if *that eminently learned man who observed that I had Denum impudentiæ*, were hee who wrote the *second Epistle* to Mr. *Baxter* printed at the end of his *Confession of his faith*, or any other did censure mee without well weighing my writings (as I have many reasons to conceive they do) as they are the more unrighteous, so they are deservedly the less regarded by mee. It was no *impudence in mee to publish that men call on mee to answer* Mr. *Bl. or that his writing was commended* when others had done it before. The most frivolous treatise that is, if it bee against me, yet it wants not some to magnifie it, Mr. *Hussey's*, Mr. *Horns*, Dr. *Savages* in Latin and others want not applauders. I discern the spirit of Pædobaptists even in those, whom I had taken to be moderate, judicious, friendly, yet in this point many of them shew neither equity to me, nor love to truth, nor judgement in according their opinion of Pædobaptism

dobaptiſm with their former and later principles and practiſes. But I ſhall wait till God awake men, and ſpecially thoſe who have been ſo forward to reform Diſcipline and Ceremonies, and have by ſolemn Covenant vowed to endeavour reformation according to Gods Word, that they may ſee from what they are faln. I go on.

Next Mr. *Bl.* ſpeaks ſomewhat of the occaſion of the doubt from *Ezra* 9. 10. "Let me premiſe, ſaith he, this as an undoubted truth, that "theſe Corinthians had their ſcruples concerning their iſſue upon their "marriage in this diſparity. That which the Apoſtle ſatisfies in his an-"ſwer, that the Corinthians ſcrupled in their letter; This no man can "deny, for he writes to give ſatisfaction, as is plain *v.* 1. to their let-"ter caſes: But we ſee in the text that he ſatisfies as ſcruples concern-"ing themſelves, ſo alſo concerning their iſſue.

To which I anſwer, the contrary is to me an undoubted truth, and ſo it was to Dr. *Thomas Goodwin*, whoſe reaſon with mine ſhould have had ſome anſwer from Mr. *Bl.* As for his ſyllogiſm the *major* is not certain, ſith the Apoſtle might give ſatisfaction on the by, about other things then the caſes which they ſcrupled and wrote to him about. But the *minor* I do directly deny, and ſith Mr. *Bl.* hath brought nothing to prove it, I ſlight it as a vain dictate.

As for Mr. *Bls. refuſing to determine peremptorily, that the occaſion of the ſcruple was that, Ezra* 9. *&* 10. it ſerves my turn to prove that no argument drawn from thence to conclude federal holineſs of infants of believers is valid. I have often ſhewed how wee can imagine *the Corinthians hit upon their ſcruple*, and were *affected with it without reſpect to the fact, Ezra* 9. *&* 10. and therefore need not again anſwer that queſtion. Mr. *Bls. not ſaying that the Iſraelites and the Corinthians caſe was wholly the ſame*, tends to ſhew Mr. *Marſhals* miſtake, and the defect of his argument.

And for what Mr. *Bl.* obſerves *that the Chriſtian Corinthians were under the moral Law of* Moſes *and it was not ſo eaſie for them to determine that the Command* Deut. 7. *was judicial*, I grant it, and thence infer that notwithſtanding the words 1 *Cor.* 10. 15. yet they might not be ſo underſtanding in gathering conſequences, or diſcerning the meaning of Scriptures, but that they might conceive otherwiſe then rational men uſually do, contrary to what Mr. *Bl.* ſuggeſts of them ſect. 3. Mr. *Bl.* having cenſured rather then refuted Dr. *Goodwins* opinion of *the childrens real holineſs*, 1 Cor. 7. 14. He tels me *my interpretation is firſt childiſh, to tell the Corinthians if their marriage ſociety were adulterous, then their children were baſtards, if their marriage were null children were illegitimate, this is too low a way of reaſoning, ſuch as every childe well knew before the Apoſtle told them.* To which I anſwer, if it were ſo eaſily underſtood it was the fitter for the Apoſtles purpoſe to ſatisfie the tender conſciences of doubting Chriſtians, who are beſt ſatisfied with that which is obvious, and eaſily diſcernable, eſpecially when the perſons are women, and men of ordinary capacities. And therefore this way of arguing ſhewed not childiſhneſs in the Apoſtle but fatherly wiſedome, and is a very good reaſon for my interpretation, not againſt it, ſith it

is acknowledged that the Apostles arguing as by me framed is right, and serves his purpose.

Secondly, saith Mr. *El.* *It is incongruous to bring phrases fully answering the Churchstate and condition of either parents, believing and unbelieving (which in the Scripture is holy and unclean) and yet to understand them of holiness and uncleanness of another kinde of legitimation and bastardy, if they may be (as I think they never were) so called is incongruous: That these words fully answer the Churchstate of parents and the Churchstate and condition which the children derive from them, is plain in that parallel text* Gal. 2. 15. *Jews by nature, that is holy by birth from believing parents, not sinners of the Gentiles, not unclean by birth from unbeleeving ancestours; so Mr.* Cartwright *on these words, in his answer to the Rhemists. If you will know what this holiness of children new born is, the Apostle telleth you, it is through the Covenant to be a Jew by nature, or birth: and if you will further understand what this uncleanness of children is, the Apostle in the same place telleth you, it is not to be sinners by nature as those which are born of the heathen.*

Answ What I said before I say still, without any jeer or disregard to Mr. *Cartwright*, that the conceit that 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. and *Gal.* 2. 15. *are two full parallel Scriptures*, is but a dream, there being neither agreement in scope, matter, words or sense between them. Not in scope. For 1 *Cor.* 7, 12, 13, 14. the Apostles scope is to resolve a doubt about continuance of married persons in disparity of religion, *Gal.* 2. 15. his scope is to determine by what we are justified, not in matter, for the one speaks of the sanctifying of husband and wife to each other, and the holiness or uncleanness of the children; the other of Jews and Gentils acding to their different national state, nor is there one word used *Gal.* 2. 15. which is used 1 *Cor*, 7. 14. nor can the sense be agreeing. For *Jew by nature* cannot be as much as *holy* 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. because then the children of the *Corinthians* should bee *Jews by nature*, which was impossible, they being born of Gentile parents, for such were the *Corinthians*, 1 *Cor.* 12. 2. Nor is Mr. *Els.* sense *Jew by nature*, that *is holy by birth from believing parents*, any where else found in Scripture; Nor doth *Jew by nature* intimate their Churchstate, as if hee meant it thus; we who are members of the visible Church, or have this priviledge to bee in the Covenont of grace by nature, in that wee are born of believing parents. For they are said to bee *Jews by nature* by reason of their natural descent, without any respect to the faith or unbelief of their parents, even those whose parents were idolaters, as *Ahaz*, *Manasseh*, or any other of that line were *Jews by nature*, and *not sinners of the Gentiles*, and the children of the most holy Proselites, yet were *not Jews by nature*: nor were they *Jews by nature* through the Covenant of grace, they were *Jews by nature* without respect to the Covenant of grace, for that was alwais to them who were believers, whether Jewes or Gentils, and the covenant whereby the Jews had priviledge was not the Covenant of Evangelical grace, but the Covenant of peculiar national blessings, but here the opposition to the Gentiles, and the occasion shews *Jews* to bee taken as a term appropriate to natural Jews by natural

descent

deſcent from *Jacob* in contradiinſtction to Gentiles from other roots. If any ask who are meant by [*we*,] and why here is mentioned [*Jews by nature*,] and why they are oppoſed to *the Gentiles*, and they termed *ſinners*, I anſwer, the words ſeem plainly to be a part of *Pauls* ſpeech to *Peter*, and that by *we* are meant himſelf with *Peter* termed *a Jew*, *v.* 14. and other believers of the Circumciſion, mentioned *v.* 12, 13. and the ſenſe is, We though we are Jews by nature, or even we who are Jews by natural birth; and this mentioned, becauſe they had the Law peculiarly given them, as *Piſcator* in his *Analyſis*, *Nos quantumvis Judai ſumus, quibus nimirum lex peculiariter a Deo data eſt.* Or as the oppoſite term [*ſinners of the Gentiles*] intimates, knowers and keepers of the Law of *Moſes*, and therefore if any, certainly much more then *ſinners of the Gentiles*, we ſhould ſeek and expect to be juſtified by the Law; yet if *we know that a man is not juſtified by the works of the Law, but by the faith of Chriſt*, and *even we have believed on Chriſt Jeſus, that we might be juſtified by the faith of Chriſt, and not by the works of the law*, it is not equal that wee ſhould as *Peter* did at *Antioch*, diſſemble our liberty in Chriſt, *compel the Gentiles to Judaize* or keep the law for righteouſneſs, and ſo not *walke uprightly* or *rightfoote it according to the truth of the Goſpel.* Now the Gentiles are termed *ſinners* in the ſenſe, in which, in the ordinary acception among the Jewes, it was taken for men that obſerved not the law, oppoſed to the righteous, *Matth.* 9.13. *Luke* 15.1,2,7,10. & 18.9,13. and many more places: And in this ſenſe it is taken, *v.* 17. *we our ſelves alſo are found ſinners*, that is, we our ſelves alſo are deprehended, convinced, or proved to be prophane breakers, or deſpiſers of the law: which the Gentiles did, and which I think is meant *Epheſ.* 2.1,2,3. and that *Paul* doth not any more reckon himſelf with them *Epheſ.* 2.3. then he doth with them *that are alive at Chriſts comming*, oppoſite to them *who are dead in Chriſt*, 1 *Theſ.* 4.17. though he uſe the firſt perſon plural in both; for I ſee not how that could ſtand with his ſpeeches of himſelf, *Acts* 23,1. *Philip.* 3.4,5,6. and therefore do conceive a conception or an *enallage* of perſon, *Epheſ.* 2.3. uſed often in ſpeeches, whereby a ſpeaker takes that to himſelf which is proper to others, whether to avoid diſtaſte as if he upbraided them, or to inſinuate into their affections, or for ſuch like reaſon. Out of all which I infer, 1. That [*Jews by nature*] is not put *Gal* 2.15. to intimate a birth-priviledge of the children of believers, whether Jews or Gentiles, concerning their Eccleſiaſtical ſtate even in infancy as viſible Churchmembers; but it is put to note either the advantage peculiar to the Jewiſh nation in that the law of *Moſes* was given to them, or rather the greater likelihood and meetneſs or congruity to ſeek or claim righteouſneſs by the law then the Gentiles. 2. That he meant not they were *Jews by nature through the Covenant of grace.* For that were clean oppoſite to his intention, which was to ſhew that their eſtate of being Jews by nature did not confer to their juſtification, which doubtleſs it would have done if it had been by the Covenant of grace, but to intimate, that the law was given to them, or rather they ſtudious of it, and Zelots for it, and therefore if any, they ſhould be juſtified by

it,

it, as *Paul* in a like place, *Phil.*3.3,4,5,6,7,8,9. So that whatever advantage or precedency is intimated by it, it is ascribed to the law, and their observing of it, not to the new Covenant of grace. 3. The deteriority or worse condition of the Gentiles is ascribed to them, not barely in respect of their birth from unbelievers, and so agreeing to their infants, much less as agreeing to infants of unbelieving Jews as well as Gentiles, but in respect of their manners either onely or chiefly, and so not competent to infants. And therefore notwithstanding Mr. *Bl.* thought *Gal.*2.15. a fit Text for his *Sermon*, in which he asserted infants *birth-priviledge* of believing Gentiles, though Mr. *Calamy* and Mr. *Vines* crack in their Epistle before Mr. *Bls. answer to my Letter*, that *he hath truly stated the the question, set it upon the right basis, and well fortified it*, and Mr. *Bl.* hath produced somewhat from Mr. *Cantwright* to colour his parallelling 1 *Cor.*7.14. with *Gal.*2.15. yet I say still, and have *such a gift of impudence* as to aver, that both Mr. *Cartwright* was mistaken, and Mr. *Calamy* and Mr. *Vines* did vainly crack of Mr. *Bls. Birth priviledge*, and Mr. *Bl.* hath grosly abused *Gal.*2.15. as he did also *Gal* 4.29. and there is no parallelism of 1 *Cor.*7.14. and *Gal.*2.15. to interpret the one by the other.

3. Saith Mr. *Bl.* "The argument thus understood is untrue: The "stress is wholly laid upon the believing party, as to the holiness of the "issue, twice over; the unbeliever is meerly passive in it, when the "child hath legitimation equally from both. Against his interpretati-"on, and for mine (which *Chamier* affirms to be *Calvini & omnium re-"formorum*) take these arguments. 1. That holiness which necessarily "follows to the issue, from the sanctification of an unbelieving by a be-"lieving yokefellow, is Covenant holiness, and not legitimation: But "the holiness in this place of the Apostle necessarily follows to the issue "from the sanctification of an unbeliever by a believer; *Ergo*, it is "Covenant holiness, not legitimation. 2. That which is derived from "the eminency of one parent above another, and not equally from both, "is not legitimation: But this holiness is derived from the eminence of "one parent (*viz.* the believing parent) above the other; *Ergo*, it is "not legitimation. 3. The result or fruit which follows from a belie-"vers faith is not legimation: But the holiness in the Text is a result "of the faith of the believing yokefellow. The *minor* is evident, seeing "faith is twice hinted at in the believer. I know that Mr. *T.* denies that "the unbelieving husband or wife is sanctified in the believing: It is "(faith he) in the husband, not in the believing husband; in the "wife, not in the believing wife, that is not in the Text. The mar-"riage is between a believer and an unbeliever, the unbeliever is sanctifi-"fied, whether husband or wife by their yokefellow, but not by their "believing yoke fellow; the Reader that puts off his reason may mat-"ter such denials.

Answ. The Reader that puts on his reason, will easily see good reason for my denial of each of the *minors* in each of Mr. *Bls.* three arguments, and the vanity of Mr. *Bls.* arguings, laying the stress wholly upon the believing party, which is not expressed in the Text, but onely hinted;

tes; and upon a translation of the particle *ἐν* by, which is not denied but may be translated *in* or *to*. Will any man of competent reason conceive, that the Apostle being to give reason of his resolution of an important point of conscience, about which he was by Letter consulted, would so loosely argue as to leave out the chief word from whence he inferred his conclusion, and conclude holiness as resulting from that which is not named, yea though he named the opposite term twice, and express a causality or antecedency by a term that had ordinarily another respect, when there was a proper and usual particle *διὰ* to express it by? And on the other side so precisely name the terms of *husband* and *wife* twice, and *your children* expressly, and yet lay no part of the stress upon the conjugal relation so often and so plainly mentioned? Yea, do we think that the Apostle giving a reason why the husband and wife might live together in disparity of Religion, would lay the whole stress upon that which was meerly accidental to their marriage state, to wit, the ones being a believer, and the federal holiness of children, without which their marriage might be good at first, and they lawfully continue together, and not ascribe it to that conjugal relation, continuing which alone made their living together lawfull as their comming together at first? That *Chamier* did overlash in saying the interpretation of federal holiness was *omnium nostrorum*, is manifest by the words of *Musculus*, *Melanchon*, and *Cameravius*, cited by me in my *Exercitation sect.* 5. That it was *Calvins* and many more Protestants opinion, is a prejudice against our opinion, but should not be with those that determine upon evidence of reason, not the authority of men. *Calvin* was an excellent man, but we may say of him, *Non videt omnia*. I follow Mr. *Bl.* in his next *section*.

Whereas Mr. *Bl.* saith, *I put the Apostles argument into this form, If the unbelieving husband were not sanctified by the wife, then were your children unclean; But they are not unclean, but holy*; Ergo, *the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife*: Had *he dealt fairly with me, he would have rectified the major*, and changed [*by*] into [*to*,] the conclusion of the syllogism, and the words next before and all along in that *section* of my *Examen* having [to the wife] which I contend for in that *section*, and *pag.* 14, 15. of my *Exercitation*, as the genuine reading, disclaiming [*by the wife*,] and of this advertise Mr. *M. p.* 97. of the first part of this *Review*. The rest of the *section* is spent about the proposition proving this sequel, [If the unbelieving husband be not sanctified in or to the wife, your children were unclean,] and so included in the Apostles consequence. Mr. *Bl.* would have it to be thus, *Answer to my Letter*, p. 38. [*All the children of an unbeliever are unclean, unless for generation he or she be sanctified by a believer.*] I conceive this proposition to be included in the Apostles consequence, [All the children of those parents whereof one is not sanctified to the other, are unclean;] or [none of the children of those parents whereof one is not sanctified to the other are holy.] The point in difference between us, is, whether it be necessary to insert [*of an unbeliever, unless for generation he or she be sanctified by a believer.*] This I deny for these reasons, 1. That is not necessary to

be

be inserted, without which the Apostles conclusion is inferred: But the Apostles conclusion is inferred without Mr. *Bls.* addition; *Ergo.* The *major* is of it self evident. The *minor* is thus proved. The Apostle in his argument doth not at all mention sanctification for generation, there may be and was sanctification without generation, else no husband and wife could be sanctified one in or to another except children were begotten, and so the Apostle should not resolve the lawfulness of their living together who were barren, which is absurd. Nor is it necessary to add [*by a believer,*] sith the Apostle hath omitted it, and that as it is very probable of set purpose. Nor is it necessary to add [*unbeliever*] because it is false then even according to Pædobaptists *hypotheses.* For then it would follow, the children of two believers are unclean, and so *Isaac* and *Jacob* should be unclean, or out of the Covenant; if this were added *all the children of those parents, whereof one is not an unbeliever sanctified for generation by a believer, are unclean.*

2. The second reason I form thus. That is not necessary to be added, which would make the Apostles proposition false: But Mr. *Bls.* addition would make the Apostles proposition false. For it is false, which he makes the Apostles proposition, *All the children of an unbeliever are unclean, unless for generation he or she be sanctified by a believer.* For whether by *uncleanness* we understand non-admissibleness into the Church, it is false; for the children of unbelievers bought with money by *Abraham*, though infants, yet were in Mr. *Bls.* sense federally holy: and me thinks Mr. *Bl.* who asserts against Mr. *Firmin* the baptizability of the infants of the generality of *English* though the parents be openly profane, and hate godliness, should not deny it: however, the case is clear in the Circumcision of professed infidels children bought with money, *Gen.* 17. 27. And for federal real holiness, I suppose Mr. *Bl.* will not deny, but that many of them, as *Rahab*, &c. were in the Covenant of saving grace.

To the first of these, Mr. *Bl.* 1. saith thus, *pag.* 338. *I pray leave generation out, and see whether there can be any sense in it, unless it be understood; their sanctification will confer no legitimation, without generation; if I say not believer, I must say husband or wife that is a believer.*

Answ. If *generation* be left out, and *believer*, it may be good sense according to my interpretation. An unbelieving husband may be sanctified to his wife, that is, may lawfully use her though she were an unbeliever as his wife, and may continue to live with her, and she with him, though they never had or should have children, else your children which you might beget should be unclean; but this being put, they are legitimate. But according to Mr. *Bls.* interpretation it is not good sense in the case of the barren; for she or he are not instrumentally sanctified for generation, there being no generation there is no being an instrument for generation, nor sanctification thereto. And an instrument is an efficient, and where there is no effect there is no efficient, nor instrument: And to be sanctified instrumentally must be as an instrument to a principal agent, which in this thing cannot be any other then God; now

now no inſtrument of God fails to produce its effect, therefore without actual generation, no wife can bee ſaid to bee inſtrumentally ſanctified for generation. And for the leaving out the term [*believer*] it is good ſenſe as I expound it without it, and if the Apoſtle had not conceived it good ſenſe without it, hee would not, as hee did, have left it out. But I confeſs it is not good ſenſe according to Mr. *Ils.* interpretation, who ſaith (though falſely) *p.* 334. *The ſtreſs is wholly laid upon the believing party, as to the holineſs of the iſſue twice over.* I confeſs their ſanctification would confer no legitimation actual without actual generation; yet their might bee legitimation of iſſue (which is enough to ſhew the conſequence to bee good and for the Apoſtles purpoſe) without actual generation, the legitimation being onely upon ſuppoſition (as it is uſual in ſuch arguments) and ſo the generation onely ſuppoſed. Doubtleſs the Apoſtle reſolved the *Corinthians* of the lawful living together of the barren as well as they that had or ſhould beget, which will not agree with Mr. *Ils.* expoſition of inſtrumental ſanctification for that is not true but of actual generation paſt or future, as I have proved.

But Mr. *Bl.* adds, *the Apoſtles major is of an unbelieving husband and a believing wife, and I make the propoſition univerſal, according to the capacity of the ſubject of all believing wives joyned to unbelieving husbands, not with Mr. I. of all husbands and wives. And this is the Apoſtles included propoſition, which muſt bee the baſis of ſo many inferences and refutations, when yet all mens Logick (except what Mr. T. hath learnt) will utterly diſclaim it.*

Anſw. That the Apoſtles *major* is not of an unbelieving husband and a believing wife, is manifeſt by the words in which the term [*believing*] is in both ſpeeches left out. And ſure if the Apoſtle would have aſcribed any thing to the believer as ſuch, hee could as eaſily have put it in as the term *unbeliever*, or the terms *brother* or *ſiſter*, uſed *v.* 12, 15. And though I deny not that *the wife*, or *husband* oppoſite to the infidel yoke-fellow were believers, yet I have learned ſo much Logick and Divinity, that what attributes do agree materially do not always agree formally in each ſpeech, as though *Iſhmael* was the ſon of *Abraham*, yet what is ſaid of him *Gal.* 4 23, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31. is ſaid of him not as *Abrahams* ſonne, but as *Hagars*. And ſo it is here, though the husband or wife were a believer, yet they are not there conſidered as believers, nor the things there ſpoken of them aſcribed to them under that conſideration, but under the conſideration of husband and wife: and if any diſclaim this Logick, he will diſclaim ſuch Logick as the holy Scripture uſeth in theſe and other places.

I alleged in my *Examen part.* 3. *ſect.* 8. *p.* 78. the words of *Chamier: tom.* 4. *pauſtr. cath. l.* 5. *c.* 10. §. 67. againſt *Auguſtines* interpretation of 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. of a ceremonial holineſs, as appoſite to refute his own of federal. For ſaith hee, *that interpretation is ridiculous if theſe propoſitions bee not true, that all born of thoſe parents whereof one is not ſanctified in the other, are begotten in the time of the womans monethly courſes, Infidel husbands never uſe their wives but at ſuch time, for ſo the*

Apostle is made to speak by Augustines *interpretation*. Now the self same I shewed to follow on his own interpretation, the words being changed which should bee changed in such a retorsion. For then according to it the Apostle should say, *All the children born of those parents of whom one is not sanctified in the other, are out of the Covenant of grace, infidel parents never beget of their wives children within the Covenant of grace.* Both which are false, and consequently the interpretation of *Chamier*, whence it is apparent that *Chamier* made these propositions in the Apostles arguing to be included, *Those children whereof one parent is not sanctified in the other are unclean, none of the children of those parents whereof one is not sanctified in the other are holy.* I said also in my *Antidote pag.* 16. that Mr. *Bl.* confessed these propositions included in the Apostles consequence. Against this Mr. *Bl.* thus riseth up.

" What can I imagine but that Mr. *T.* knowingly fastens this gross " untruth upon mee? Seeing he so well knowes that I both deny it and " have argued against it (having made such defence as he could in his " Apology of it) yet now in his *Antidote* says I confess it. I am over- " much honoured to be named (if I may say so) the day that *Chamier* is " mentioned, but as much wronged to have such a Monster of absurdi- " ties (as is contained in that proposition) obtruded upon mee; my " thoughts are over-high of *Chamier* to believe any such weakness " in him, when Mr. *T.* shewes it in him (having yet given his Rea- " der no account where it may bee found) I shall subscribe to " that Proverb; *Nullum magnum ingenium sine aliqua mixtura de-* " *mentiæ.*

Answ. *Chamiers* words in the place cited, making the Apostles arguing with *Augustines* exposition to include the two propositions before named, do plainly shew, that in his Logick the Apostle asserted these propositions, *All the children whereof one parent is not sanctified in the other are unclean, none of them are holy*; and Mr. *Bl.* in his *answer to my Letter ch.* 7. *sect.* 2. *pag.* 36. to my fourth argument against instrumental sanctification thus made, in this form of reasoning this proposition is included; Their children could not bee holy without that sanctification, which could not bee true of instrumental sanctification and federal holiness, replies never denying the proposition to bee included, but *avers it true of instrumental sanctification and federal holiness, yea most true, necessarily and universally true*: Now hee that saith without that sanctification (of one parent in the other) the children could not be holy, saith none of the children of those parents whereof one is not sanctified to the other are holy, to which is equipollent all the children of those parents whereof one is not sanctified in the other are unclean. And thus it is shewed Mr. *Bl.* where hee and *Chamier* confessed those propositions to bee included, which indeed have no monster of absurdities in them, but are the genuine *medium* of the Apostles argument, and *Chamier* without *any mixture of madness* did acutely discern to be included in the Apostles reasoning, though hee heeded not how this very observation overthrowes his own interpretation as well as *Augustines*.

The

The reſt of this ſection not anſwered about the reaſon I gave why the propoſition included in the Apoſtles ſequel is to be conceived without the terms of *believer* and *unbeliever* inſerted by Mr. *Bl.* and the illuſtration of it I ſhall make no further reply to here, but refer the Reader to what is ſo largely ſpoken in vindication of my ſelf in the firſt part of this *Review ſect.* 21. *pag.* 170. *ſect.* 36. *pag.* 249, 250. I proceed to examine Mr. *Bls.* fifth Sect. of the 29th. Chapter, although there are ſome things in the ſixth Section which perhaps might bee more fitly anſwered firſt.

Mr. *Bl.* Sect. 5. having ſaid that I alledge, that the Apoſtles in this text brings a formal argument to prove the marriage ſociety of theſe yoke-fellowes lawful, which in the two former verſes hee had determined, hee then adds.

"And it cannot be denied but the words at the firſt ſight, ſeem to "carry ſome colour to underſtand them ſo far in Mr. *T.* his ſenſe, as to "make them formal, concluding reaſons of his former determinati-"on having ſaid *v.* 12, 13. then hee adds *v.* 14. But the way of infe-"rence will as well bear it, that the Apoſtle doth firſt determine in "the controverſie by revelation (as Mr. *T.* will have it) as an Apo-"ſtle, then takes off their ſcruples which occaſioned their fears, both "reſpective to their poſterity and themſelves; Mr. *T.* indeed challen-"ges this way of interpretation to make the Apoſtle immethodical, but "what better method then to determine a point, and then anſwer "reaſons againſt it; The Apoſtle meeting with their fears in reſpect "of their poſterity and themſelves, it muſt needs bee that they ſignified "them and hee anſwers them; The Apoſtles method (it is true) and "manner of inference indifferently favours either interpretation; But "the words themſelvs clearly evince, that they are a removal of ſcruples "againſt their marriage ſociety, and not a formal concluding argument "againſt it.

Anſw. It is true it is a bottome I build much on, 1. That the Apoſtle brings the *media* or middle terms of two Syllogiſms or formal arguments *v.* 14. to prove the lawfulneſs of the continuance in marriage ſociety of the believing yoke-fellow with the unbeliever, determined by him *v.* 12, 13. and that they are not as *v.* 16. a Rhetorical argument onely to move the affections to embrace what before their judgements were ſetled in, but a Logical proof of the reſolution by ſetting down the *medium* out of which a ſyllogiſm is to be framed to infer the concluſion. 2. That the Apoſtle doth not at all reſolve any doubt about their poſterity, but takes the ſtate of their poſterity as out of doubt with them, and thence infers that which was doubtful to them concerning their own marriage ſtate. Now Mr. *Bl denies not the words at firſt ſight ſeem to carry ſome colour to underſtand them ſo far in my ſenſe as to make them formal, concluding reaſons of the Apoſtles former determination*, and confeſſeth *the Apoſtles method and manner of inference indifferently favours either interpretation.* But that the words are to bee analyſed and conceived onely in the form I have reſolved them, I prove, firſt by the particles, *for, elſe, but now*: all theſe particles are argumentative.

[*For*] in many places, as *Rom.* 3. 20. *&* 4. 15, *&c.* 1 *Corinth.* 7. 9, 31, *&c.* ἐπεὶ ἄρα tranſlated *elſe*, or *otherwiſe*, or *for then* are argumentative, as 1 *Cor.* 5. 10. *&* 15. 15, 29. *Rom.* 11. 6. in which places it notes an abſurdity conſequent, if the antecedent bee not granted: νῦν δὲ *but now*, is uſed alſo frequently as an argumentative particle, as 1 *Corinth.* 12. 18, 20. *Rom.* 3. 21. *Heb.* 8 6. *&* 9. 26. there are both theſe uſed, as ἐπεὶ *&* νῦν δὲ, ſo 1 *Corinth.* 15. 20. And accordingly *Paſor* in his *Lexicon* on the word νυνὶ, *dici ur etiam* νυνὶ, 1 *Cor.* 15. 20. *interdum ſervit aſſumptioni ſyllogiſmi*, 1 *Cor.* 7. *v.* 14 *&* 15. *v.* 20. Mr. *Cobbet Juſt. vindic. part.* 1. *chap.* 1. *ſect.* 1. *where the words* ἐπεὶ ἄρα *uſed in argumentation, as* 1 *Cor.* 5. 10. *and the particle* νῦν δὲ *in like ſort uſed,* 1 *Cor.* 12. 18, 20. So *Rom.* 3. 21. *Heb* 8. 6, *&* 9. 26. *&* 11. 16. *Do declare that that ſentence* (in the latter part of 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.) *is annexed in way of argumentation to the propoſition immediately before. Beza annot. ad* 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *particula* νῦν *hoc in loco non eſt temporis adverbium, ſed eſt conjunctio quæ adhiberi ſolet in argumentorum aſſumptionibus.* 2. This is proved from the matter, it is agreed on that the Apoſtle determines the doubt of the *Corinthians v.* 12, 13. and it is apparent that the firſt part of *v.* 14 is a reaſon of his determination. Let us conſider the determination *v.* 12, 13. *let him not put her away, let her not leave him.* Now this determination may be underſtood either as a plain prohibition forbidding the believer to put away or leave the unbelieving yoke-fellow at all, being contented to dwell with the believer. But this ſenſe ſeems not to me to be the Apoſtles intent; 1. Becauſe it might then be a hard yoke, that a believer muſt not put away his wife which will dwell with him though ſhe play the harlot; or it may be underſtood as a determination of their liberty, *Let him not put her away, let her not leave him*, that is, there is no neceſſity that he ſhould put her away, that ſhe ſhould leave him, conſcience and duty to God ties them not to do ſo, and this ſenſe ſeems moſt probable to me, though I reject not the other, if ſome limitation more be added, as thus, *let him not put her away, nor ſhee leave him*, that is, I forbid them to leave each other barely for the diſparity of religion. Now the reaſons of this later explication are theſe. 1. Becauſe the phraſe *v.* 15. *let him depart* is not an abſolute command but a permiſſion, as the words following, *a brother or ſiſter is not under bondage in ſuch caſes*, ſhew, and the like is to bee ſaid of the reſolution *v.* 17. *ſo let him walk*, that is, ſo hee may walk, and that it is the ſenſe, I gather from the inſtances in the following verſes, whereby the Apoſtle illuſtrates his determination *v.* 17. *Is any man called being uncircumciſed? v.* 18. *let him not become uncircumciſed: Is any called in uncircumciſion? let him not be circumciſed.* Which ſpeeches do not abſolutely forbid the drawing up the fore-skin or the cutting it off, there might bee caſes in which either might be lawful, but leave it at liberty, and ſo much the words following alſo intimate *circumciſion is nothing, and uncircumciſion is nothing but the keeping the commandements of God*, which expreſſion intimates the indifferency of theſe, and the non availing to ingratiate us to God, which is not a fit reaſon for an abſolute prohibition, but for a determination concerning the liberty of either.

Then

Then the Apoſtle *v.* 20. repeats his determination *v.* 17. *Let every man abide in the ſame calling wherein he was called*; which (though true of it) is not meant of his Chriſtian general calling, as if he had ſaid, Let every man abide in Chriſtianity wherein he was called, which the words ſeem at firſt reading to import; for the words following, *v.* 21. *Art thou called being a ſervant?* do ſhew, that the term [*calling*] *v.* 20. notes the ſtate of life antecedent to his being a Chriſtian, which by an elegant *Antanaclaſis* is termed by the Apoſtle *his callin* : And this the Apoſtle doth not enjoyn ſo as that he forbids any ſervant to be free; but the meaning is, as *Diodati* in his *Annot.* rightly expounds it, *He may abide therein with a ſafe conſcience, and ought not raſhly to change it, neither through ſuperſtition, nor by doing another any wrong: but if he can do it for any juſt cauſes, or through any lawfull means, it is then lawfull for him to do it.* The ſame is repeated *v.* 24. and is to be underſtood, not (as oft preachers do underſtand it) of a mans trade, or imployment onely, and as an abſolute command, that a man ſhould not leave his imployment, trade, or function in which he was bred, as of a tradeſman to become a preacher, *&c.* but *the calling* is any ſtate of life in which the perſon was found, who was called to be a Chriſtian, as to be circumciſed or uncircumciſed, a ſervant or freeman, married or unmarried, ſubject or Magiſtrate, and ſo proves that Magiſtracy or any other ſtate of life is conſiſtent with Chriſtianity. And the Apoſtles determination is not of neceſſity, as if a Chriſtian might not alter the calling or ſtate of life he was in when he was converted, for then the ſervant might not become free, nor the unmarried marry; but of liberty, that Chriſtians ſhould not think themſelves bound by their Chriſtian profeſſion, to forſake theſe eſtates, but they might continue in them. And ſo is the reſolution *v.* 12, 13. to be expounded. 2. This expoſition is agreeable to the occaſion of the Apoſtles determination, which was the *Corinthian* Chriſtians doubt of the lawfulneſs of their living together, not of the inconvenience or convenience (for in that they could have beſt reſolved themſelves) and ſo the Apoſtles reſolution is of the lawfulneſs of living together. 3. This is further confirmed from the reaſon of his determination, *v.* 12, 13. in the firſt part of *v.* 14. which is apparently ſet down to meet with the reaſon of their doubt: they thought that they might not live with the unbeliever, becauſe unholy. The Apoſtle on the contrary determines though hee were unholy in himſelf, yet he was to his wife as if hee had been holy: and the reaſon is thus, The wife may live with him as her husband, who though an unbeliever, is in reſpect of marriage uſe as if he were ſanctified: But ſo is the unbelieving husband; *Ergo*. Which reaſon cannot be a meer Rhetorical argument to move the affection, for it ſuppoſeth the unbeliever continuing ſuch, which was their vexation; but an argument to ſatisfie their conſciences: Yet not of their duty that they muſt live together, for it is heterogeneous to that end, they were not bound to live together by reaſon of the ſanctifiedneſs of the unbeliever, but Gods command, which alone makes duty; but of the lawfulneſs notwithſtanding his infidelity, by determining againſt the ground of their

doubt,

doubt, the unlawfulneſs of living together with an unſanctified infidel. As for the words following, [*Elſe were your children unclean, but now are they holy,*] they cannot be the reſolution of another doubt: but 1. the forms of expreſſion [ἐπεὶ ἄρα, *elſe* or *otherwiſe*, and *but now*,] do plainly ſhew, that thoſe words do confirm what was ſaid next before, [*the unbelieving wife is ſanctified to the husband.*] 2. They ſhew that the thing was certain even to them, that their children were not unclean, and that it was abſurd in their conceits that their children ſhould be unclean. Mr. *Bl.* himſelf ſaith, *Vindic. Fæd.* pag. 323. *Elſe implies a certainty, that upon this account of ſanctification of the parent, from whom the ground of fear aroſe, the children are holy; a like certainty, that were it not that they were thus ſanctified they were unclean.* Which words do plainly ſet down the two propoſitions I conceived in the Apoſtles argument, which Mr. *Bl.* terms *a monſter of abſurdity*; for [*It is certain that upon this account of ſanctification of the parent from whom the ground of fear aroſe, the children are holy,*] is equipollent to this, [All the children of thoſe parents whereof one is ſanctified to the other, are holy;] and [*it is certain, that were it not that they were thus ſanctified, they were unclean,*] is equipollent to this, [none of the children of thoſe parents whereof one is not ſanctified to the other, are clean or holy:] and hereby *their fear* is confeſſed to have been *about their own living together*, and the ground of it the imagined *non ſanctifiedneſs of the parent*, and that [*elſe*] *doth imply a certainty of the childrens holineſs upon this account of ſanctification of the parent*; which evidently ſhews, that the childrens holineſs is a conſequent of the parents ſanctification, and brought to prove it, and not to reſolve another doubt of them. Yea, it were ridiculous to reſolve a doubt by a doubt, to reſolve them their children were holy, becauſe they were holy. Rightly ſaith *Piſcator* in his *ſcholie* on the place. *The argument is from the effect, to wit a conſequent abſurdity*, and it is after this form, *If the unbelieving husband were not ſanctified in the wife, their children would be unclean: But they are not unclean, for they are holy; therefore the unbelieving husband is ſanctified in the wife.* Whence it is apparent, that the words are not a reſolution of a doubt of their children, for then the childrens holineſs would have been the concluſion, whereas it is the aſſumption, and conſequently that the Apoſtle uſeth formal arguments, or gives the middle-terms of them, and that he doth not reſolve two doubts, but one of the lawfulneſs of the living together of yokefellows in diſparity of Religion, and that the firſt argument is taken from that which obviates the ground of their fear, and the later confirms that argument from a conſequent abſurdity even in their apprehenſion, if that were not granted. This to be the true *Analyſis* of the Apoſtles words, the words of *Chamier*, *Beza*, *Zegedin* in his *tables*, and many more do ſhew, which I forbear to alledge as conceiving it needleſs. What ſaith Mr. *Bl.* to this?

" Let us look firſt into *v.* 16. where the [*for*] may lay as fair a claim " to a formal reaſon as this in the 14th. and M. *T.* himſelf ſays is a reaſon, " *Antipol.* pag. 110. But I would fain learn how he can make it up in- " to a reaſon; he muſt thus draw it up. Whom a man in *marriage*

" ſociety

" ſociety may have hopes to ſave from idolatrous ways, with ſuch a one " he may continue in marriage ſociety: But a believing husband in " marriage ſociety may have hopes to ſave his unbelieving wife from " idolatrous ways; *Ergo.* This propoſition as to ſuch a concluſion is " 1. vain; for though there were no ſuch hopes, yet marriage ſociety " is to be continued, Gentiliſm being not of the ſubſtance of marriage, " which Mr. T ſeems to yeeld, *Examen, pag* 121. 2. This propoſition " is falſe as to this purpoſe; the inceſtuous *Corinthian* might have had " hopes to have converted his fathers wife (if a heathen) and yet ſuch " hopes would not conclude the lawfulneſs of their ſociety together. " *Herod* might have had like hopes to have converted his brother *Phi-* " *lips* wife, and yet this was not objected againſt *John Baptiſt*, and had " it been objected, it had been frivolous. We have many caſes put about " marriage, if ſuch an argument would ſerve the turn, it would ſalve " them all.

Anſw. Though I ſay 1 *Cor.* 7.16. is a reaſon to perſwade to the reſolution *v.*13. yet I do not ſay it is a reaſon to conclude the lawfulneſs of living together, but to perſwade them the rather to live together from the poſſibility or hopefulneſs of that event, which he urgeth in a Rhetorical way in an interrogation, not in a Logick way as he did *v.*14. and yet it may be drawn up Logically thus. They are the rather to live together, it being otherwiſe determined lawfull, whereof one, if they live together, may ſave the other: But ſo it may be if the brother or ſiſter live with the infidel yokefellow, *Ergo.* So that by my maintaining that *v.*14. [*for*] notes the *medium* of a formal argument, and that thereby the lawfulneſs of the believing and infidel yokefellows continuing together in marriage ſociety is concluded, and that [*for*, *v.*16.] notes a reaſon of the reſolution, *v.*16. yet it follows not the concluſion inferred *v.*16. is the ſame with that inferred *v.*14. nor the reaſon to be drawn as Mr. *Bl.* would, nor is there any need I ſhould retract my *Analyſis* of *v.*12,13,14. nor anſwer Mr. *Bls.* objections againſt an argument which I neither aſcribe to the Apoſtle, nor is deducible out of any of my grants.

Mr. *Bl.* adds. " And for *v.*14. though I cannot ſay, but in caſe it " were made up (into Mr. *Ts.* his ſenſe) into a reaſon of the former " concluſion, it would contain a truth, and ſo far might paſs in the " way of a reaſon: Yet I have many material exceptions againſt it; " 1. from the thing it ſelf, it would be a reaſon ſilly, childiſh, vain, " your married condition is lawfull, elſe your children were baſtards; " what child in *Corinth* but well underſtood it? 2. From the phraſe in " which it is delivered altogether unſuitable to a reaſon of this doctrine, " 1. being onely to tell them, that the legitimation of their iſſue pro- " ved the lawfulneſs of their marriage ſociety, he ſhould attribute all " (as to either ſex) to the believer, when the child owes his legitima- " tion equally to either parent: 2. That being to give a reaſon of the " lawfulneſs of marriage in ſuch a ſpecial caſe, he ſhould give his rea- " ſon of equal concernment to all marriages, where both are unbelie- " vers, both believers, as well as this between a believer and an unbe-

liever:

" liever: 3. When he is to ſpeak onely of legitimation and baſtardy, " he ſhould phraſe it in ſuch uncouth language, and in words fit " it onely ſuteable to their parents Eccleſiaſtical capacity, whether " title to it, as in the believer, or want of it, as in the unbelie- " ver. Now on the other hand interpret the Apoſtles words (as " his method will equally beare) accordingly as you have heard " before, and no ſuch inconvenience follows from the words either " *v.*14. or 16.

Anſw. Mr. *Bls.* confeſſion that *my analyſis and expoſition would contain a truth, and that it might paſs in the way of a reaſon*, and therefore is appoſite to the Apoſtles purpoſe, and his exceptions though termed by him material, yet, as I ſhall ſhew, having no weight, and his method and expoſition neither agree with the words nor matter, is a very good evidence for me againſt him. As for his exceptions, they are the ſame which he brought before, *ſect.* 3. and are anſwered by me in this *ſection*, that it was the fitter for the Apoſtle to uſe if the reaſon were ſo eaſily underſtood, that the Apoſtle doth not attribute all to the believer, that no reaſon was ſo fit to ſettle them about their ſpecial caſe, as that which evinced, that the marriage ſtate was not made void by the unbelief of the parties, that the Apoſtles phraſes are not uncouth language after my ſenſe, but very agreeable to ſuch language he uſeth in the ſame Chapter; as when *v.*20. by an *Antanaclaſis* he terms the civil ſtate of the Chriſtians *the calling wherein they are called*, and to other expreſſions, as I ſhew in the firſt part of this *Review*, *ſect.* 12, 23, 24, 25, 26 and that the phraſes are not ſuitable to the parents Eccleſiaſtical capacity; and the Apoſtles ſpeeches and argument do imply ſainthood, and are inconſiſtent with the terms and matter of them, if expounded and reſolved as Mr. *Bl.* would.

Mr. *Bl.* adds. " And now Mr. *T.* may eaſily receive anſwer to that " odious inference, which he makes from our interpretation of Covenant " holineſs. According to this interpretation (ſaith he) the *medium* of " the Apoſtle to prove the lawfulneſs of the living of a believing wife " with an unbelieving husband, will as well prove the lawfulneſs of a " believing fornicatrix living with an unbelieving fornicator, as may " appear (ſaith he) by a ſyllogiſtical analyſis of the Apoſtles argument " the *major* whereof is this, That man and woman may live together, " notwithſtanding the unbelief of one party, whereof one is ſanctified " to the other for begetting an holy ſeed. This is manifeſtly the Apoſtles " reaſon after our interpretation. But Mr. *T.* is manifeſtly miſtaken, " not to mention the liberty that he will ſcarce allow another, to leave " out husband and wife expreſt in the Text, and inſtead of it to put " man and woman: The Apoſtle doth not conclude the lawfulneſs of " their marriage ſociety by the federation of their iſſue, but ſhews that " the ſuppoſed and feared non-federation doth not conclude the unlaw- " fulneſs: And I dare yeeld that any man and woman may live toge- " ther, notwithſtanding any fear of the unholineſs of their iſſue; where " one is ſanctified by the faith of another to the begetting of an holy " ſeed. And if Mr. *T.* will apply this, which the Apoſtle ſpeaks, of a

" mans

"mans living with his wife (*ad faciendum populum*) to the living with "his whore, there is no danger to yeeld it; *Pharez* his iſſue had belon-"ged to the Commonweal of *Iſrael*, if *Thamar* had been an infidel, as "for ought wee know, in all probability it was with *Jephtaes* mother. "If *Sampſon* had iſſue by the harlot of *Gaza Judg.* 16. 1. ſuch iſſue "had belonged to *Iſrael*, ſuch iſſue male had right to circumciſion. To "gratifie Mr. *T.* I ſhall put it under my hand, that if a man have no o-"ther reaſon from Scripture to leave his harlot then the non-federati-"on of his iſſue, he may ſtill abide with her.

Anſw. There is no miſtake in my argument, nor is there any anſwer at all made by Mr. *Bl.* to it, which hee either wittingly or unwittingly I judge not, certain I am he doth manifeſtly miſtake. He tels me, *the Apoſtle doth not conclude the lawfulneſs of their marriage ſociety by the federation of their iſſue*, whereby he intimates as if *I* ſaid he did, and that therein was my miſtake: But let my words be viewed *Apol.* ſect. 18. p. 96. *Poſtſcript.* ſect. 7. p. 122. *Review* part. 1. ſect. 22, 36. and it will appear that I frame not the argument ſo according to the Apoſtle, lightly underſtood, but as Mr. *M.* and others interpret him. I ſaid the Apoſtle concludes the lawfulneſs of their living together by the ſanctification of the husband though an unbeliever to or in the wife, and that the propoſition of the *Apoſtle* is, They may live together whereof one is ſanctified in the other, the aſſumption is, But the unbelieving husband is ſanctified in the wife, *Ergo.* Now the *major* with Mr. *Ms.* and Mr. *Bls.* expoſition hath this ſenſe, They may live together whereof one is ſanctified by the faith of the other for the begetting a holy ſeed, for ſo they expound the *Apoſtle.* But according to them the vnbelieving fornicator is ſanctified by the believing fornicatrix for the begetting a holy ſeed, which is confeſſed by them. By Mr. *Bl.* here, when he ſaith, *The iſſue of* Tamar, Jephtha's *mother*, *the Harlot at* Gaza *were holy federally*: and for the *major* there is no neceſſity of putting in [*huſband and wife*] ſith as Mr. *Bl.* ſaith p, 334. *The ſtreſs is wholly laid upon the believing party, as to the holineſs of the iſſue*, and here, *I dare yeeld*, ſaith he, *that any man and woman may live together, notwithſtanding any fear of the unholineſs of their iſſue; where one is ſanctified by the faith of another to the begetting of an holy ſeed.* Now put all theſe together. The *Apoſtle* argues the believer may live with the unbeliever, becauſe the one is ſanctified in the other, and this ſanctifying is according to Mr. *Ms.* and Mr. *Bls.* expoſition for the begetting a holy ſeed, and this begetting of a holy ſeed according to Mr. *Bl.* is aſcribed wholly to the faith of the one parent, it's a reſult or fruit of the parents faith whether married or unmarried, therefore according to Mr. *Bls.* expoſition of the *Apoſtle*, the lawfulneſs of living together is deduced from that which doth as well agree to fornicators as the married, and conſequently the lawfulneſs of living together in fornication is inferred from the *Apoſtles* reaſon as Mr. *Bl.* and Mr. *M.* and others expound it as well as of husband and wife. It is true I would not allow another to leave [*husband and wife*] expreſſt in the text out of the argument framed by me according to my expoſition, which is the *Apoſtles* meaning as I conceive, becauſe I lay

I lay the whole ſtreſs upon thoſe terms, and ſtill contend that no perſons are ſanctified one in or to another but the husband and wife, and that theſe are ſo ſanctified, whether one or both or neither are believers. But if I frame the reaſon according to Mr. *Ms.* Mr. *Bls.* and others interpretation of the Apoſtle, I am to be allowed to leave them our, ſith by them no ſtreſs is laid on the husband and wife or conjugal relation, but the faith of one party. That there was any ſuch fear of non-federation of iſſue, or ſuppoſition of it in the *Corinthians* if they livid together cannot be evinced from the text, but the contrary is manifeſt by the arguing from the uncleanneſs of their children, as an abſurdity in their apprehenſions, and the holineſs of them as a thing known and certain to them, as the particle [*elſe*] ſhews: and therefore that *the Apoſtle ſhew, that the feared and ſuppoſed non-federation doth not conclude the unlawfulneſs*, is but a fiction, nor doth the Apoſtle make any ſuch diſtinction between concluding the lawfulneſs, and the not concluding the unlawfulneſs, between which if there bee any diſtinction (which yet I perceive not) yet it is certain that the words *v.* 12, 13. *let him not put her away, let her not leave him*, are a poſitive reſolution of the lawfulneſs of their continuing together in marriage ſociety, and the reaſon ſhews *v.* 14. that the doubt was of the believers conjunction with the unbeliever, becauſe he was an unſanctified perſon, and conſequently the reaſon of the doubt was not the fear of the non-federation of iſſue but the unlawfulneſs of marriage ſociety with an infidel unſanctified: and conſequently it is a monſtrous addition which Mr. *Bl.* ſeems to put either into the concluſion thus, *let her not leave him if this be all the fear the non-federation of iſſue*, or in the reaſon, *They may live together whereof one is ſanctified by the faith of the other party, ſo as that there is no fear of the non-federation of their iſſue*, there being nothing in the text for this addition. Yet if it were put in it will juſtifie my *odious inference* as hee terms it. For let the *major* be thus after Mr. *Bls.* minde, They may live together whereof one is ſanctified by the faith of the other, ſo as there is no fear of non-federation of their iſſue, the *minor* is thus expreſly after Mr *Bls.* minde; But the unbelieving fornicatrix is ſanctified by the faith of the believing fornicator, ſo as that there is no fear of non-federation of their iſſue, *Ergo* they may live together according to Mr. *Bl.* and conſequently Mr. *Bl.* blaſphemouſly by his expoſition makes the Apoſtle juſtifie the living together of a believer with an unbeliever in fornication; which is enough to ſhew the falſhood of that expoſition, yea and of any other which aſcribes the ſanctifiedneſs *v.* 14. (which is the reaſon of their lawful living together, *v.* 12, 13.) to the faith of the one party, and not to the conjugal relation. The reſt of Mr. *Bls.* talk *of my willingneſs to have him waſte his time, his falling on my ſapleſs tree, the readineſs of his axe, his pains in applying it*, is vain and trivolous talk, ſith the tree ſtill ſtands after all his hacking and hewing at it, and his axe appears to bee very blunt, or elſe he ſtrikes beſides the tree. As for my ſixe years ſpace, Mr. *Bl.* might have underſtood that the reaſon of my not publiſhing the firſt part of my *Review* till 1652. ſix years after the printing of *Apology*, was (beſides my

conſtan

constant labours and extraordinary publike and private employments) from the necessity of my removing my dwelling from the Temple to *Bewdley*, from *Bewley* to *Ledbury*, thence to *Lemster*, besides my frequent flittings by reason of the wars, travels to regain my plundered goods, difficulty to get my treatise printed, the variety of Antagonists I had to answer, which is yet the reason of my slowness in publishing this part of the *Review*, and comes from the venemous spirit of such as Mr. *Bl.* Mr. *B.* and other Pædobaptists, who would never comply with me in the fair motion in the Epilogue of my *Examen* to joyn together in a brotherly way of ventilating the point, but what they can bait me with calumnies tending to discredit me as covetous, arrogant, *&c.* with multitude of replies, and magnifying them though trivolous, vilifying my writings that men might not reade them, and discern the truth, nor Book-sellers be willing to print or sell them, stirring up Parliaments and Rulers to remove those of our way, out of all places which have publike salary, that our hands may be weakned; which I may truly call wicked practises, of which too many of them have been guilty, and for which God will judge them. I go on.

Mr. *Bl.* sect. 6. to my argument against his instrumental sanctification, that barren persons cannot be said to be instrumentally sanctified for producing an holy seed pressed by me in the 1. part of this *Review* p. 150, 151. sect. 19: saith thus, *And I will appeal to any, yea the meanest Christian, whether persons that have children born in wedlock bonds, in such disparity may not have their fears and scruples about them, notwithstanding others in the same condition of marriage are childless, or unable to bring forth children? whether the seed which came of those marriages* Ezra. 10. *were not unclean, notwithstanding many so married had no children; Many of the Priests had herein transgrest, and it was but some of them had wives by whom they had children, Ezra* 10.44. All which I grant, but there is not a jot in all this which answers my objection; that the barren by accident or nature could not bee said to bee sanctified to produce an holy seed, and yet the reason of the Apostle must bee conceived to reach to the proof of the lawfulness of their living together in disparity of religion as well as the fruitful, and therefore the sanctifying must be expounded in another sense then Mr. *Bls.* which agrees not to their case.

But hee adds. *And because this is the* medium *for proof of the Apostles determination, v.* 14. *that they might live together*, pag. 152. *hee will have it to be from a future contingent; but when this is no* medium *for proof of the Apostles determination, as hath been sufficiently shewn it is not, this fals with the other.*

Answ. That it hath been sufficiently shewn that the first part of *v.* 14. is not a *medium* for proof of the Apostles determination, is said without any colour of truth. All the reason I finde given is, *v.* 16 *is not a formal reason*, ergo, *neither v.* 14. towhich answer hath been given by denying both the antecedent and the consequence, it is a formal reason though not as Mr. *Bl.* frames it, and if it were not, yet the term [*for, else, but now*] being argumentative terms, shew there is formal reasoning

ning *v.* 14. *v.* 14. and the producing an holy seed being a contingent event, if the Apostle should, as Mr. *Bls.* exposition makes him, prove their lawful living together, because the unbeliever is sanctified instrumentally to produce an holy seed, hee should argue from an uncertain event, which *Chamier tom.* 4. *paustr. Cath.* lib 5. chap. 10. sect. 46. disapproved in another case, as I shew in my *Examen* pag. 73.

To my argument against instrumental sanctification, that it cannot be meant of it, sith the barren cannot bee said to bee Gods instrument, for that always effects, and when God sanctifies hee specially designes some, whereas this is common to all husbands and wives, and the unbeliever is said to bee sanctified, whereas it is the believer according to them who is the instrument of producing a holy seed.

Mr. *Bl.* saith, "I am sure they bring forth children unto God, *Ezek.* 16. 20. and this they do not independently of themselves, so "Christ would not have warned *Matth.* 23. 10. call no man father upon earth, for one is your father who is in heaven. All natural parents "are instruments of God to produce a seed to people the world, according to that blessing of *Gen.* 1. 28. *Gen.* 9. 1. Bee fruitful and "multiply and replenish the earth; All believing parents are instruments of God for an holy seed, it being of his free grace that the "promise is to them and their seed.

Answ. What is said *Ezek.* 16. 20. was said onely of *Israelites* and those manifest idolaters as well as true believers, and the words do import no more but this, that the *Israelites children were born* of right *to him*, that is, to be at his disposal for his service, *Levit.* 25. 42. *because bee brought them out of Egypt*, and therefore it was unjust in them to alienate them from him by offering them to idols, which is not to be said of the *Corinthian* believers children. *Matth.* 23. 9. is as impertinently alledged, for it speaks not of Gods being a Father in respect of natural generation, nor forbids calling any man a father in that respect, but in that manner in which the Jews termed their teachers fathers and themselves their children, in respect of absolute subjection of their consciences to their dictates, as *Diodati* rightly in his *annot. This teacheth the believers not to yeeld that absolute reverence, nor power over their consciences to any living man which belongeth to God onely, as ignorant people did use to do to the Pharisees.* If all natural parents be instruments of God to people the world, yet Mr. *Bl.* will not say they are instruments to produce a holy seed to people the Church for then all children and not believers onely should be federally holy: so that all this is meerly impertinent. That *all believing parents are instruments of God for an holy seed*, is said without proof, there being *no such promise to them and their seed* produced, nor if there were did it follow they were all federally holy in Mr. *Bls.* sense: But were this granted, yet it is nothing to prove the unbelieving parent to bee Gods instrument to produce a holy seed, who is said, and not the believer to bee sanctified, and that *signanter* considered as an unbeliever, much less every unbelieving wife though barren who hath a believing husband, much less to bee specially designed for that end,

end, and therefore the ſanctification inſtrumental which Maſter *Bl.* conceives meant 1 *Corinth.* 7. 14. is quite beſides the Apoſtles meaning.

Mr. *Bl* goes on thus of me, " The 2d. argument he hath in his *Apol.* " p. 123. where he ſays that the Apoſtles propoſition underſtood of fe- " deral holineſs were moſt certainly falſe, giving in his reaſon, for many " children of both unbelieving parents are federally holy; he ſaith that *I* " anſwer, they are not ſo at their birth. My anſwer is, if afterwards " by grace they are changed; this is no fruit of their birth (of which " the queſtion is in this place) but the work of the Goſpel through grace, " Mr. *T.* ſays, This is nothing to the purpoſe, ſith the propoſition hath " not thoſe words in it, nor the Apoſtle; the Apoſtles reaſon ſuppoſeth " it cannot be at any time; It ſeems then that the Apoſtles propoſition " hath this in it, that their children ſo born cannot bee clean at any " time, or elſe Mr. *T.* his exception is leſs to purpoſe, who does not ſee " that the Apoſtle ſpeaks of uncleanneſs or holineſs, as as a product of " their birth without conſideration of any thing which after by provi- " dence (through the omnipotence and free grace of God) might hap- " pen, as a mean woman given in marriage to a Senator or Peer, ſhe " is enobled by her husband, otherwiſe her iſſue were Plebeians; " yet ſo as they are capable of honour by the Princes munificence, or " their own merit; It ſeems that propoſition of Chriſts, That which is " born of the fleſh is fleſh, *Joh.* 3 6. will not hold, unleſs it muſt for " ever continue fleſh, and no omnipotence of God ſhall be able to make " it otherwiſe.

Anſw. It is true that it ſeems to me the Apoſtles propoſition hath this in it, that their children born unclean cannot be clean at any time, and I grant that the Apoſtle ſpeaks of uncleanneſs or holineſs as a product of their birth or generation, without conſideration of any thing which after by providence (through the omnipotence and free grace of God) might happen, and therefore of illegitimation and legitimation by birth, and not of federal holineſs which is no product of birth, and yet that propoſition, *That which is born of the fleſh is fleſh, Joh.* 3 6. will hold, though after the perſon born after the fleſh be made ſpirit or ſpiritual, there being no contradiction in this, that the perſon born after the fleſh ſhould become ſpiritual in his qualities, but it is impoſſible that that which hath been illegitimate in birth, ſhould not be illegitimate in birth, it being a thing paſt, and therefore cannot by God be made not a thing paſt, or not done, for then it ſhould be true that a thing hath been at birth, and hath not been, been and not been, which is a contradiction.

Mr. *Bl.* ſaith, *I farther add, And yet it may be certain that the child of two unbelievers may be federally holy at birth, whether it bee underſtood of election, inherent holineſs or outward holineſs, if God pleaſe to work and declare it, I would Mr. T. would ſpeak, whether there were ever any ſuch a thing as the child of two unbelievers, at the inſtant of their birth, declared of God to bee of thoſe whom hee took to bee federally holy, and of the number of his Covenant people, let that propoſition ſtand till God by ſuch a miracle confute or contradict it.*

Anſw.

Answ. 1. Though I could not speak there was such a thing, yet it is enough for me to shew that and how it might be. 2. I doubt not but many a captive woman gotten with child by an infidel, and she her self an infidel, hath been delivered in *Abrahams* house, and those children were in Mr. *Bls.* sense federally holy at the instant of their birth, for for they were, if males, capable of Circumcision on the eighth day, according to the law, *Gen.*17.12,13. and this is to be federally holy according to Mr. *Bls.* doctrine, who makes all to be in the Covenant at their birth who are capable by reason of their birth of the sign of the Covenant.

He yet saith, *Mr.* T. *adds*, But the issue of them that are not lawfully conjoyned as husband and wife cannot be made legitimate by God, because it is contrary to the definition of legitimation, which is a state consequent upon birth by the lawfull copulation of lawfull husband and wife. *This must conclude for his interpretation, and against ours, because God by his omnipotence can make our unclean ones holy, and to make his unclean ones holy, is without the verge of omnipotence: If we should put case in Mr.* T. *his manner, that God should appear in approbation of a mans enjoying a woman out of marriage society, then there were a legitimation of the issue, as he did the marriage of the brothers wife,* Deut.25.5. *otherwise against the moral law,* Levit.18.16.

Answ. It concludes for me if it be true (which Mr. *Bl.* disproves not) that the holiness is meant 1 *Cor.*7.14. which cannot be without the sanctification there spoken of, and Mr. *Bls.* holiness may be without his sanctification, and the proposition is true of no other holiness but that which I assign. If the definition of legitimation be a state of birth from parents generating in lawfull marriage, though God should approve of a mans enjoying a woman out of marriage society, there were no legitimation of the issue, and yet the marriage *Deut.*25.5. were lawfull, and the issue legitimate. I am sorry Mr. *Bl.* hath tyred himself and me with so many impertinent words, which have shaken nothing of my Fabrick: I am glad I am so near an end with him, and pass from him to Mr. *Sydenham*, who in the 7th. *ch.* of his *Exercit.* thus speaks,

The scope of the Apostle here is to hold forth some special Gospel priviledge annexed to the state: and he frames his argument by no ordinary medium, of the lawfulness of the marriage according to a natural, moral, or positive rule; but a majori, from an eminent advantage they had together in the Gospel. For 1. *the unbelieving husband is sanctified in, or to, or by the wife.* 2. *The children in such a state are holy, as if they had been both believers.*

Answ. The scope of the Apostle, 1 *Cor.*7.12,13,14. can be no other then the resolving of the doubt in the *Corinthians*, which Mr. *Sydenham* truly saith *he answered, v.*12,13. *and then gives, v.*14. *an argument* to prove it. Now therein is no special Gospel priviledge held forth; For 1. if any priviledge be there assigned it is to the unbeliever remaining an unbeliever, for he is said to be sanctified: But sure an unbeliever remaining an unbeliever hath no special Gospel priviledge; *Ergo.* 2. The unbeliever is put there, not to shew any meliority of condition

to

to himself, but to take away the doubt which was concerning him, as defiling their society: So that the meaning is not, the unbeliever is a gainer by his wife, but the unbeliever brings no damage to her in respect of the thing in doubt concerning the lawfulness of continuing together in marriage use by his unbelief; there is no advantage mentioned to either of them, but a determination that there is not that disadvantage from the one as necessitated to leave the other. Nor is there any thing that carries the shew of an argument *a majori*: The Apostle doth not say, they have an eminent advantage together in the Gospel, therefore much more may live together. Yea, such an argument had been far from being strong, there being no argument usually weaker then such, if any disparity may be shewed they are quickly enervated. And in this thing the proposition would have been false upon which such an argument must turn as its hinge, to wit, They that have an eminent advantage together in the Gospel may much the rather live together. For 1. it would have been from that which is meerly extrinseeal and accidental to marriage society, Gospel priviledges neither establishing nor dissolving marriage society, which is lawfull as well among them who have no Gospel priviledge as those that have. 2. The proposition were false, for then if the unbelieving whore have Gospel advantage (as I conceive Mr. *S.* will not deny any more then other Pædobaptists do) by the believing fornicator, they may live together; so that if the fornicator being a believer beget a holy child on an unbelieving whore, or what ever other Gospel priviledge it is the unbeliever hath by the believer, imagine to cast out Devils in Christs name, though she be not joyned to the Church, to propheſie in Christs name, or to do wonders, by this Gospel priviledge they are allowed to live together in fornication: Which are monstrous absurdities following Mr. *Ss.* conceit.

But he tels us. *That the Apostle holds out a Gospel priviledge, not common to meer unbelievers in their marriage state is clear; 1. because the Apostle puts the advantage on the believers side, and there fixeth it; The unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife, as believing; and so contrarily, the unbelieving wife in the husband: So Beza affirms, that in two special Copies he finds the words thus read,* ἐν τῇ γυναικὶ πίστει ἐν τῷ ἀνδρὶ πίστῳ: *Neither can it hold sense with the former words, but as thus read: And if it had not been the Apostles proper meaning to shew the special priviledge the believing party hath notwithstanding the unbeliever, he would have onely said, the husband is sanctified to the wife, and the wife to the husband; that would have been the plainest and least ambiguous expression of such a sentence: And the Apostle would never have made an argument of four terms, when three could onely satisfie; for all know, that an argument with four terms is most deceitfull and false.*

Answ. 1. The reason hath no strength in it, the Apostle puts the advantage on the believers side, *Ergo* the Apostle holds out a Gospel priviledge not common to meer unbelievers in their marriage state. For there may be expressed an advantage on the believers side, as suppose her liberty, her quiet of conscience, *&c.* and yet the thing from whence it is

inferred

inferred no Gospel priviledge, but a thing common to unbelievers, as in case, a believer doubt of the lawfull eating of an infidels meat offered to an Idol, and it be resolved as the Apostle doth 1 *Cor.* 10.25,26,27. from the right God hath to all creatures, here is the advantage on the believers side, the quiet of his conscience, and yet no Gospel priviledge held forth but such as is common to unbelievers, the lawfull eating of what was sold in the shambles. 2. Mr. *Ss.* antecedent, that *the Apostle puts the advantage on the believers side, and there fixeth it*, is contrary to what he said before, *that the argument is from an eminent advantage they had together in the Gospel*; for if they had the eminent advantage together, it was no more put or fixed on the believers side then on the unbelievers. 3. It is so far from being true that the Apostle puts the advantage on the believers side, that it is true rather on the contrary, if any advantage be expresst it is put on the unbelievers side, for the unbeliever is said to be sanctified, not the believer. 4. It is not true that the unbelieving wife is sanctified in the husband as believing, and that which Mr. *Sydenham* alledgeth to prove it is of no force. For the reading in two Copies is not sufficient to countervail the multitude of Copies which have it otherwise, it being more likely that the addition of *τῇ* and *πιστῷ* was made by some Scribe then by the Apostle at first, who *v.*13. used *γυνὴ* without it. And for the sense it holds as good sense without it as it did *v.*13. The unbeliever is mentioned not to shew a special priviledge to the believer, but because the occasion of the doubt was from his infidelity, and therefore that could not be omitted without omitting that in which was the force of the objection, which could not be distinctly satisfied without mentioning it; and by putting it in there are not four terms, as unskilfully Mr. *S.* intimates, but by omitting it there come to be four terms, the conclusion to be proved being this, The wife may live with her unbelieving husband, and the premises these, That wife may live with her husband who is sanctified to her, But so is the unbelieving husband to his wife, *Ergo*. But of this the Reader may see more at large the first part of this *Review*, *sect.* 14.

2. Saith Mr. *S.* *The Apostle doth use higher terms and phrases in this argument, then is ever used in Scripture to express a meer lawfull or common priviledge; as to be sanctified in the wife, and the children to be holy; expressions of another dialect then to hold forth a civil or natural, or legal conjunction: being singled out in Scripture, to hold forth the best state of persons in relation to God and his use.*

Answ. 1. Were all this true, as it is not, yet Mr. *Ss.* conclusion is not proved thereby. For though the terms should never express a meer lawfull or common priviledge, a civil or natural, or legal conjunction, and that they are singled out in Scripture to hold forth the best state of persons in relation to God and his use; yet it follows not the Apostle holds out by them a Gospel priviledge, sith they may hold out a Jewish priviledge, which is not a Gospel, but rather a legal priviledge, as the term [*holy seed*] doth *Ezra* 9.2. 2. How fitly these terms sute to the exposition I give without holding forth a Gospel priviledge, may

be

be ſeen in my *Examen part. 3. ſect. 8.* in the firſt part of this *Review, ſect.* 12, 13, 24, 25, 26.

Mr. *S.* adds, 1. *That the term unclean notes the ſame it doth* Acts 10.14. *where* Cornelius *being a Gentile without the pale of the Jewiſh Church, is called common and unclean, as all the Gentiles were before they came under the promiſe, he was no baſtard, he was without the Church juſt in the ſame phraſe with the Apoſtle here, when he ſaith that children are not unclean, he muſt needs mean they are not of common uſe or to be excluded from outward priviledges of the Church.* 2. *That* [*unclean*] *is uſed for legal pollutions and uncleanneſſes, which made men to be ſeparated from the Congregation, and excommunicated from the priviledge of ordinances untill they were waſhed and ſanctified: Thus in* Levit. 5. 1, 3, 4. *ch.* 7. 19. & 14. 7, 8. *Iſa.* 52. 1. *Hag.* 2. 13. *with many other places, where unclean is oppoſed to a preſent ſuitable capacity for Church priviledges.*

Anſw. 1 In all thoſe places, *Levit.* 5. 2, 3, 4 & 7. 19. & 14. 7, 8. *Hag.* 2. 13. *Iſa.* 52. 1. the uncleanneſs is not oppoſed to a Goſpel privileege, but a legal or Jewiſh, nor were the unclean out of the Covenant or the people of God even when they were unclean, and therefore if 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. he ſhould tell them their children were not unclean in that ſenſe, he ſhould not tell them of a Goſpel priviledge, but a Judaical Legal Moſaical priviledge, which had been both falſe, for they were uncircumciſed Gentiles, and therefore were unclean in that ſenſe, and vain to tell them of that as a priviledge, which was no priviledge, but which hee counts nothing of 1 *Cor.* 7. 19. 2. *Cornelius* is not termed *unclean* as wanting a Goſpel priviledge, he was in Covenant with God and accepted with him, and in the viſible Church, ſith *he with his whole houſe feared God, prayed continually, Acts* 10. 2. But he is termed *unclean* as one not meet by reaſon of his uncircumciſion for a Jew to go into, or eat with *Acts* 11 3. and therefore if the Apoſtle ſhould 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. mean it juſt in the ſame ſenſe with *Acts* 10. 14. he ſhould tell them their children were not unclean, that is, were perſons with whom they might eat and converſe which underſtood of infants were ridiculous. If meant in the ſenſe God tearmed *Cornelius* clean, then it is as unfitly applied to infants, who are not clean as *Cornelius*, in that *fearing God and working righteouſneſs he was accepted with him, Acts.* 10 34, 35. which is more then an outward Church priviledge and another thing then Mr. *S.* and his fellow Pædobaptiſt conceive the Apoſtle meant 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.

That which Mr. *S.* brings of the uſe of the word *holy that it expreſſeth the Hebrew word* קדש *and that it ever ſignifies that which is appropriated to a Divine uſe, and that it is the proper notion of holineſs in the Old and New Teſtament, and never taken otherwiſe: and that for proof of it he hath compared above 100 places in the Old Teſtament according to the Septuagint, and all the N. T. places where the word is generally taken in Scripture to expreſs a ſeparation of things to God.* how falſe or inſufficient it is to his purpoſe, is ſo amply ſhewed in the firſt part of this *Review* ſect. 12, 13, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 that I conceive it unneceſſary at this time to add any more In which places it may be ſeen what I grant concerning the word generally taken, and that I bring more places then 1 *Tim.*

4 5. 1 *Thes.* 4. 3, 4, 7. for another use then Mr. *S.* asserts, to bee the *proper notion of holy in the Old and N. T. that it notes that which is appropriated to Divine use, and is never taken otherwise*, to shew it to bee taken otherwise, as 1 *Sam.* 21. 5. *Isai.* 13. 3. *Ezra* 9. 2, *&c.* But let's view what hee saith to my allegation of 1 *Tim.* 4. 5. 1 *Thes.* 4. 3, 4, 7. for a different use from his sense.

From 1 *Tim.* 4. 5. *saith Mr.* T. *is meant onely the lawful use of the creature in opposition to what is to be refused. It is a wonder, but that God leaves men to blindness when they leave truth, how any man of common understanding, finding the word holy and sanctified alwayes used in a religious sense, should flye to this place to make an exception*

Answ. I have so far as I thought needful looked into my former writings, and do not finde any place where I say as Mr. *S.* here saith I do, what I yeelded at the Dispute at *Bewdley*, and for what reason is shewed in the first part of this *Review* sect. 27. p. 203. and if Mr. *S.* took from Mr. *B.* this which he here so unbrotherly chargeth me with, hee might have there found an answer, which should have been taken notice of, if my answer printed 1652. came to his knowledge afore the publishing his *Exercit.* 1653. But I never could finde in my Antagonists Mr. *B. M. I. &c.* any such candor as to construe any thing that came from me, since this controversie arose between us, in the better part, but I think I may say almost in every thing I have done or said that they mention, they pervert my words and deeds, and aggravate them in the worser sense, when they might have had a good or at least excusable construction. As for this thing which Mr. *S.* here makes an instance of Gods leaving me to blindness when I left truth, the true state of it is thus. I had said in my *Examen* part. 3. sect. 8. p. 73, 74. That this may be the sense, I gather from the like use of the word ἁγιάζεται used 1 *Tim.* 4. 5. where *the creature of God is said to be sanctified*, that is lawfully used in opposition to *that which is to be refused*; so here *the unbelieving husband is sanctified*, that is lawfully enjoyed as a husband by, or to, or in respect of his wife, whether believer, or unbeliever, in this case there is no difference, and alledged some words of Mr. *M.* in his Sermon p. 24. to the same purpose. Which when Mr. *M.* in his *Defence* p. 155. framed an argument from against me, I shewed him his mistake in the first part of this *Review* sect. 13. p. 115. denying the sanctification 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. to bee such a sanctification as that place 1 *Tim.* 4. 5. means, but onely make them like thus far, that as 1 *Tim.* 4. 5. it signifies lawfully enjoyed, so here, though in a different manner, and from a different reason or cause. And for the concession in the Dispute at *Bewdley*, my yeilding Mr. *Bs.* conclusion doth prove that Mr. *S.* doth here falsely charge mee to say that 1 *Tim.* 4. 5. is meant onely the lawful use of the creature. Nor is it true that I *fled to this place to make an exception against the taking the word holy in a religious sense.* For neither did I make use of 1 *Tim.* 4. 5. about the sense of the word *holy*, but the word *sanctified*, nor do I conceive the word *sanctified* used in any other then a religious sense, yea I have often said that [*sanctified*] 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. is taken for religiously sanctified, as 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. as *baptised*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. *mother*,

mother, *Mark* 3. 35. *dead*, *Heb.* 11. 12. *made himself Eunuch*, *Matth.* 19. 12. *son*, *Exod.* 2. 9. and many more places, the words are taken in their proper notion, onely they are applied in a limited sense, or in some respect by an impropriety or abuse of speech to those to whom absolutely and in propriety or exactness of speech they do not belong, and therefore this which Mr. *S.* here suggests of me is but his calumny which he was willing to take up that through my sides he might wound the truth.

But Mr. *S.* adds. "The Apostle saith first, Every creature which God "hath made is good in it self, and none to be refused: that is, all may "be lawfully used without any legal pollution as formerly: But then "he goes higher, speaking of a religious use of outward things, they are "sanctified by the Word and Prayer; they are all good and lawfull in "their use to every man; but they are onely sanctified by these holy "means, the Word and Prayer. And he might have as well said, that the "Word and Prayer are not holy means, but onely lawfull to be used; as "that the sanctification which is by the word and prayer, is to make the "creatures onely lawfull to be used. If a wicked man eat his meat with-"out seeking a blessing on it, or giving thanks, will any one say that he "hath not a lawfull use of the creature? but any man may say, it's not "sanctified to him. The Apostle in these 2 *ver.* goes on *gradatim* by "degrees, from a lawfull use to a holy use of the creatures; All is good "and may be used, but they are sanctified by the word and prayer. Thus "you see the nature of this priviledged place.

Answ. What word it is which is meant 1 *Tim.* 4:5. whether the word of Gods power creating them, which the words *v.* 3. *which God hath created for receiving* seem to lead to, or the word of Gods declaration, whether by our Lord Christ, *Mark* 7. 15. or to *Peter*, *Acts* 10. 15. or promise of blessing, it is manifest that the Apostle in that place doth not make any distinction between a sanctified and a lawfull use, nor doth he say they *are created for any to be received but with thanksgiving of them who believe and know the truth*; nor doth he make *the creature good or not to be refused but being received with thanksgiving*, nor *sanctified but by the word of God and prayer*: Nor do I find but that interpreters take lawfull use and sanctified for the same. So *Beza* in his *Annot.* *It is made holy, to wit, in respect of us, so as that we may use it with a good conscience, as duly received from the hand of God. For other men do enjoy it no otherwise then as thieves and sacriledgious persons goods usurped. And he lawfully useth goods, who acknowledgeth and invocateth the giver of them after his word.* *Piscat. anal.* *He minds which is the lawfull and allowed use of meats, to wit, when we receive them with thanksgiving and prayer proceeding from faith.* *Diodati*, *Ditson*, and others speak to like purpose. Nor is there any thing here that intimates any gradation from a lawfull use *v.* 3, 4. to a sanctified use *v.* 5. For *v.* 3, 4. to *the receiving of them thanksgiving* is required *of them that believe and know the truth*, and the *creature* is not said *to be good* and *nothing to be refused but being taken with thanksgiving*, which is the same with *sanctified by the word and prayer*, *v.* 5. and *v.* 5. is a reason of that which is said *v.* 4. and therefore no gradation or rising higher, as Mr. *S.* imagines.

4 5. 1 *Thes.* 4. 3, 4, 7. for another use then Mr. *S.* asserts, to bee *the proper notion of holy in the Old and N. T. that it notes that which is appropriated to Divine use, and is never taken otherwise*, to shew it to bee taken otherwise, as 1 *Sam.* 21. 5. *Isai.* 13. 3. *Ezra* 9. 2, *&c.* But let's view what hee saith to my allegation of 1 *Tim.* 4. 5. 1 *Thes.* 4. 3, 4, 7. for a different use from his sense.

From 1 *Tim.* 4. 5. *saith Mr.* T. *is meant onely the lawful use of the creature in opposition to what is to be refused. It is a wonder, but that God leaves men to blindness when they leave truth, how any man of common understanding, finding the word holy and sanctified alwayes used in a religious sense, should flye to this place to make an exception*

Answ. I have so far as I thought needful looked into my former writings, and do not finde any place where I say as Mr. *S.* here saith I do, what I yeelded at the Dispute at *Bewdley*, and for what reason is shewed in the first part of this *Review* sect. 27. p. 203. and if Mr. *S.* took from Mr. *B.* this which he here so unbrotherly chargeth me with, hee might have there found an answer, which should have been taken notice of, if my answer printed 1652. came to his knowledge afore the publishing his *Exercit.* 1653. But I never could finde in my Antagonists Mr. *B.* M. *I l &c.* any such candor as to construe any thing that came from me, since this controversie arose between us, in the better part, but *I* think I may say almost in every thing I have done or said that they mention, they pervert my words and deeds, and aggravate them in the worser sense, when they might have had a good or at least excusable construction. As for this thing which Mr. *S.* here makes an instance of Gods leaving me to blindness when I left truth, the true state of it is thus. I had said in my *Examen* part. 3. sect. 8. p. 73, 74. That this may be the sense, I gather from the like use of the word ἁγιάζεται used 1 *Tim.* 4. 5. where *the creature of God is said to be sanctified*, that is lawfully used in opposition to *that which is to be refused*; so here *the unbelieving husband is sanctified*, that is lawfully enjoyed as a husband by, or to, or in respect of his wife, whether believer, or unbeliever, in this case there is no difference, and alledged some words of Mr. *M.* in his Sermon p. 24. to the same purpose. Which when Mr. *M.* in his *Defence* p. 155. framed an argument from against me, I shewed him his mistake in the first part of this *Review* sect. 13. p. 115. denying the sanctification 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. to bee such a sanctification as that place 1 *Tim.* 4. 5. means, but onely make them like thus far, that as 1 *Tim.* 4. 5. it signifies lawfully enjoyed, so here, though in a different manner, and from a different reason or cause. And for the concession in the Dispute at *Bewdley*, my yeilding Mr. *Bs.* conclusion doth prove that Mr. *S.* doth here falsely charge mee to say that 1 *Tim.* 4. 5. is meant onely the lawful use of the creature. Nor is it true that I *fled to this place to make an exception against the taking the word holy in a religious sense.* For neither did I make use of 1 *Tim.* 4. 5. about the sense of the word *holy*, but the word *sanctified*, nor do I conceive the word *sanctified* used in any other then a religious sense, yea I have often said that [*sanctified*] 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. is taken for religiously sanctified, as 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. as *baptised*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 2.

mother,

mother, *Mark* 3. 35. *dead*, *Heb.* 11. 12. *made himself Eunuch*, *Matth.* 19. 12. *son*, *Exod.* 2. 9. and many more places, the words are taken in their proper notion, onely they are applied in a limited sense, or in some respect by an impropriety or abuse of speech to those to whom absolutely and in propriety or exactness of speech they do not belong, and therefore this which Mr. *S.* here suggests of me is but his calumny which he was willing to take up that through my sides he might wound the truth.

But Mr. *S.* adds. "The Apostle saith first, Every creature which God "hath made is good in it self, and none to be refused: that is, all may "be lawfully used without any legal pollution as formerly: But then "he goes higher, speaking of a religious use of outward things, they are "sanctified by the Word and Prayer; they are all good and lawfull in "their use to every man; but they are onely sanctified by these holy "means, the Word and Prayer. And he might have as well said, that the "Word and Prayer are not holy means, but onely lawfull to be used; as "that the sanctification which is by the word and prayer, is to make the "creatures onely lawfull to be used. If a wicked man eat his meat with-"out seeking a blessing on it, or giving thanks, will any one say that he "hath not a lawfull use of the creature? but any man may say, it's not "sanctified to him. The Apostle in these 2 *ver.* goes on *gradatim* by "degrees, from a lawfull use to a holy use of the creatures; All is good "and may be used, but they are sanctified by the word and prayer. Thus "you see the nature of this priviledged place.

Answ. What word it is which is meant 1 *Tim.* 4:5. whether the word of Gods power creating them, which the words *v.* 3. *which God hath created for receiving* seem to lead to, or the word of Gods declaration, whether by our Lord Christ, *Mark* 7. 15. or to *Peter*, *Acts* 10. 15. or promise of blessing, it is manifest that the Apostle in that place doth not make any distinction between a sanctified and a lawfull use, nor doth he say they *are created for any to be received but with thanksgiving of them who believe and know the truth*; nor doth he make *the creature good or not to be refused but being received with thanksgiving*, nor *sanctified but by the word of God and prayer*: Nor do I find but that interpreters take lawfull use and sanctified for the same. So *Beza* in his *Annot.* *It is made holy, to wit, in respect of us, so as that we may use it with a good conscience, as duly received from the hand of God. For other men do enjoy it no otherwise then as thieves and sacriledgious persons goods usurped. And he lawfully useth goods, who acknowledgeth and invocateth the giver of them after his word.* *Piscat. anal.* *He minds which is the lawfull and allowed use of meats, to wit, when we receive them with thanksgiving and prayer proceeding from faith.* *Diodati*, *Dickson*, and others speak to like purpose. Nor is there any thing here that intimates any gradation from a lawfull use *v.* 3, 4. to a sanctified use *v.* 5. For *v.* 3, 4. to *the receiving of them thanksgiving* is required *of them that believe and know the truth*, and the *creature is* not said *to be good* and *nothing to be refused but being taken with thanksgiving*, which is the same with *sanctified by the word and prayer*, *v.* 5. and *v.* 5. is a reason of that which is said *v.* 4. and therefore no gradation or rising higher, as Mr. *S.* imagines.

Which I do not produce to shew that I conceive no distinction between a lawful use and a holy use of things (which I do acknowledge in the first part of this *Review* p. 114. and elsewhere) but onely to shew how insufficiently Mr. *S.* opposeth me, whom he so severely censures, even in that which I spake rightly enough, and his own blindness made him to judge hardly of me, as left by God to blindness.

Mr. *S.* saith further, "But the main place Mr. *T.* alledgeth for holiness to be used for what is barely civil or lawful, is that 1 *Thes.* 4. 3, 4, 7. Here uncleanness is taken, saith he, for fornication, and holiness for chastity. To which I answer with Mr. *M.* that chastity among the heathen is never called sanctification, but among believers it is, being a part of the new creation, and one branch and part of their sanctification wrought by the spirit of God. And though Mr. *T.* saith this is but a shift, yet he shall see it demonstrative, if he observe the phrases in the text, and the nature of sanctification: in the 1 and 2. *v.* the Apostle beseecheth and exhorteth them to walk as they had received from him how to walk and to please God according to the rules of Jesus Christ; and he urgeth it in *v.* 3 with this; It's the will of God, even your sanctification, that is, that you should walk in all holiness, suitable to the blessed rules of the Gospel, and as one part and expression of holiness, to abstain from sin: And he instanceth specially in fornication, which was the common and reigning sin among the Gentiles: so that if you view the place you shall find, that 1. He speaks of sanctification in general, in it's full latitude *v.* 3. as suitable to all the will and mind of God; This is the will of God, even your sanctification; that is, it is Gods command, and Gods delight to see you sanctified; then he brings in abstinence from fornication (the sin of the times) as one part of that holiness God requires: For sanctification may be considered as it lies in vivification, or in mortification, which for distinctions sake we we may call the two parts of sanctification. Now chastity in it self, as in the heathens and natural men, is not properly a part of sanctification; some other Epithite becomes it better: would Mr. *T.* call all the abstinencies and actings of the heathens by the name of sanctifications, and speak like a Christian and a Divine? Would it be proper to say in his Pulpit (when he was speaking of the nature of holiness and chastity) sanctified *Socrates*, holy *Aristides?* And can he think the Apostle would express that which is common among heathens, in such a high Gospel dialect as sanctification is appropriated always in Scripture to God, Angels, Saints, and their highest graces and workings, and to things raised above common use, dedicated to God and his service, but that he meant it according as the whole tenure of Scripture defines holiness? How much will the phrase of holiness and sanctification be debased and made common, if that sense should be admitted, contrary to the Scripture use of the word? But that is a weak cause that puts men to such extraordinary shifts to maintain.

Answ. It's the property of some persons, like *Thersites* in *Homer*, to speak much and to performe little, and so it befals Mr. *S.* here. He saith, 1. *I alledge* 1 *Thes.* 4. 3, 4, 7. *as the main place for holiness to be used*

for what is barely civil or lawfull, whereas I alledge it not as Mr. *S.* ſaith, but to ſhew that it is not true which Mr. *M.* ſaid, that *holineſs is always taken in a ſacred ſenſe, for a ſeparation of perſons and things from common to ſacred uſes.* 2. *Though I ſay, Mr.* Ms. *anſwer to be but a ſhift, yet I ſhall ſee it demonſtrative, if I obſerve the phraſes in the Text, and the nature of ſanctification.* But if all ſhould be yeelded, that 1 *Theſ.* 4. 3,4 7. holineſs were but a part of the new creation, that chaſtity in heathens is never called ſanctification; yet this were but a ſhift to avoid the proof againſt Mr. *Ms.* aſſertion, *that holineſs is always taken in a ſacred ſenſe for a ſeparation of perſons and things from common to ſacred uſes*; for the chaſtity of regenerate perſons, confeſſed to be termed holineſs and a part of ſanctification, is not taken in a ſacred ſenſe for ſeparation from common to ſacred uſes: But of this more may be ſeen in the firſt part of this *Review*, *ſect.* 12. *pag.* 108. And as for Mr. *Ss.* reaſoning, it is far from demonſtrative, it being indeed againſt himſelf. For if *v.*1,2. be an exhortation *to pleaſe God in general*, and *v* 3. *expreſs one part and expreſſion of holineſs to abſtain from ſin*, and no other ſin be named but fornication, he doth particularly term abſtaining from fornication holineſs; which is more fully confirmed *v.*4. where chaſtity is termed *poſſeſſing our veſſel in holineſs and honour*, oppoſite to poſſeſſing our veſſel (that is our body) *in the luſt of concupiſcence as the Gentiles*, among whom fornication was frequent, and thus is *v.*7. termed *uncleanneſs*, and the oppoſite to it *holineſs*, that is chaſtity. And for the other thing, that *chaſtity in it ſelf as in the heathens and natural men is not properly a part of ſanctification*, and that *ſanctity is aſcribed to the higheſt things*, it is but frivolous. For though it be no part of true ſanctification, yet it may be termed holineſs, as there be many called Gods who are not the true and everliving God, to whom though the term [*God*] do properly belong onely, yet Magiſtrates and Angels are ſometimes termed Gods without any debaſement, and though I would not in my pulpit without diſtinction term Magiſtrates, Angels Gods, or call an unlawfull aſſembly of Idolaters *a Church*, yet who knows not the term *Elohim*, and *Eccleſia* or *Church* to be applied to them? So that however Mr. *S.* prattle of his demonſtration and of the weakneſs of my cauſe and extraordinary ſhifts, yet this is but frivolous talk without any performance.

He adds. "But to go on a little further; The ſame word is uſed by "the Apoſtle in all his ſalutations and inſcriptions of his Epiſtles to all "the Churches; τοῖς ἁγίοις to the Saints or holy ones at *Rome*, at *Co*"*rinth*, *Galatia*, *Epheſus*, &c. which when appropriated to perſons, al"ways ſignifies a viſible Saint: So here when he calls children of be"lieving parents holy, he cannot but mean, they are to be accounted "as viſible Saints, until they do profeſs the contrary: and I know no "reaſon can be given, why the meaning of the Apoſtle in his Epiſtles, "when he writes τοῖς ἁγίοις, *to the Saints*, ſhould not be as well un"derſtood written onely to the legitimate, and thoſe that are not baſtards "at *Rome*, *Corinth*, &c. as well as for them to interpret the ſame word "ſo in this place: For ἅγιοι when applied to grown men, muſt ſigni-

"fie

" fie visible and Evangelical holiness, and must be translated Saints:
" but when applied to children, it must onely signifie legitimacy, that
" they are not bastards; when all men know, that *magis & minus non*
" *variant speciem*; and the word is of the same import in every place of
" the New Testament.

Answ. It is not true, that *the same term is used by the Apostle in all his salutations and inscriptions of his Epistles to all the Churches*, it is not used in the Epistles to the *Galatians* and *Thessalonians*; and in the titles where it is appropriated to persons, signifies a Saint *called, sanctified in Christ Jesus, faithfull*, which rather note an invisible then a visible Saint: and if they do note a visible Saint, they note one by calling, sanctified in Christ, believer in profession, none of which are to be ascribed to infants of believers as such, nor can be meant 1 *Cor.*7.14. where children are termed *holy* by birth, not by calling; and are not said to be holy in Christ, but in respect of their parents. Whence apparent reason is given, why the term [*holy*] in the titles of the Epistles cannot be translated legitimate in opposition to bastardy, but Saints, or men who are set apart for God by the love of God, and therefore termed *beloved of God*, *Rom.*1.7. and the sanctification of the spirit by the Gospel: and on the other side, why [*holy*] 1 *Cor.*7.14. cannot be translated Saints, or visible Saints, not for that frivolous conceit of Mr. *S.* as if they might not be termed Saints 1 *Cor.*7.14. for want of age; whose gross application of a Logick rule, shews he was but a smatterer therein: For if visible saintship had been given to elder persons in respect of grown age, and denied to infants, yet there had been no variation of kind from more or less growth, saintship being not the species or kind of such persons, but humanity. And what he saith, *that the word is of the same import in every place of the New Testament*, it is so false a speech, and so ill becomming him that said, *p.*53. *he had compared all the places in the New Testament* where the word is used, that no other excuse but of heedlesness or forgetfulness can acquit him from deceit. For besides the places alledged, *Luke* 2.23. 2 *Pet.*1.18 *&c.* and his own distinctions of federal and inherent holiness, together with the holiness intentional meant *Rom.*11.16. shew it to be false.

What he adds, *By the same reason we account grown men holy, we may account infants of believers; for these that make a profession, may have no inward and inherent holiness; and a bare profession is not holiness; we onely account them holy by a judicious charity; and we are often deceived, and have cause to repent of our judgements: Infants may be inwardly sanctified, and God hath taken them into Covenant with their parents, and would have us look on them as separated to himself; which is ground enough to build our charity on, as to esteem them holy, as grown persons. There is no difference but this in it; That concerning the holiness of persons at age, we trust our own judgements; and in judging of infants, we trust Gods word, who hath comprehended them under the promise with their parents; there hath been as many deceits in the event in our judgement of those of riper years, as in that which is acted through a mixture of faith on infants. And Gods promise, though never so indefinite, is a surer ground for hope then*

my

my probable judgement; which is the most I can have of the generality of professors of ripe years, is much of it false, as *that God hath taken infants into Covenant with their parents, thay are comprehended under the promise with their parents, God would have us to look on them as separated to himself, by the same reason we account grown men holy we may account infants of believers, we onely account them holy by a judicious charity,* and all impertinent, forasmuch as professors of faith are accounted visible Saints not by a judgement of charity, but of certainty from their profession which is visible, and so are qualified for Baptism, not from hopes of real holiness, or faith of Covenant holiness, which do not entitle to Baptism without certainty of profession.

What he adds. *That holy is a pure religious word, that in my sense it would be no considerable* medium *for argumentation. that* else were, *&c. hath force from the specialneß of the priviledge to their issue to be in a peculiar state of seperation to God, visible Churchmembers with the believing parent,* contains nothing but unproved dictates often before refuted. What he adds of *cold comfort in my sense, and of strength and sweetneß in his,* is alike frovolous. For the speech of the Apostle was to be no otherwise consolatory, then so far as it might satisfie their consciences of the lawfulness of their continuing together, which is clearly done by my *Analysis* and exposition of the Apostle, and not done at all by his way. For what is a priviledge of the children which perhaps they shall never have; or if they have, it is nothing to take away the defilement by the infidel for satisfaction of their consciences concerning living together in disparity of Religion? I have done with this scribler: I shall a little examine what some others have said, with as much brevity as the maintenance of the truth will permit, and hasten to an end.

SECT. LXXVII.

Mr. William Carters *attempt of proving the Christian Sabbath from* Heb. 4.7,9,10. *is shewed to be succeßleß, and so uſeleß for proof of Infant Baptiſm.*

THere is a Treatise intituled, *The Covenant of God with* Abraham *opened* by Mr. *william Carter,* which pretends *to clear the duty of Infant Baptiſm,* and in his Epistle to the Reader saith, *the root of this matter is the Covenant of God with* Abraham; which because of the eminency of the Author, and the publishing it *in observance* (as is said) *of the commands of the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Sheriffs of the City of London,* rather then for any shew of strength in the discourse, I shall examine, that if this *Review* come to their hands, they also may discern their mistakes. Which I think necessary to be done, because he also (as other Pædobaptists use to do) is not afraid upon his own conjectures (for they are no better) to charge us who baptize not infants *as breaking* Abrahams *Covenant, as small friends to Christs Kingdome,*

waving

waving and neglecting the right way of increasing that Kingdome, and of exalting his Throne and power in the world, taking up ways unnatural, unsafe and false. Let's then see what he writes.

Afore he meddles with the point of infant Baptism (which he saith *is the thing he especially intended in his discourse*) he endeavours to deduce the Christian Sabbath, as it is termed, from *Heb.* 4. I omit that he saith, *p.* 3. that *Heb.* 12.15,16. *the birthright* vendible is *their priviledges in the Church, and worship of the Gospel*, and that *p.* 6. he expounds the holding fast the confidence or liberty and the rejoycing of the hope, *Heb.* 3.6. by *holding fast the ordinances and priviledges of the Gospel*: Which if he mean (as he seems to do) of the outward priviledges and worship, it appears that he mistakes, sith the birthright not to be sold, and the confidence and rejoycing of hope are greater matters, which no hypocrite may attain to, and are plainly intimated *Heb.* 12.14,15. to be *the seeing of God, the attaining his grace*, and the estate Evangelical mentioned *v.* 22,23,24. which they might sell, though they never had it, by their Apostacy from their profession of Christ, through whom they were in expectation of it, at least in appearance. And in like manner the boldness, liberty, confidence, or rejoycing of their hope, must needs be of something yet attainable, and not to be attained without holding it to the end, *v.* 6, 14. and which no unbelievers could attain to; which are not true of bare outward Church priviledges and Gospel worship, but of *that salvation* mentioned *Heb.* 1.3. *the grace brought in the revelation of Jesus Christ* 1 *Pet.* 1.13. whereby we are *Gods house*, *Heb.* 3.6. are *partakers of Christ*, *v.* 14. But I shall insist somewhat on that he saith *p.* 8. that *by to day if ye will hear his voice, in that Psal.* 95.7. *is meant the Christian Sabbath day*, by which he means the day which in the New Testament is termed *the Lords day* or *first day in the week*; which I conceive not right for these reasons. 1. *The day*, *Heb.* 4.7. is a limited or definite day, and that must needs imply this meaning; [This is the day in which if ye hear his voyce and harden not your hearts, ye may enter into Gods rest; if ye do not this day, ye will come short.] Which if true, then (as Mr. *C.* expounds it) though they should hear the voice of Christ, and not harden their hearts on the week day, yet they should not enter into the rest promised, which I think will be counted absurd, and evacuate the hopes by all the week day Lectures. 2. From *Heb.* 3.13. I thus argue. *To day*, *Heb.* 3.7. is the same with the space of time *which is called to day*, *v.* 13. This is so evident in the Text, that every one that reads the Text will easily perceive it, sith it is plain, that the calling it to day is meant of the calling it in that place *v.* 7. and the words, *lest any of you be hardened*, shew it. But [*to day*, *Heb.* 3.13.] is meant of any day, or every day wherein Christians might exhort one another, therefore not restrained to the Lords day: but either extended to the whole space of time they live on earth, or to any opportunity in any day whatsoever, whether week day or Lords day, wherein they might exhort. 3. By comparing these places with 2 *Cor.* 6.2. where it is said, [*Now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation,*] which seem plainly to intimate the same day with that which is meant *Heb.* 3.7,13.

and

and that day being manifestly meant of the time wherein the Embassadours for Christ do beseech men to bee reconciled to GOD, 2 *Cor.* 5. 20. it is very probable or rather certain, that *to day*, *Heb.* 3. 7, 13. & 4. 7. is not meant particularly the Lords day or first day of the week, but any day of a mans life wherein the Gospel of Christ is preached, and reconciliation to God offered him; and received by him. Or as *Cameron. quæst. in Epist. ad* Heb. 3. 7. *That time which by the Prophets and Apostle is called the last dayes and fulnesse of time, which is the time of the* Messiah *exhibited*, not precisely the Lords day or first day of the week. Let us view Mr. *Carters* reasons for his conceit.

First, it is evident that it is meant of a day of rest chap. 4, 7, 8. *for if* Joshuah *had given them rest, namely that rest of which* David *speaketh, then hee would not afterwards have spoken of another day, therefore of a day of rest it must bee meant, else the Apostles argument had not been concluding nor pertinent, because many other days might have afterwards been spoken off, although* Joshuah *had given them all the rest that was ever to bee expected.*

Answ. It is true that the Authour of that Epistle doth rightly gather from the word [*to day*] that there was another day of rest yet remaining for the people of God besides the seventh day rest, and the rest in the Land of *Canaan* which they possessed by *Joshuah*'s conduct, yet doth not imply that the day in which the word was spoken was the day of rest. But thus hee gathers it, These words were spoken by *David* many hundreds of years both after God sware in the Wilderne's they should not enter into his rest who believed not, and after *Joshuah* had setled the posterity of the unbelievers in the land of *Canaan*, and therefore the rest in the land of *Canaan* is not that which is meant in *Davids* speech, but there is implied a future day of rest to bee attained by believing in JESUS the Messiah. For *David* if it had been meant of the rest in *Canaan* would not have spoken to them not to harden their hearts for fear of being excluded from Gods rest.

" Secondly, *saith Mr C.* It is meant of such a rest as GOD " can and sometimes doth swear in his wrath against his own people, " who are his house, and the people of his pasture, that they shall " not enter into it: this cannot bee said of what they enjoy in their per- " sonal interest by faith onely; but as for the comfort of his ordinances " and Sabbath.

Answ. To omit the unfitnes of the expression, sith the comfort of Gods Ordinances and Sabbath is a personal interest enjoyed by faith onely, it is not true, that what is said of the rest cannot bee meant of what the people of God enjoy in their personal interest by faith onely, because of Gods oath. For that oath doth not imply that believers shall not enter into the rest, yea the Apostles inference is to the contrary v. 1, 6. sith some were not to enter in, others were to enter in, and sith GOD sware some should not, hee promised some should, and *chap.* 3. 18. sith some entred not through unbelief,

others in whom *the word is mixed with faith*, *ch.* 4. 2. do enter in. And this is a good argument that the rest mentioned is not the Christian Sabbath day which is the first day of the week; sith they that believe not come short of it; it's a consequent upon the holding the *boldneß, confidence and rejoycing of our hope firm to the end*, it was then in promise to the *Hebrews*, and remained to the people of God, who were to bee warned that they came not short of it; where as the Sabbath dayes rest was then in possession, not to bee expected afterwards, but then in use when this Epistle was written, and yet such as hypocrites, unbelievers, and Apostats did in some sort enjoy as well as sincere persevering believers.

"Thirdly, *saith Mr. C.* That it is meant of a Sabbath dayes rest, "appeareth by the manner of the Apostles arguing in this place, in as "much as the Apostle proveth it to be another day of rest, besides what "was in use in the Church before. Another in opposition to the 7th. "day Sabbath, and that because *David* speaketh of it as a rest to bee "entered into a long time after; although the 7th. days rest was en"tered into from the beginning of the world, in as much as hee spake "as it is *Heb.* 4. 4, 5. implying a promise that some shall, though o"thers shall not enter into it. Now, sayes the Apostle, this being spo"ken by the Propher *David* of a time then to come: and again, as "*Heb.* 4. 7, 9. over and beside the seventh dayes Sabbath. Now from "this his manner of arguing it is evident, that he supposeth this day of "which *David* speaketh, saying, *To day if ye will hear his voice*, to "be a day of the same kinde as the seventh dayes Sabbath was; because "else there had been no such opposition to bee made, nor would there "have been place for an although, or a notwithstanding, in the case, as "in *v.* 31. because any other rest might have also been entred into from "the beginning of the world, as a believers personal rest by faith was; "but that which maketh the opposition is, that *David* speaketh of a Sab"baths dayes rest, to be entred into now a long time after, even in the "times of the New Testament, of which times that *Psal.* 95. is a pro"phesie, as appeareth by the Apostles application of it in this place, "and thereupon hee concludes it to bee another day of rest remain"ing for us besides the seventh dayes rest. By this wee see that "by to day if yee will hear his voice is not meant onely of a Chri"stians personal rest by faith, which is every days enjoyment, and was "entred into from the beginning of the world, but of another Sabbath "dayes rest besides what was in use before.

Answ. It is not denied that *Psal* 95. is a prophesie, nor that it speaks of a rest to be a long time after *Davids* time, even in the times of the New Testament, nor that [*although*] doth imply a distinct rest from the seventh day Sabbath rest, and an opposition of that kinde which some Logicians call *disparata*, though others will not have it called opposition but distinction; yet the words *Heb.* 4. 3. are not as Mr. *C.* cites them, [*although the seventh days rest was entred into from the beginning of the world*] but [*although the works were made or finished from the foundation of the world.*] Nevertheless, this doth not prove that

that either the rest is not a believers personal rest by faith, or that it is of the same kinde with a meer weekly Sabbath dayes rest, but rather the contrary. It is distinguished from the seventh day Sabbaths rest, and so it is also from the rest which the *Israelites* had by *Joshuah*'s conduct in the land of *Canaan*, which the Author mentions *v.* 8. as well as the seventh dayes rest *v.* 4. and therefore the seventh dayes rest opposed to the rest *v.* 7, 9. doth no more prove the day of rest to be a day of the same kinde, as the seventh day Sabbath was then the day of rest in *Canaan* by *Joshuahs* leading. Yea, sith the seventh days rest mentioned *Heb.* 4. 4. is onely Gods rest, it is apparent the day of rest is of different kinde from an ordinary Sabbath dayes rest. Neither doth the term [*although*] import any such identity of kinde, but that God spake of another rest of his, although hee had rested long ago when his works were finished from the foundation of the world. Yea the words *Heb.* 4. 10. *Hee that is entred into his rest hath also ceased from his works as God did from his*, (which expresseth the rest for the people of God yet remaining *v.* 9.) do shew that the day of rest is not till a mans works bee ceased, which I know not how to understand of any other works then his works of labour and sufferings, which are not till the end of this life; and therefore the sabbatism or day of rest is not here the keeping of a weekly sabbath, but a day of rest, as is meant *Revel.* 14. 13. which though it bee not every dayes enjoyment, yet it may bee a Christians personal rest by faith onely, that is that rest which by faith onely is entred into or obtained. And though it were entred into by all believers from the foundation of the world, yet it was not so conspicuously as when Christ entred into the heavens; However those *Hebrews* and the believers to come after had not then entred into it. That the Sabbath days rest was in use before, proves against Mr. *C.* that the rest was not of the same kinde, unless in manner of a type or shadow, as one thing like that's resembled by another may in a Catachrestique manner be termed of the same kinde with that which resembles.

Mr. *C. adds.* "Fourthly it is meant of a day of rest to bee cele-
"brated in Gods house in his worship. So the Apostle concludeth *v.*
"9. There remaineth therefore a Sabbatism σαββατισμὸς the celebra-
"tion of a Sabbath for the people of God: a word comprehending
"the Sabbath and worship put together as was before observed. And
"the coherence of the words *Psal.* 95. implieth as much *Heb.* 95. 6,
"7, 8. It appeareth also from the Apostles wherefore, *Heb.* 3. 7. His
"house are we; wherefore, as the Holy Ghost saith, *To day if ye*
"*will hear his voyce*, &c. So as if the question bee what it is? Or
"what day? The answer from the Psalm and from the Apostles infe-
"rence must bee this, the day of worshipping the Lord our God then, and
"of resting with him in his house, and his voice, which in his word we are,
"inviting us to it.

Answ. Sabbatism in the notation of the word imports no more then rest: what it imports in the use of it I cannot discern but from this place, sith I know not where it is used in the New Testament but here,

nor in any other authour afore this. Here it appears not to import any more then rest, sith it expresseth but what is expressed by κατάπαυσις, v. 8, 10, 11. though I conceive that the matter shews it to bee meant of a holy rest, it being the rest of Gods people. But that *the word comprehends rest and worship put together*, I do not conceive. For the word alludes to the Sabbath Gen. 2. 2, 3. quoted Heb. 4. 3, 4. Now Gods rest imported not worship, though his appointing us to rest on the Sabbath, and to sanctifie it, doth import our worship of him. Nor do I think the coherence of the words Psal. 95. 6, 7, 8. doth imply that *Sabbatism* Heb. 4. 9. comprehends the Sabbath and worship put together, or that Psal. 95. 7. *To day if yee will hear his voyce, is meant of a day of rest to bee celebrated in the house of God in his worship*, sith in those words there is not the word *Sabbatism*, and the Exhortation, *To day if yee will hear his voyce*, doth not appear to have been on the weekly Sabbath day, the Psalm being not (as the 94th. Psalm) intituled *A Psalm for the Sabbath*, and it is more likely that [*to day if you will hear his voyce*] intimates the day *at the end of every seven years in the solemnity of the year of release in the feast of tabernacles, when all Israel was come to appear before the Lord in the place which he should chuse, and the Law was to bee read before all Israel in their hearing*, Deut. 31. 10, 11. at which time of the year every year *they had gathered in their Corn and Wine*, Deut. 16. 13. and then they had no harvest, and so it was the fittest time to resemble the rest remaining to Gods people; yet so far was it from being the weekly Sabbath day, that as Ainsworth notes on Deut. 31. 11. *The Jewish Doctors say that if the day of the assembling of the people happened to bee the Sabbath day, the reading of the Law was put off till after.* Yet were it the Sabbath day, it doth not follow, that *it is meant of a day of rest to be celebrated in the house of God in his worship*, for the weekly Sabbath was not celebrated in the house of God, that is, the Tabernacle or Temple, but in their dwellings, Exod. 16. 29. And therefore if the term [Διὸ *wherefore*, Heb. 3. 7.] did refer to *whose house ye are*, v. 6. (though I conceive the inference is made from the words, *if wee hold fast the confidence and rejoycing of the hope firm unto the end*) yet it proves it not to bee a weekly Sabbath of rest to bee celebraged in the house of God in his worship. For the weekly sabbath was not celebrated in Gods house, and if it were, each Christian or the Church were not fit to answer Gods house in which it was celebrated; sith they are not the place where, that made the worship of God accepted as the Tabernacle or Temple that is proper to CHRIST and his body, *John* 2. 19. *Heb.* 8. 2. but the persons by whom it is celebrated and who worship God. Lastly, were all this granted, that Heb. 4. 7. were meant a day of rest to bee celebrated in the house of God in his worship, yet this might be meant of the rest in heaven often called Gods house, where the Elders cast down their crowns before God and worship and praise him, and not the weekly Sabbath.

Fifthly,

" Fifthly, *saith Mr.* C. Because the Apostle understands it of a day " to be kept upon the same ground, in relation unto Christ his ceasing " from his works and entring into his rest, as the 7th. day Sabbath was in " relation to God his ceasing from his works, after his making the first " creation, and entring into his. So it followeth *v.* 10. Which to be " meant of Christ, and his entrance into his rest (which he makes to be " his passing into heaven, v. 14.) inferred from his entring into his rest " *v.* 10. he endeavours to prove by 5 reasons.

Answ. 1. The coherence between *Heb.* 4. 9. and *v.* 10. doth rather intimate that [*he that is entred into his rest, v.* 10.] is a term common to all *the people of God* mentioned *v.* 9. and the exhortation *v.* 11. doth also import, that the person that enters into his rest *v.* 10 is meant every believer. Nor is any one of Mr. *Cs.* reasons convincing of the contrary. For 1. let the translation be mended as Mr. *C.* would have it, yet it may be true of every believer, that he *also hath ceased from his works, as God did from his own works.* 2. *Seeing then*, v. 14. may point out to what is said, *Heb* 3. 12, 13. 3. If *Heb.* 4. 10. cannot be meant of ceasing from sin, yet it may be from laborious works and sufferings as *Revel.* 14. 13. and such rest may be participate with refreshing, and looking upon them as good. 4. That *v.* 10. should be taken for a proof of *v.* 9. is not necessary, γὰρ being not always causal or rational, yet if it were, it might be thus, The rest of the people of God in heaven shall be a Sabbatism like Gods; for such of them as shall enter into their rest, shall cease, or have ceased from their sufferings and painfull works, as God did from his in the beginning. 5. What he saith, that *Christ were not Lord of the Sabbath, as he saith* Mark 2. 28. Luke 6. 5. *unless he had entred into his rest*, or as *p.* 75. *he could not be Lord of the Sabbath, unless he also had a rest which he entred into as God did into his*, is without proof, and is false; sith Christ speaks of his being Lord of the Sabbath at that time afore he entred into his rest; and doth imply that which some would call blasphemy, that Christ as God had not been Lord of the Sabbath unless he had entred into his rest as man. But were it granted, that Christ by reason of his entring into his rest as man, was Lord of the Sabbath, doth that prove that *Heb.* 4. 10. is meant of Christs entring into his rest? or is it not rather *a baculo ad angulum*? But were it granted that *Heb.* 4. 10. were meant of Christs entring into heaven, yet the rest before mentioned is rather thereby confirmed to be meant of rest in heaven with Christ, then rest on earth on a weekly sabbath, sith the argument is strong thus, Christ is passed into his rest in the heavens, therefore there is a rest remaining for the people of God there; but hath no strength thus, Christ is entred into the heavens to rest, therefore there remains to the people of God a weekly day of rest on earth. Lastly, this very reason quite overthrows Mr. *Cs.* building. For he would ground the week day Sabbath upon Christs entring into his rest, and this day he would have to be the first day of the week, and the reason for inferring a week day Sabbath upon Christs entring into his rest is taken from the rest of God after the first creation, whereby the 7th. day Sabbath was sanctified: Now if there be the like reason of keeping a week day

Sabbath

Sabbath becauſe of Chriſts reſt, as there was of keeping the 7th. day Sabbbath becauſe of Gods reſt, then it will not be the firſt day of the week which muſt be the Sabbath, for that was not the day of his entring into his reſt, but another day, to wit, the fifth day of the week, as may be gathered from *Acts* 1.3. Mr. *C.* himſelf, *p.* 76. though he ſay that *it is very probable that the aſcenſion day was on the firſt day of the week*, yet *confeſſeth it not to be clear*; and the reaſon of the probability from *Act.* 1. *by the computation of the forty days from his reſurrection, and the mention of a Sabbath days journey, from Mount* Olivet *to* Jeruſalem, *occaſioned (as is likely) from their making that journey then upon that day*, *v.* 12. is ſo ſlender, that I know not that ever any learned man did conceive ſo with him; and the computation of forty days from his reſurrection, being on the firſt day of the week (though the day of the reſurrection contrary to the common computation ſhould be excluded) will not fix the Aſcention day on the firſt day of the week, but two days at leaſt ſhort of it. And for the mention of *a Sabbath days journey*, *Act.* 1.12. it is clear from the words that it was onely to ſhew the diſtance of the place from *Jeruſalem*, not to ſhew that day to have been the Sabbath day. I liſt not to trouble my ſelf about the reaſon of uſing that expreſſion rather then another, it being not material. Yet were it granted it had been on the Sabbath day, it had not been the firſt day of the week, for that is not termed in Scripture, certainly not in the Acts of the Apoſtles, the Sabbath day. What Mr. *C.* adds, *But albeit his reſt was not compleated till he paſſed into the heavens, yet he firſt entred into it at his reſurrection, which being upon the firſt day of the week, there needeth no more to fix the command of the Sabbath on that day*, doth overthrow his arguing from Heb. 4.7,9,10,14. whence he would deduce the Chriſtian Sabbath becauſe of Chriſts entring into his reſt at his paſſing into the heavens. Which hurts not others, as Mr. *Cawdrey*, *Sabb. Rediv. part* 4. *ſect.* 23. who confeſſeth the words Heb. 4.10. *not to be ſpoken of Chriſt, though he allude to them*. I have inſiſted on this point by the way, becauſe Mr. *C.* makes uſe of it for infant Baptiſm, but to how little purpoſe the ſequel will ſhew.

Mr. *C.* for proof of infant Baptiſm, *p.* 20. layes down this poſition, that *what the Lord confirmed by oath to* Abraham, *he confirmed it to us, even to all believers after Chriſt to the worlds end*; which I grant if underſtood of ſpiritual Evangelical promiſes which accompany ſalvation, but not if meant of thoſe peculiar bleſſings and privileges which were promiſed to *Abrahams* natural ſeed. Yet in his proof of that poſition I conceive ſundry things not right which are vented by him, as *p.* 18. that *the voice of Chriſt* meant Heb. 3.7. is *an inviting us to celebrate his day of reſt in his houſe in the worſhip of the Goſpel*, which he means of a weekly Sabbath, and a particular Congregation, and outward worſhip, as ſundry paſſages following ſhew; and this he makes *a part of the Goſpel*, *p.* 21. and the believer that neglects it *comes ſhort of the promiſe of entring into Gods reſt*, and is *a departing from the living God*, Heb. 3.12. *in tanto, though not in toto*. In which ſpeeches as there is much miſtake, and wrong interpretation of the Text, which ſpeaks not of ſuch a week

day

day rest, or the house of God in the second capacity as he terms it, or of entrance into his rest as his house in that capacity, so that speech is very dangerous, *Now this entrance into his rest as his house in this second capacity, is that which the Apostle chiefly speaketh to here, when he saith, Take heed brethren of an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God. And that in case the people of his pasture, and sheep of his hand, even his own children, will not hear his voyce, but forsake his worship, refusing his offer in this Gospel rest as they did in* Canaan *rest, he will also swear against them as he did against these, that they shall not enter into his rest.* Which if true, then they that are not convinced of the weekly Christian Sabbath, as many godly and learned Divines in forreign parts, and in these Nations are not, those who do not on that day joyn in the publike and solemn worship, as prayer, preaching, breaking bread, and that too in a particular gathered Congregation, as Sectaries, and many other persons, whereof we cannot but judge many of them to be godly, these are chiefly meant by the Apostle as those that have an evil heart of unbelief, depart from the living God, God will swear they shall not enter into his rest. Nor will the limitation *in tanto* help to free his speech from those horrid consequences, which it is liable to, if it be true which he saith, that *the Apostle chiefly speaketh to that entrance in his rest as his house in the second capacity, Heb.* 3.12. and to expound Gods swearing that they should not enter into his rest in that sense, if they did not hear his voyce inviting to keep the Sabbath, makes the speech inept thus, If ye will not keep the Sabbath, I swear ye shall not keep the Sabbath. Nor do I conceive what he saith, p. 34. is right, that *Christ gave his Saints the Keys of the Kingdome of Heaven*, Matth. 16.18. *and from that gift to* Peter *the Saints do claim their Church power, each according to their place and station in the Church; for they have it as* Peters, *that is, as stones in that building, or if you will, as confessours, which makes them to be stones in the house of God*: For neither by *the Keys* is meant all Church power, nor are the Keys given to the Saints, much less to them as stones or confessours, though such things are supposed oft times, but not proved. But I hasten to the view of what follows, being the chief thing Mr. *C.* infers his infant Baptism from.

SECT. LXXVIII.

Mr. Carters *exposition of* Gen. 22.16,17,18. *as if God promised to make every believer a blessing, so as to cast ordinarily elect children on elect parents, is refuted.*

THat which is Mr. *Cs.* basis for his fabrick of Infant Baptism, is *from the Covenant of God with* Abraham, *Gen.* 22.16,17,18. which he saith contains four things. "1. That God would bless *Abraham*, and "with him all believers, with all spiritual blessings in Christ, *Rom.* 9.7. [illegible] *Gen.* 3.15.] Which I yeeld.

"Secondly

"Secondly (*saith he*) more particularly in Gods promise to *Abraham* "is contained something peculiar unto him, and which believers are to "claim particularly from his promise made to *Abraham*; as namely, in "the second place, that God would not onely bless *Abraham*, and in him "all believers, but also would make them blessings, and that chiefly and "in the first place to their families; and not onely so, but also to Na- "tions, *Gen.*12.1,2,3. So *Gen.*18.18. This promise *Peter* alledgeth "and explaineth to the Jews, *Act.*3.25. The word is all the families of "the earth. The same word we have, *Ephes.*3.15. The Covenant made "with *Abraham* therefore, as by this place we see, that we have it in "that of *Gen.*12.1. where it was first made and given, so also that it re- "specteth families and posterity; else he had said all the b lievers, or "all the people of the earth, not all the families of the earth shall be "blessed. And he could not have said to the Jews, ye are the children "of the Covenant, had it not respected the children of the people of "God. Nor is it to be restrained onely to the Jews; for the promise is "concerning all the fami ies of the earth, therefore it tolloweth in the "next words, *v.*26. unto you first. And this blessing as it is first laid "down, *Gen.*12. and here repeated by the Apostle, we see is a blessing "both upon the people of God themselves, and upon their families. "Nor is this promise to be restrained onely unto this, that of *Abraham* "and his seed should Christ come, (although that also be included, be- "cause what we receive from *Abraham* we have it all in Christ,) for so "all those of the line of Christ were blessings to the world as well as "he. And because here is something intended applicable to all belie- "vers, namely, that they also shall be blessings in their generations; "and because a blessing upon families is intended also, for so the words "run, thou shalt be a blessing, and in thee shall all the families of the "earth be blessed; therefore I say it must not be so restrained. But "the meaning is, that in his Covenant with *Abraham* he hath thus far "limited himself, and discovered his mind and purpose, that his choice "shall not be proportion bly all over the world alike, but that it shall "be by families and nations; so as he will ordinarily cast elect chil- "dren upon elect parents; and the lot of the Saints in neighbourhoods "and places together, and not by equal numbers in each part of the "world alike. Had not his election been so limited to families and na- "tions, neither *Abraham* nor believers could have been said to be bles- "sings in spiritual things, either to their families or to any other where "they live, as now they are, because God so blesseth onely his elect, *E-* "*phes.*1.3,4.

Answ. The sum of this I conceive to be, that *God promising to* Abra- ham *he should be a blessing*, Gen.12,2. *that in him all the families of the earth*, Gen.12.3. *all the nations of the earth*, Gen.18.18. *shall be blessed, in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed*, Gen.22.18. *did promise that every believer should be a blessing in his generation in spiritual things to his family and neighbourhood, and thereby God hath limited himself to cast ordinarily elect children on elect parents, and the lot of the Saints in neighbourhoods and places together, and not by equal numbers in each part*

of

of the world alike. Which exposition is many wayes faulty, and the conclusion inferred from it either false or uncertain, and yet if it were true and certain, would not yeeld a sufficient reason for infant baptism, as will be shewed in the sequel.

The first thing I except against this Exposition, that when it is said *Gen.* 12. 2. והיה ברכה he takes it for granted, it is to bee understood actively, as if the meaning were that *Abraham* should be a blessing to others, whereas (as *Pareus* in his *Com* saith) *it may be an amplification of the things going before, thou shalt bee altogether and very blessed: in which sense we use often the abstract for the contract, as a man very honest is called honesty.* Yea the LXX render it καὶ ἔσῃ εὐλογημένος, *and thou shalt be blessed. Piscat. schol. Vel, esto in benedictione, hoc est benedictus. Diodati annot. Blessed every way: as if all blessings were gathered together in thee, or a pattern of a compleat blessing.*

2. That he takes it as if *what is said must bee applicable to all believers, that they shall be blessings in their generations.* But this is not proved from the text, which onely speaks of *Abraham being a blessing*, and though it is true *Heb. 6.* 14. the promise of blessing to *Abraham* is made a promise of which all believers are heyrs, *v.* 17. yet is it plain from many passages in that Chapter *v* 9, 11, 12, 15, 18, 19. that it is meant that they are heirs of the promise of blessing to themselves in enjoying salvation as *Abraham* did, not of imparting blessing to others.

3. That he takes it as if it must follow, that if "*Abraham* were "a blessing to others, it must bee in that spiritual blessings according to "election were in some proportion entailed to the posterity and neigh- "bourhood of all true believers. But *Pareus* thus; "Some expound "it actively, thou shalt be a blessing, that is, thou shalt bless others: "my blessing shall not bee shut up in thee alone; but out of thee it "shall flow also to others. Blessing shall so stick in thee whereſoever "thou comest, that by thy ministry others may also come to a bless- "sing. Nor do the exposition of some *Hebrews* seem to bee refused, "that *Abraham* shall be a publike example of all sort of blessing in "the world, so that all that wish well to themselves or others, may "wish for the happiness of *Abraham*: *Or as the new annot in Gen.* 12. 2. *shalt be a blessing*] "That is, more then thou shalt have a blessing, "for in this blessing is virtually comprised the happiness of both worlds, "and of all that are truely blessed in all ages; whereof though God be "the onely Author, *Abraham* is honoured to bee a principal means "under him to bring it to pass in being the progenitour of the promised "seed, and setting such an example of belieſe as might qualifie "him to be stiled father of the faithfull, *Rom.* 4. 11, 12. The world "shall receive by thy seed, which is Christ, the blessing which it lost "in *Adam.*

Mr. *C.* himselfe denies not *to bee included in this promise, that of* Abraham *and his seed the Lord* CHRIST *should come*, but saith, *if it bee restrained onely to this then it will follow that all those of the Line of* CHRIST *were blessings to the world as well as bee.*

To which I reply, 1. if the ſenſe given be included as he grants, then his ſenſe is not neceſſary, nor can any thing be proved by it. 2. Though the ſpeech in the ſenſe given bee reſtrained, yet the abſurdity followes not, ſith the being a bleſſing by begetting Chriſt is not ſo inveſted in any as in *Abraham*, who is made the firſt Truſtee as it were, of this bleſſing by the Covenant, or Charter granted to him. 4. I except that in the promiſe, *In thee*, or *in thy ſeed ſhall all the families or Nations of the earth bee bleſſed.* Mr. *Carter* conceives *thee* and *thy ſeed* to *comprehend every believer*: Whereas the Apoſtle expounds *Acts* 3. 25. [*in thy ſeed*] of Chriſt onely, and [*in thee*] *Galath.* 3. 8, 9. of *Abraham* onely, *with whom* as the pattern of believing and beeing bleſſed, they which *bee of the faith are bleſſed.* I deny not that by *Abrahams ſeed* believers are meant *Gen.* 17. 7. and *Gen.* 15. 5. and that the Apoſtle *Rom.* 4. 18. *Gal.* 3. 29. and elſewhere ſo expounds it; But nowhere do I finde the promiſes *Gen.* 12. 3 & 18. 18. & 22. 18. expounded ſo as that *in thy ſeed* ſhould note every believer, and the ſenſe in which Mr. *Carter* takes it, as if *in every believer all the families of the earth ſhould bee bleſſed*, it is derogatory from *Abrahams* peculiar priviledge one way underſtood, another from Chriſts, and not much ſhort of blaſphemy. 5. That hee makes *families and nations of the earth to bee different in the promiſes mentioned*, as appears by his words [*and that chiefly and in the firſt place to their families; and not onely ſo, but alſo to nations*] whereas the holy Ghoſt makes no ſuch difference. For as the ſame promiſe which is expreſſed by *families*, *Gen.* 12. 3. is expreſſed by *nations*, *Gen.* 18. 18. ſo in the new Teſtament the promiſe *Gen.* 12. 3. where the word is rendred *families*, is expreſſed *Gal.* 3. 8. by *nations* and the term which is *Gen.* 22. 18. *all the nations of the earth* is *Acts* 3. 25. *all the kindreds or families of the earth*, as Mr. *C.* would have it. 6. Mr. *C.* ſeems by *families to whom believers ſhould be a bleſſing*, *children*, as when hee ſaith, *God will ordinarily caſt children elect upon elect parents*, and *by nations neighbourhoods*, as when hee ſaith, *the lot of the Saints in neighbourhoods and places together*, whereas *families* in the *Hebrew* מִשְׁפָּחוֹת whether rendred by φυλαὶ as the LXX *Gen.* 12. 3. that is, *tribes*, or πατριαὶ *Acts* 3. 25. notes more then poſterity or houſholds, even whole tribes, and kindreds that draw their line from one great Anceſtour, and עַם notes a whole people of one language, though in their dwellings ſo remote as to have no entercourſe one with another. I will not trouble my ſelf to enquire what difference there is between the words in Hebrew and Greek which are tranſlated families, tribes, kindreds, nations: This I am ſure they contain greater and more ample numbers of men then thoſe who live together under one roof or one town, and if from thence the extent of the Covenant be inferred to poſterity of believers and their neighbours, and ſo the ſeal of the Covenant (as Mr. *C.* doth) becauſe believers are promiſed to bee a bleſſing to poſterity and neighbours, it will follow from the termes *families* and *nations*, that they are bleſſings to whole parithes, townes, cities and nations, and they are to be Diocaeſed and parochial, city, national Churches to bee ſet up again, againſt which

which Mr. C. with his brethren have ſo much hitherto contended. 7. By Mr. C's. expoſition whereas the promiſes are that *all the nations of the earth ſhall be bleſſed in a believer*, this is brought to ſo narrow a compaſs, as that it is reſtrained to poſterity and neighbourhood. 8. The manner how in believers their poſterity is ſaid to be bleſſed, and he a bleſſing to them is expreſſed to be, in that *God caſts elect children upon elect parents*, which I know not well how to underſtand. It ſeems to bear a ſenſe if not the ſame yet very near that in which we are ſaid to be *choſen in Chriſt, Epheſ.* 1. 3, 4. which Mr. C. alledgeth to this purpoſe, and 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. *we are of God in him, who is made to us of God wiſdom, and righteouſneſs, and ſanctification, and redemption*, which were near blaſphemy. Which to avoid it concerned Mr. C. to have more clearly and diſtinctly expreſſed himſelf.

What he ſaith [*that the Covenant made with Abraham* Gen. 12. 2, 3. *reſpecteth families and poſteritie; elſe he had ſaid all the believers, or all the people of the earth, not all the families of the earth ſhall bee bleſſed*] ſhews his overſight in not obſerving that it is *Gal.* 3. 8. *all the nations of the earth*, which is equivalent to all the people of the earth, and yet *v.* 9. by *all the nations of the earth*, are meant no more then *they that are of faith*. And when he ſaith, *that the Apoſtle Acts* 3. 25. *could not have ſaid to the Jewes, ye are the children of the Covenant, had it not reſpected the children of the people of God*, hee heeded not that they are ſaid as well to bee *children of the Prophets*, and therefore the ſenſe is not that they were deſcended from the Covenant or Prophets by natural generation, but ye are they to whoſe Anceſtours the Covenant was at firſt given, and the Prophets ſent, which are not common things to all the children of the people of God or true believers, the Gentile believers children are not children of the Covenant and Prophets in the ſenſe there meant, but proper to the Jews.

Nor is the propoſition true which Mr. C. would gather from the Covenant to *Abraham*. For, 1. God hath plainly diſcovered his mind *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 18, 24, 25. that he chuſeth at his pleaſure children of unbelievers as well as believers, and of the poſterity of believers, either none or which he will, arbitrarily and by no ordinary or certain rule, but as a potter doth with his clay, according to his ſoveraignty, not out of ſpecial grace to the children of his elect for the parents ſake, and accordingly the ſaints praiſe him for their redemption *out of every kinred, and tongue, and people, and nation*, *Rev.* 5. 9. without reſpect to their Anceſtours.

2. Our Lord Chriſt foretold *Matt* 10. 34, 35. that *he came to divide a man againſt his father, and the daughter againſt her mother, and the daughter in law againſt her mother in law, and a mans enemies ſhould be they of his own houſe*. And in the families of the moſt godly, how few were found elect may appear by the poſterity of *David, Joſiah, Jehoſhaphat, Eli, Samuel, Abraham* himſelf, with many more. As for our own experience in our own times it is ſo uncertain, that no good eſtimate can be made thereupon, concerning Gods ordinary way. Perhaps in ſome families it falls out, that the poſterity, and neighbours, and ſervants are

godly, but many complaints of degenerating, of back-sliding, shew it as often to be otherwise.

I wish it were true which Mr. *C.* writes, though I find no proof of it, "That in all ages God hath cast it so in his providence, that his people "are not to be found in all places alike: but we finde them together "in some families and nations. Now this is not falu out by chance, but "because God hath so made his choise, hath been a God to believers "and their seed in their generation; and hath made them blessings for "the conversion and edification of their children, neighbours and ac-"quaintance, and that not onely by a common providence, as he bles-"seth the corn and grass of the field, but it is by vertue of a special word "of blessing a creating word of promise, which giveth a being to the "things promised, even this promise made to *Abraham* and in him to "all believers, *Gen.* 12 2, 3. without which, good examples and other "means of education and conversion, had not had such efficacy and power "in turning sinners to God. But I do not believe it, sith neither hath the Covenant such a sense as Mr. *C.* gives it, nor is there such experience proved, and it is found that what good is done among children of believing parents, is done as often by servants, ministers, good company, remarkable providences and other wayes, as by parents endeavours, and if without such a promise as Mr. *C.* imagines, such means had not such efficacy, I think not onely parents who believe no such promise, but also ministers, and others who expect a blessing upon their endeavours without Mr. *Cs.* promise, would be discouraged in their work.

That which is said *Psal.* 105. 8. though it prove the perpetuity of Gods Covenant with *Abraham*, yet proves not the sense Mr. *C.* gives of the Covenant. Nor doth that *Luk.* 19. 9. yeeld any clearness to it, For salvation came to *Zacheus* his house in respect of his person, and if it did to others in his house, yet it is not said by vertue of the Covenant to *Abraham* as Mr. *C.* imagines, and what Mr. *C.* saith about *Act* 16. 31. *that it was spoken because of this promise to Abraham* is his own gloss without any hint from the text, and would infer this proposition, that by vertue of Gods promise to *Abraham* upon the faith of an house-keeper his house should be saved, which is contrary to constant experience of believing masters, husbands, parents having unbelieving servants, wives, children.

I grant *Abraham* to be the *holy root*, *Rom.* 11. 16. and that *v.* 28. the Jewes *as touching the election are beloved for the Fathers sake and that they shall be graffed in again because the guift once given to them, God will not repent of*, and though I say not *the Church bringeth forth children to Abraham*, yet I yeeld *Jerusalem which is above* the Evangelical Covenant doth, and *that the children of promise*, or of *the free-woman* are *Abrahams seed all believers* even of the Gentiles, but this is so far from proving *the blessing upon families and kinreds, and Gods ordering in such manner his election*, as Mr. *C.* devised, and would have perpetual from *Psal.* 105. 8. that it rather proves the contrary. For the breaking off the Jews, and the ingraffing the Gentiles, not of the families or kinred of the root *Abraham* but a wild Olive by nature, proves the blessing not to

to be to families, nor election so ordered, as that *to a thousand generations, to all generations even to the worlds end, God ordinarily casts elect children upon elect parents.* Nor doth the citing of *Isa.*59.20. which is *Rom.*11.26,27. with the inference thereupon, prove that *God entails his blessing upon families from generation to generation*; but that God hath such a special love to the family of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, that after a long breaking off that nation shall be restored again and re ingrafted for the Fathers sake, which is there made the peculiar priviledge of *Israel* after the flesh. But there is not a word in the Apostle, *Rom.*11. that shews *that priviledge to have been enjoyed by believing Gentiles since their being grafted into the same root and Olive tree from whence the Jews were broken off.* Nor is it true. For God hath removed his Candlestick from many places where there were famous Churches, and from many kindreds, families, and people, where there were formerly godly company and society; so that now the progeny are become profane, and Apostates, and the Churches repleniſhed with plants out of families in which a little while since Popery, profaneness, and viciousness did abound. Nor do 1 *Cor.*7.14. *Acts* 2.38. make any thing for Mr. *Cs.* purpose, as shall appear in the sequel. Nor doth *the application of Circumcision to the child*, or *Abrahams title of Father of all them that believe*, prove the Covenant with *Abraham* in Mr. *Cs.* sense: Nor is it true, *the application of Circumcision to the child is a necessary and essential part of that Ordinance.* For that is not an essential part of an Ordinance without which it might be: But the Ordinance of Circumcision might be, and perhaps was at first without application to a child, if thereby be meant an infant; however, if none but parents were circumcised, as when the Circumcision was *Josh.*5. it had been the Ordinance of Circumcision nevertheless: when onely one proselyte at age was circumcised it was the Ordinance. *Ergo.*

As for what Mr. *C.* answers to the objection from experience, it is indeed a pulling down of what he had spent so much time to build up. For *if Gods blessing do not take effect through mens sin, or defect of using means*, then the promise is not to families and kindreds in that absolute manner Mr. *C.* before described it, then the promise is to the quality and diligence of the persons, not to the relation; then is the promise as well to any other so qualified and diligent, as to the parent; then is it false which he said before, *pag.*38. that *the success was not from example and other means, but a special word of blessing the promise to Abraham.* Finally, if that be true which he hath *pag.*35. (which is false printed) G 2. that *although Gods promise be to carry his election so, as to cast elect children upon elect parents, yet he reserveth to himself, and also useth in this a liberty, namely, ever and anon to be still breaking of some, and grafting in others into this holy root*; then what he said before, p.37. F 3. that *God hath thus far limited himself, and discovered his mind and purpose, that he will ordinarily cast elect children upon elect parents*, is false: For what God reserveth to himself, and useth a liberty in, he hath not limited himself so far; and if he ever and anon useth this liberty, to be still breaking off some, and grafting in others,

then

then he doth not ordinarily cast elect children upon elect parents; for what is otherwise ever and anon and still, is not so ordinarily, much less *still in being to a thousand generations, to all generations, even to the worlds end*, as he said *pag.* 33. *G.* So that Mr. *Cs.* discourse from his own words is found hitherto to contain mistakes, uncertainty, and in the main, inconsistency with it self. Let's view whether in the rest there be any thing worthy of a Lord Mayors *imprimatur*.

A third thing Mr. *C.* observes as contained in the Lords promise unto *Abraham*, is, "That by thus blessing and making believers blessings, "God would multiply his seed, *Gen.*22.16. So *Gen.*17.2,5. That this "is part of the Gospel, and contained in the promise made to him and "us, is proved from *Heb.*6.14. A further proof we have *Gen.*15.5. al-"ledged *Rom.*4.3,18,22. as belonging to believing Gentiles, the in-"crease of whose number by means of Gods blessing believers so as to "make them blessings as *Abrahams* seed, was intended in that promise, "and as part of that Gospel, which God preached unto *Abraham*: "There's a promise that the Kingdome of Christ shall fill the world, "*Dan.*2.35,44. To this purpose is that of our Saviour, *Matth.*13.31, "32,33. Now the Lords making believers blessings, and thereby "multiplying *Abrahams* seed, is that which makes his Kingdome thus "to be like leaven, whereby the whole world at last will be seasoned "with the knowledge and love of Christ. Therefore this multiplying "of believers, so as to fill the world, is made by the Apostle, *Rom.* "4.13. to be part of *Abrahams* promise; then mark what follows, "*v.*16,17,18. This promise was made sure to all believers, as well Gen-"tiles as Jews.

Answ. 1. Why Mr. *C.* makes that the 3d. thing in Gods promise *Gen.*22.17,18. which is the 2d. and puts that as the 2d. thing which is after the rest *v.*18. and so the 4th. I see no reason, but onely that he foresaw that otherwise there had been no colour for this which he here infers, that *by thus blessing and making believers blessings God would multiply his seed, Gen.*22.16. But the right order of the promises shews this conceit to be only Mr. *Cs.* fancy. For in that the promise *v.*18. is put last, it is shewed thereby that it is a distinct promise, and that it doth not express the manner how God would multiply *Abrahams* seed, as Mr. *C.* conceives. 2. It is true *Gen.*15.5. is a Gospel promise to believing Gentiles, *Rom.*4.18. but not in Mr. *Cs.* sense, that *the increase of the number of believing Gentiles, should be by means of Gods blessing believers so as to make them blessings as* Abrahams *seed, in that God would cast ordinarily elect children on elect parents, and the lot of the Saints in neighbourhoods and places together*: But in this sense, that *Abraham* should have an innumerable company of children, or his seed among the Gentiles by faith, who should be *blessed with faithfull* Abraham, *Gal.*3.9. in their own persons, but no mention is there of their being a blessing to others. 3. That *the Church of Christ should fill the world, Dan.*2.35,44. that *the Kingdome of Heaven as a grain of mustard seed, or leaven, Matth.* 13.31,32,33. *shall fill or season the world*, is granted; but that it is meant in those places to be done in Mr. *Cs.* way, is denied: I do conceive

conceive it to have been meant of the Apostles preaching, as me thinks Christs words, *Matth.* 24.14. do import. 4. That *the promise of being heir of the world was to* Abraham *and his seed believing Gentiles*, is granted; but that his or their being heir of the world did import any such blessing as Mr. *C.* imagines, as if God would ordinarily cast elect children on elect parents, or that any such thing is intimated by the Apostle *v.* 16, 17, 18. is denied: Nor do I yet find any interpreter afore Mr. *C.* who hath so expounded the promise.

In the opening of the 4th. promise, that *the seed of* Abraham *should possess the gates of their enemies*, though his exposition be granted, I see not what advantage it gives him for proof of infant Baptism, and therefore let it pass; onely I take notice, that when *p.* 43. he makes *the multiplying of the seed of* Abraham, *and the conquest of the world to be a spiritual work to be effected by the sword of the spirit the word of God*, it follows, that it is to be done by preachers rather then by parents, and consequently not in that way Mr. *C.* imagines, but in the way which Christ took, by sending his Apostles to preach the Gospel to every creature. What he saith *p.* 45. of the meaning of *Gen.* 9.26. hath been shewed before to be uncertain, and to be proved false by the History of the Church, in that in *Affrica* the posterity of *Cham* were in the Church of Christ as well as *Shems* and *Japhets* posterity; and how *Abrahams seed shall fill the world at last, and rule over it*, is so doubtfull, as that I conceive no certainty can be thence deduced. The conceit of the four Kings *Gen.* 14. as if *their people became afterwards the four Monarchies* is such a fancy, as a waking man that knows the distance between *Rome*, *Greece*, and *Canaan*, and the voyage they must take by sea, and other circumstances which the story *Gen.* 14. and other Histories suggest, will take onely for a dream. Mr. *Cs.* gloss, *p.* 50. on the words of Christ, *Mark* 10.15. *whosoever shall not receive the Kingdome of God as a little child; that is, as a child receiveth it, shall not enter therein*; whether he mean it of the visible Church or Kingdome of glory, it cannot be true. For let the way of entring the Kingdome of God be by birth, or Baptism, or any other way, yet a true believer by faith and profession may enter into the Kingdome of God in a way different from that a little child receives it in who hath no understanding of Christ: And though both be passive in the first work on their souls, yet believers of age are not meerly passive as little children who have no understanding at all of Christ. But for the true meaning of Christ, I need say no more but refer the Reader to Christs words, *Matth.* 18.4. whence the meaning appears to be, that no person not endued with that qualification of self-humbling, of which a little child is a fit embleme, *Psal.* 131. 2. shall become an inheritour of glory. Nor is there any proof made by Mr. *C.* of his dictate, that *because Christ would that little children also should be members of his Kingdome, therefore hath he made it ever branch of the Gospel of this Kingdome, that the families of the righteous shall be blessed.* His reason he gives, *p.* 51. is no reason; for *God might have gone further then ordinarily to cast elect children upon elect parents*, even to have done so universally and perpetually, and yet we might no more have *been sons of God*

by

by natural generation, and as much *by nature born children of wrath* as now we are conceived. Though *God had not so far*, as Mr. *C.* imagines, *confined his choice to families, kindreds, and nations, his elect had not been destitute of means of education*, sith God could have provided Catechists, Preachers, and others to that end, in other families, kindreds, and nations: Sure in some ages of the Church there was so little provision made to that end in families, kindreds, and nations, that it appears that almost all the means of education was from Monasteries in *Scotland* and *Ireland*, by the Histories that remain, as may be seen by *Seldens* Epistle before the Histories collected by *Twisden*, *Ushers* relation of the *Irish* Religion, and elsewhere. *If it were the most natural and ready way to multiply the spiritual seed for the increase of Gods Kingdome, by making believers a blessing to families and nations*, as Mr. *C.* saith *p.* 52. sure God by sending Apostles, and not using Kings and Masters of families for that end, omitted the readiest and most natural way; and I see not why it should be judged the best way to propagate the Gospel, to gather Churches out of Parishes, and set Pastors over them, or to send itinerant preachers, but to reduce all Churches to family and national Churches, and to make Kings and Masters of families Elders and Rulers over them. Nor do I find that *either God so casts the lot of his Saints together*, as Mr. *C.* imagines, or that *by that means the gifts of Gods people are improved, and light increased*; but by raising up holy Teachers and Pastors, and associating of the Saints from their several dwellings into a well ordered assembly. If as Mr. *C.* saith *p.* 55. *the Israelites destroyed the Canaanites not by common rules of righteousness among men, but by special revelation and command from God*; then either they did it not by the promise *Gen.* 12. 17. or that promise did not assure them of the possession of *Canaan* by common rules of justice, as Mr. *C.* conceives. That *the people of God in the times of the N. T. may not make war against Antichrist or Babylon and their party as an Anathema, but upon a natural and civil account, for the just liberties opposed and invaded by them*, may be well doubted, considering sundry passages which are *Rev.* 17. 16, 17. & 18. 6, 24. That *the dominion which the Saints shall at last obtain, shall need no force either to get or maintain it*; *but it shall naturally fall upon them, as from other causes, so also by reason of their number, according to the law of nature, and common rules of righteousness*, is not proved from *Isa.* 2. 3. and how much it may tend to denying the lawfulness of Christians fighting in wars, especially if the chief or onely cause be to preserve the Godly from oppressions in Religion, is to be considered. And that *power is naturally devolved upon the Saints because of their numbers*, (as *p.* 60. is intimated,) seems to me an unsafe speech, as resting on this position, That power is naturally devolved on the greatest number. It is enough that I have onely by the way noted these things, that what men preach and print may be better considered: I pass on to the examining of Mr. *Cs.* application.

Sect. 79.

SECT. LXXIX.

Neither did Circumcision seal Mr. Cs. additional Promise, nor was Abraham *thence termed Father of Believers.*

THe first thing Mr. *C.* obserues is, that "in the promise to *Abraham* "there's an addition made to the former promise to *Adam*, *Gen.* 3. "15. which I grant, but not such an addition as Mr. *C.* conceives.

The next is, that "to this promise of making believers blessings to "families and nations, God made an addition of the seal of Circumcisi-"on, and the application of this seal to infants is part of the seal, there by "signifying and confirming that promise of such blessing. So *Gen.* 17. 10, "14. Had not the application of it to the infant been part of the token "of the Covenant the childs not being circumcised had not been a "breach of the Covenant; nor could the Lord have said, this is my Co-"venant, that the manchild be circumcised, if the application of that "ordinance to the child, had not in it a signification and confirmation "of something in the Covenant.

Answ. There are these things to be proved: 1. That Circumcision was a seal of the Covenant made to *Abraham Gen.* 17. 2. That Circumcision was a seal of this promise of God, of making believers blessings to families and nations in order to the multiplying the seed, and encrease of the Kingdome of Christ. 3. That the application of this seal to infants is part of the seal. 4. That thereby was signified and confirmed that promise of such blessing. But the proof is of other things, 1. that the application of Circumcision to the infant is part of the token of the Covenant. 2. The application of that ordinance to the child, had in it a signification and confirmation of something in the Covenant; For neither is it all one to bee a token and to bee a seal of the Covenant, there being other tokens then seals; and signe and token being the same, though distinguished *Rom.* 4. 11. they are unfitly confounded by Mr. *C.* nor is it all one to signifie something in the Covenant, and to signifie this thing in the Covenant, that God would make believers blessings in Mr. *Cs.* sense. Nor do neither of Mr. *Cs.* middle terms prove either of his conclusions. For the childs not being circumcised had been a breach of the Covenant, as being a breach of the command of God enjoyned then, though circumcising the child had been no part of the token of the Covenant, and the Lord might have said, this is *my Covenant that the man child bee circumcised*, that is, this is my command in my Covenant, if the application of that ordinance to the child, had not in it a signification and confirmation of something in the Covenant. But allowing that Circumcision is called the Covenant by a meronimy of the thing signified for the signe, and that it signified something in the Covenant beeing applied to infants, yet not one of Mr. *Carters* propositions is proved thereby;

For 1. it may be a signe and not a seal. 2. It might be a seal of the Covenant *Gen.* 17. yet not of that promise *Gen.* 22. 18. which is in another Covenant, not in that *Gen.* 17. 3. If it were a seal of that promise Gen. 22. 18. yet not in Mr. *Cs.* new devised sense. 4. To omit the ineptness or non sense of the speech, *the application of this seal to infants is part of the seal.* For what doth hee mean by the application of this seal to infants but onely Circumcision, and hee before called Circumcision the seal which hee meant; so that his speech can have no other construction then this, Circumcision of infants is part of Circumcision, which is inept or non-sense, I say further that the speech is not true. For if it bee a part it is either essential or integral, I know no other sort of parts it can bee meant of; But it it is not a part essential, for then without application to infants there should bee no seal, and so a Proselyte had not the seal though hee were Circumcised, unless hee had an infant manchild and hee circumcised, nor integral, for the Circumcision of a Proselyte was entire Circumcision or seal (as they speak) without his manchilds Circumcision.

Thence also, saith Mr. *C. is that in* Acts 7. 8. *that is, he did it according to that Covenant of Circumcision, so as the application of the seal to the infant was part of the Covenant to bee performed on the part of* Abraham *and his seed in their generations, even by his spiritual seed to a thousand generations, in that which is the same for substance, and equivalent to circumcision, as we shall see anon.*

Answ. That *God gave* Abraham *the Covenant of Circumcision, and so,* or *accordingly,* or *he* (according to the Copies that have ὁ θ῀ς not οὗτος) *begate Isaac, and circumcised him the eighth day* is not denied, nor that he did this *according to the Covenant of Circumcision,* that is according to the command of God concerning Circumcision as a signe of his Covenant *Gen.* 17. in which sense it is granted that *the application of the seal* (meaning circumcision) *to the* (male) *infant was part of the Covenant to be performed on the part of* Abraham *and his seed in their generations,* but this proves not what Mr. *C.* undertook to prove, that *it was part of the seal,* or *part of the token of the Covenant* (it being not all one to bee part of the Covenant and part of the seal or token of the Covenant) unless Mr. *C.* confounds them (as he seems to do) nor is there any word of God for application of any seal to the infant but Circumcision, the text is expres for Circumcision, *this is my Covenant which ye shall keep between me and you and thy seed after thee, every man child shall bee circumcised,* which can bee understood of no other then Circumcision, without making God to speak non sense, and making God command a thing in words which they signifie not, and making God to command a thing indefinite and indeterminate, which no wise Law-giver doth, and making a pronoun demonstrative to impore not the definite thing expressed, but some other *individuum vagum,* of which it is uncertain what it is, contrary to the very exposition of the Holy Ghost Gen. 17. 13. where it is expresly said, that *Abrahams* Circumcising was as *God had said unto*

unto him, contrary to what *Abraham*, and all interpreters Jewish and Christian (that I have ever met with afore Mr. *C.*) have conceived, and which if it be granted it will follow that if the male child of *Abrahams* posterity had not been circumcised, but had another seal of the Covenant applied to it, the Covenant or Command *Gen.* 17. 9, 10, 11, 12. had not been broken, *Moses* had kept the command if he had baptised his son, though he did not circumcise him. These and many more absurdities follow on that portentous opinion, which I guessed long since by some words of Mr. *Cawdrey* and *Palmer* in the first part of their *Sabb. Rediv. ch* 2. §. 32. to have been hatching to maintain the Judaizing conceit of infant Baptism from infant Circumcision, that they might not seem therein to run on the rock of holding the Law of Circumcision yet in force; yet might have some colour for a command of infant Baptism, *Gen.* 17. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. where infant Circumcision is commanded and nothing else, but I found it not so expressly vented by any afore Mr. *C.* Now what saith he for it? 1. *That this part of the Covenant was to be performed by Abrahams spiritual seed.* But hee doth not prove that it was to bee performed by *Abrahams* spiritual seed of the Gentiles after Christs comming. Hee urgeth the words of the Psalmist *Psalm.* 105. 8. *Hee hath remembred his Covenant for ever: the word which hee commanded to a thousand generations.* But first, *The word* is not meant of the command of a seal to bee applied to Infants, but of *his own promise, which hee will have firme as his Command*, *Psalm.* 133. 3. & 42. 8. & 44. 4. as the *New Annotat.* and *Piscat.* on the place, which also appears from the words following, which terme it *Gods Covenant hee made with* Abraham, *and his oath unto Isaac*, which is expressed *vers.* 11. which cannot be understood of his Command to us what we should do, but his promise of what hee himself will do. Secondly, the word *commanded* signifieth Gods decree within himself; Or as *Diodati* in his note on the place, *Hee commanded*] *which hee appointed by his soveraign and irrevocable decree*, as the word commanded is used *Psalm.* 133. 3. and elsewhere. Thirdly, *To a thousand generations*, notes not just so many; But as *Piscator* in his *scholia* on the place, *it is by a synecdoche of the kinde*, as if it were said *unto many ages*. And this must needs bee granted, sith the Covenant however it bee granted to imply in the latent sense the promise of the heavenly inheritance, yet in the patent sense must bee understood (as *v.* 11. 44. compared shew) of the earthly *Canaan*: which they had not a thousand generations, but for many ages; as *Exod.* 20. 6, *To thousand generations* is meant not precisely so many and no more, but a long time indefinite, beyond three or four generations: and thus must also bee understood the promise of the land of *Canaan* to bee for ever, *to be an everlasting possession*, that is, for a long time, as frequently it is used *Exod.* 21. 6. *Exod.* 40. 15. 1 Sam. 2. 35. *Levit.* 23. 14, 21, 31, 41. *&c.* What hee saith *of Baptism being the same for substance and equivalent to Circumcision*, unless hee mean it, that infant Baptism and infant Circumcision are one equivalent to the other, and the same for substance in this sense [they are of no force

not obliging Christians nor benefiting them] it will be found in examining that which follows, to have no truth.

Mr. *C.* adds, *And that this blessing upon families and posterity was signified, held forth, and sealed by circumcising the child, appeareth further by that promise uttered in that phrase*, Deut. 30. 6. *which kind of expression intimates, that the promise of the conversion of their children was held forth, and confirmed in that seal. As when the Apostle saith we are baptized into one body, is signified and sealed in Baptism our union with Christ in one body, because else those words had been in no capacity to have been so used in that sense, as they are used both by the Apostle and by Moses.*

Answ. 1. The phrase of *circumcising the heart*, *Deut.* 30 6 being used to express conversion or change of the heart, doth shew indeed that there is some resemblance between them, yet that it is so by institution is not proved, no more then because by *breaking up our fallow ground*, together with *circumcising*, the same thing is signified *Jer.* 4. 3, 4. and by *washing*, *Isa.* 1. 16. therefore plowing and washing are by institution to bee used to that end, 2. But be it granted that Circumcision was instituted to signifie the change of the heart, as baptism our union with Christ in one body, yet this proves not that it was to signifie and seal a promise of something future, but rather what was already done. For if it signifie as Baptism, then it signifies conversion already effected, Baptism being a sign that the person was united to Christ and to all his members by one spirit, as the very terms 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. ἐβαπτίσθημεν *wee have been baptized*, ἐποτίσθημεν *we have been drenched*, shew. And though the words *Deut.* 30. 6. are a promise, yet the term [*circumcise*] of it self, and in like manner the use of circumcision, according to the institution, may as well note a thing done, as a thing promised to bee done. 3. Nevertheless let it bee granted that circumcision did in the institution of it note conversion of the heart, and signified a promise of it as being a token of the Covenant in which that was covertly promised, yet this proves not that it held forth *a blessing upon families and posterity*. For there is no mention *Deut.* 30. 6. of families, though there be of posterity, and that mention which is of posterity, is of them not in their infant, but adult estate, and upon condition of the childs returning to God, and obeying his voice as well as the parents, as Mr. *Baxter* rightly observes in his *Friendly accommodation with Mr. Bedford p.* 361. I may add, that the promise there is expressed onely concerning one case, to wit repentance in captivity, *v.* 1, 2. 3, 4. and the promise (as appears from *v.* 5.) is a promise peculiar to the Israelites. 4. But were this further granted, that thence might be proved that circumcision by institution signified the promise of conversion of posterity, and that this were to Gentile believers, yet this is not that which Mr. *C.* would evince, that the application of the seal to infants in that it was to infants sealed this promise, or that the promise was sealed in Mr. *C.* sense, so as that God would ordinarily cast elect children on elect parents, and make parents a blessing, so as that *Abrahams* seed by faith should be multiplied in families and nations by them.

What

What Mr. C. adds, *That the sign had not held proportion with the thing signified; namely, there had been nothing in the sign to signifie and seal that blessing upon posterity, had the application of it to infants been left out,* is but a vain dictate. For 1. if the sign held similitude with the thing signified, though it held not proportion so as to be applied to all whose conversion was signified it might serve for the use of a sign, as a conveyance to a Father may assure the childs interest; and therefore that which Mr. C. dictates, that *for this reason infants were to be circumcised, to seal that promise of believers being a blessing, added to* Adams *Covenant*, is a vain conceit without proof, which it might have been as well assured if the parents had been circumcised onely, as well as when the male infants onely were circumcised.

And that which he saith further is most false, and vain, *Nor indeed had there been any use of the application of it to the infant, nor that made a part of the Ordinance, had there not been such a branch in the Covenant as a blessing upon families and posterity to be thereby signified and sealed.* For besides this, that Mr. C. proves neither that branch in the Covenant, nor that use of infant Circumcision, it is clear by *Stephens* speech, *Act.* 7.5,6,7,8. that *Abraham* circumcised *Isaac* in assurance of the land of *Canaan*, and that he received the Covenant of Circumcision to that end: and that the circumcising of infants had this use, to signifie Christ to come, seems plainly to be delivered by the Apostle, *Col.* 2.17. and by the general consent of Divines. Much more vain is that which he adds, *So as if that priviledge be denied unto infants, that which was given to us in* Abrahams *Covenant is rejected, as he saith Gen.* 17. *The uncircumcised man-child shall be cut off from his people, he hath broken my Covenant.* For neither if Mr. C's. sense of the promise *Gen.* 22.18. *Gen.* 12.2,3. be rejected, is there any thing which was given to us in *Abrahams* Covenant rejected, nor had the denying of Circumcision to infants necessarily inferred the rejecting of that which was given in *Abrahams* Covenant, nor do the words *Gen.* 17.14. import, that by not circumcising the person omitting it had rejected that which was given in *Abrahams* Covenant, for so *Moses* not circumcising his son had rejected the Covenant; but *the breaking the Covenant* was onely meant of breaking the command of that which was the token of the Covenant. Much less is this true of those that deny infant Baptism, that they reject the spiritual blessings given in *Abrahams* Covenant, Baptism being not by Christs institution a seal of Gods Covenant or promise to us, unless by consequence, much less the mixt Covenant of *Abraham*, as it contained domestical benefits proper to *Abrahams* house, much more less the new conceited promise of Mr. C. Nor was infant Baptism ever commanded by God, but invented by men in a fond imitation of Jewish Circumcision; and as long as we keep close to the institution *Matth.* 28.19. and baptize and are baptized upon believing in testimony of our union with Christ and his Church, *1 Cor.* 12.13. we may securely slight Mr. C's. doom of being cut off from Gods people, which after Mr. *Cotton* refuted by me in the second part of this *Review*, *sect.* 11. he hath vainly here renewed to affright silly people with.

Mr.

Mr. C. adds, "That *Abraham* was called father of believers, 1. from "believing this additional promise given in order to the increase of his "spiritual seed, which he proves from *Rom.* 4. 18. *Gen.* 15. 5. 2. From his "receiving the seal of that promise, *Rom.* 4. 11. From which place we "may observe, 1. That Circumcision was a seal of the righteousness of "faith. 2. That because it was a seal of that righteousness, which he had "before he was circumcised, he therefore became the Father of all that "believe, whether circumcised or not. Now had not this seal been given "him that he might be the Father of believers, his receiving it at this "or that time, whether before, or after his believing to righteousness, "had made nothing for the universality of his relation as a Father of "all believers.

Answ. I grant that *Abrahams* believing the promise, *Gen.* 15. 5. and his receiving Circumcision a seal of that righteousness of faith he had in uncircumcision, was the reason of his title of Father of believers. And I grant that *Abrahams* personal Circumcision was a seal of the righteousness of faith to all believers circumcised or uncircumcised, and therefore he had it afore his Circumcision, that it might not be judged as proper to the circumcised. But 1. I deny, That the promise was *Gen.* 15. 5. as Mr. *Cs.* additional promise is, that Every believer should be a blessing to his family and posterity, so as that God should ordinarily cast elect children on elect parents; but that *Abraham*, though then childless, should have innumerable children by natural generation, though he were and his wife aged, and more by believing as he did. 2. The Scripture doth not say, that *Abrahams* Circumcision was a seal of the promise *Gen.* 15. 5. but a *seal of the righteousness of faith he had*, *Gen.* 15. 6. it was not a seal of a promise of a thing future, but of a benefit obtained many years before. 3. I find not any ones Circumcision, but the Circumcision which *Abraham* had in his own person, stiled *the seal of the righteousness of faith*, nor to any but him that believes as he did. 4. That his receiving the seal is not made the reason of *Abrahams* relation of *Father of all believers*, but justification by faith afore he received Circumcision. Nor do I find that any of Mr. *Cs.* assertions is proved from *Rom.* 4. 11, 18. that *Circumcision was a seal of the Covenant*, *Gen.* 17. or *of Mr. Cs. additional promise*, or *that the application to infants was part of the seal*, or that *by it Mr. Cs. imagined promise was confirmed*, and therefore this Text is impertinently alledged also.

Mr. *C.* adds. "That it was not *Abrahams* faith onely, nor his degree "of faith above others which gave him that title, appeareth 1. because "others were as eminent believers as he before him. 2. There was "something given which believers had not, at least in such a way had "not before, in reference to which he was so called, therefore it was not "for his faith onely, nor the eminency thereof. 3. There is nothing "in faith or the eminency thereof, that could occasion that his name is "be given to him; but it was in reference to something which he was "to have as a Father this additional promise and the seal thereof, he was "the first Father that received this blessing which was a blessing upon "parents and their children; and because at least in a great part by

"vertue

"vertue thereof the holy seed was to be propagated and encreased. And "believers are said to be his seed, because that promise and Covenant "made to *Abraham* concerning the Lords blessing and multiplying his "seed, is so much a cause of their being brought forth unto Christ; his or-"dering his election so as to bestow his blessing thus by families and "nations, being that which makes the Kingdome of Heaven like lea-"ven, one believer ordinarily being the means of the conversion of "another.

Answ. The title [*Father of believers*] is a relative, with which *Abraham* was denominated from his Fatherhood as the form denominating, and this form denominating was from his begetting justified believers as the foundation, this begetting justified believers I know not how otherwise it should be then by his exemplary faith, and Gods declaration of his justification by it; which the Apostle doth plainly intimate, *Rom.* 4. 11. by expressing *Abrahams* children in this phrase, *walking in the steps of his faith.* The object indeed of this faith was the promise *Gen.* 15. 5. not Mr. *Cs.* imagined promise to other believers, and so the promise was the occasion, and in some sort the cause of the title, as the object may be said to be the cause of the act in somewhat an abusive expression. His personal Circumcision was a sign or seal of that whence the title came, the righteousnes of faith; and a token of that Covenant wherein God declared it, *Gen.* 17. 4, 5. But Circumcision did not make him such, he was such afore Circumcision was instituted, *Gen.* 17. 4, 5. Nor is it said *Rom.* 4. 11. that his receiving Circumcision was that he might be the Father of the faithfull, but his having righteousnes by faith before Circumcision made him the Father of justified believers of all nations. Nor do Mr. *Cs.* reasons prove the contrary. For 1. though others faith might be as strong, yet no ones faith was so eminently exemplary, the time and other circumstances considered; and this is apparent from *Rom.* 4. 18, 19, 20, 21. 2. *Abraham* had that exemplary faith, and promise and declaration of God, which no Saint had before in the manner I have explained it. 3. This was fit to denominate him *Father of believers*, as *Sara* the *Mother of obedient and well doing wives*, 1 *Pet.* 3. 6. by her exemplary obedience to her husband, and we are termed *children of God by following him*, *Ephes.* 5. 1. wicked men *children of the Devil* by *doing his lusts*, *Joh.* 8. 44. It is true, *we are to look to other examples, chiefly Christs*, *Heb.* 12. 1, 2. yet none of meer men so eminently believed as *Abraham*, and therefore no meer sinfull man is propounded as a Copy or pattern equal to him. As for Mr. *Cs.* reason, it is not right. For 1. Mr. *Cs.* additional promise in his sense is but a figment. 2. There is not the least hint in Scripture of that as the reason of the title. 3. If he were *the first Father that received this blessing*, then it was two thousand years and more afore God ordered his election as Mr. *C.* imagines, then believing parents had not this blessing before, whereas if there were such a blessing, it was rather before then after *Abrahams* time; for we find not any setled Ministery by which the spiritual seed was multiplied afore *Abrahams* time, therefore it is more likely to have been by believing parents;

but

but after *Abrahams* time we read of Prophets and Apostles, Priests and Teachers appointed to that end. And if *Abraham* were *the first who received this blessing*, then this was not perpetual, and so the application of the seal to infants not moral, sith the foundation of it began but in *Abraham*. Sure I am, this directly crosseth Mr. *Richard Baxters* conceit of infants visible Churchmembership by promise *Gen.*17.15. which I leave to them to contend about. What Mr. *C.* saith of the reason of the title of *Abrahams* seed given to believers, is quite besides the Scripture, *Rom.*4.11,16. *Gal.*3.7 *Joh.*8.39. And what he saith of *one believers being ordinarily the means of conversion of another*, is true rather of others, specially preachers of the Gospel, then parents, housholders, Princes: and I wish it were better considered by him, whether by his dictates all along in making *the multiplying of the spiritual seed to be by every believers being a blessing to families and nations, by ascribing ordinarily conversion hereunto*; and that p. 38. not *onely by common providence, or so much by good education and example, but by vertue of a special word of blessing, a creating word of promise to all believers, without which other means of conversion had not had such efficacy and power in turning sinners to God*, do not cross the Apostles speech, *Ephes.*2.20. be not contrary to the experience both of the first and continued gathering of the Churches of Christ, and do not indeed undermine and blow up a select Ministery for conversion, as being useless, without assurance of Gods blessing, God having provided another way, and ordinarily working by it according to a special promise. And how much this tends to justifie that disorder of every gifted brothers pretended prophesying and teaching in the Churches, which is the occasion of the jangling and schisms by which Churches are torn asunder and perverted, is easily discernable. But of this onely by the way. What Mr. *C.* hath summed up, p. 70. hath been examined, and found to be a fardel of mistakes: Let us view the rest.

Those insinuations which are p. 71. as if Antipædobaptists did *easily part with ancient entailed priviledges, wherein the Saints have rejoyced for so many ages; wanted so much compassion on their children, as not to blot their names out of Heaven, or thrust them out of the Kingdome of Christ into the Kingdome of Satan*; have been so often discovered to be false and grosse abuses, as that were not men resolved to use any artifices to uphold an ill cause by creating prejudices against their adversaries, they would leave them. But Mr. *C.* thinks to prove infant Baptism from hence, and thus he argues.

Sect. 20.

SECT. LXXX.

Mr. Cs. conceit, as if Gen. 17. 9. *were a command in force to* Abrahams *spiritual seed in the* N. T. *is shewed to be vain.*

" IF this be granted, that the promise made to *Abraham* Gen. 17. espe-
" cially that part of it *v.* 8. concerning *Canaan* to bee an everlasting
" possession to his seed bee of such extent, and made also to his spiritual
" seed of the New Testament, it will follow that that command of God
" in those words next following *v.* 9. is to bee meant also of his spi-
" ritual seed even in our dayes, and as a command that now lieth up-
" on the same spiritual seed in all generations, in as much as that com-
" mand is brought in with a therefore, upon the promise made to the
" same seed in the words *v.* 8.

Answ. Hitherto Pædobaptists have been wont to deduce infant Baptism, from the connexion between the promise *Gen.* 17. 7. *to be a God to* Abraham *and his seed*, and the command *v.* 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. which it seems Mr. *C.* dares not rest on, but takes another way, and yet seems not very certain what to pitch upon. For whereas *p.* 70. to clear the duty of infant Baptism, he sums up his suppositions; *That God made to* Abraham Gen. 22. 17, 18. *&* 12. 2, 3. *an additional promise of believers being a blessing to families and nations, that for confirmation of this hee added a seal, to wit Circumcision, that the application of it to infants was part of the token of the Covenant, thereby that additional promise was sealed, in reference to them* Abraham *was called the Father of all them that believe*; who would not think that he would have inferred infant Baptism from these suppositions, and the connexion between his additional promise and seal? But in stead thereof, as if all hee had before discoursed had been out of the way hee meant to take, whether because there is a great distance between the command *Gen.* 17. 9. and the promise *Gen.* 22. 17, 18. or whether he saw his exposition would not stand good, he now goes another way to work, and thinks to deduce infant Baptism from the connexion between the promise *Gen.* 17. 8. and the precept *v.* 9. and his inference is thus made; *The promise is concerning* Canaan *to be an everlasting possession to* Abrahams *seed*, ergo *to his spiritual seed in the* N. T *if so, then the command lieth upon the spiritual seed still v.* 9. *and this the word* [*therefore*] *v.* 9. implies. *That precept ties onely to keep the Covenant by sealing with the seal of it, their children, v.* 10. *explains what seal should be for that time now another is come in the room of it, which is for substance the same, and equivalent to it, parents are bound by the precept* Gen. 17. 9. *the former seal ceasing and another substituted to baptise their children.* This is as near as I well can gather it, the force of Mr. *Cs.* discourse. Against which I except, 1. That the term [*everlasting possession*, Gen. 17. 8.] doth not prove it to bee meant of another *Canaan* then that part of the earth which the *Israelites* possessed.

For besides places before alledged, wherein the terms *everlasting* and *for ever* are vsed for a time of some few ages, and shorter, *Numb.* 25.13. God promiseth *a Covenant of an everlasting Priesthood to Phinehas and his seed after him*; and yet we know that Priesthood was to cease *Heb.* 7.11. It is promised *Ier.* 35.19. that *Ionadab the son of Rechab should not want a man to stand before God for ever*, and yet this could be true onely of some ages: Therefore Mr. *Cs.* reason is of no force from the term [*everlasting*] to infer the extent of that promise to the N. T. Nor indeed can the reason be good. For if it were, then God should not promise at all the possession of the earthly *Canaan* in that place: But that is manifestly false; for the Text *saith*, *Gen.* 17.8. that *God would give to Abraham and his seed, the land of Canaan, wherein Abraham was then a stranger*: which can be understood of no other then that part of earth which is elsewhere called the land of the *Canaanites, Perizites, Jebusites*, &c.

I deny not that in the latent sense there may be a promise of eternal life to *Abrahams* spiritual seed, though I find no passage in the N. T. so expounding the promise *Gen.* 17.8. yet sure it is but bold presumption to build any doctrine on an allegory not expounded so by the Holy Ghost; and it is in mine apprehension, a great usurpation of the Divine prerogative, to impose duties on men consciences by arguments drawn from such devised senses. 2. That Mr. *C.* builds his inference upon the conjunction [*therefore, Gen.* 17.9.] which though it be so in the English translation, yet is it in *Hebr.* וְאַתָּה rendred by the *Tigur. And thou*; by *Paren. But thou*; by *Piscator, Thou verily*; which is enough to shew there is no strength in Mr. *Cs.* inference, sith there is no firm ground on which it rests. 3. But were it granted that [*therefore, Gen.* 17.9.] were the onely reading, and that the command is to be meant also of *Abrahams* spiritual seed even in our days, yet that the inference of the command, *v.* 9. should be onely from the promise *v.* 8. or *v.* 7. and not also from the promises *v.* 4, 5, 6. I know no good reason is or can be given. 4. Were it that there could be good reason given thereof, yet sith the promise *v.* 8. is mixt, containing both spiritual promise (if Mr. *C.* be in the right) and promise peculiar to the natural seed of *Abraham*, me thinks the precept should be onely to that spiritual seed which is also natural, and not bind the Gentile believers, sith they have no part of the promise as it concerns the possession of the earthly *Canaan*, from which the duty is inferred as well, if not onely, as from the promise of the heavenly *Canaan*. 5. But were all that Mr. *C.* would have here granted, that the term [*everlasting possession, v.* 8.] proves it meant of the times of the N. T. that [therefore] *v.* 9. proves the command extends to the spiritual seed now, that it is from the promise, *v.* 7. or 8. not from the rest *v.* 4, 5, 6. that it is to Gentile believers now, and not peculiar to *Israel* after the flesh; yet sure if the promise be the reason of the command, and the command belongs to them to whom the promise belongs, it belongs to no other, and therefore to none but elect persons to whom that promise is made; no meere professours of faith are bound to keep Gods Covenant by vertue of the promise, sith no

promise

promise is made to them. 6. Were this also granted, that the command is to every professour of faith to keep the Covenant as is enjoyned v. 9. then it remains still as a duty for every professour of Christian faith to circumcise his males of eight days old (which is contrary to Christianity;) For there is no other thing commanded there then Circumcision. But to prevent this, Mr. C. saith.

It is to be observed, that this command of God is primarily fixed upon the general duty, namely, the Covenant to be kept, and not upon this or that way of keeping, either by circumcising or baptizing: so as the circumcising of the child came under the command onely upon this, because it was declared then to be the token of the Covenant; and by the words it is supposed, that when it should cease to be the token of the Covenant, it should no longer be a duty; and what else, by the same authority, should be made the token of the same Covenant, would be the duty instead thereof. Mark the words, he doth not say, Thou shalt therefore circumcise every man-child among you as a token of the Covenant between me and you; for so had that been made the token for perpetuity, to have continued so long as the Covenant it self. But 1. in general he saith, v. 9. that is, they should observe and perform the token of the Covenant whatever that prove to be; and he addeth in the 2d. place, v. 10, 14. therefore, as I said, as for Circumcision, that was a duty onely upon those words, declaring that to be then the token. Circumcision is now abolished, yet the command of keeping the token of Abrahams *Covenant is still in force, and binding to* Abrahams *spiritual seed in their Generations; therefore what is now the token of that Covenant must be observed instead thereof.*

Answ. No wise and just Law-giver would ever make such a command of a general duty concerning ceremonies or rites then undetermined, but to be determined two thousand years after, *Thou shalt keep my Covenant*, that is, what ceremony I shall now appoint thee, or what I shall hereafter appoint when I take that away: such indefinite disjunctive commands so ambiguous, unintelligible, to be understood at one time one way, at another time another way, are so like Delphick jugling answers, as that I dare not ascribe them to the Almighty. Many absurdities follow on this conceit of Mr. C. which I have before set down. For present these arguments from the Text are against it. 1. There is nothing enjoyned Gen. 17. 9. but what *Abraham* was enjoyned in his own person to do as well as his seed after him in their generations; this is proved from the express words, *And God said unto* Abraham, *thou shalt keep my covenant therefore*, and again, *thou and thy seed after thee in their generations*, twice is this imposed on *Abraham* distinctly named, and the term [*therefore*] specially applied to him, and after with difference, from yet with his seed, so that to deny this, is to deny it's light when the Sun shines at noon day. But to *Abrahams* person was not enjoyned to observe and perform the token of the Covenant whatever that prove to be, for then he had been bound to baptise, which is absurd, *Ergo.* 2. This precept is as well to *Abrahams* natural seed in their generations, as to his spiritual seed, for the precept belonging to those, to whom the promise belongs, and it cannot be denied the promise v. 8. to belong to *Abrahams*

natural ſeed, at leaſt ſuch as *Moſes*, *David*, afore Chriſt, it follows they were bound to obſerve and perform the token of the Covenant what ever that prove to be, and conſequently to baptiſe, which is abſurd. 3. If this precept be to the ſpiritual ſeed of the Gentiles, then Gentile believers are bound to obſerve and perform the token of the Covenant whatever that prove to be: But Circumciſion the text it ſelf makes the token of the Covenant, *Ergo*, Gentile believers by this expoſition are bound to circumciſe. 4. From *v.* 10. That Covenant was enjoyned *v.* 9. and no other, which is expreſſed *v.* 10. This is proved from the form of words which do plainly ſhew Gods meaning, *this is the covenant which yee ſhall keep*, which are as expreſs as words can bee that hee meant no other Covenant to bee kept then what is ſet down *v.* 9, *&c.* But that is onely Circumciſion, therefore no other is there enjoyned *v.* 9. But what need I ſo fully refute that which hath no proof at all brought for it, but Mr. *Cs.* word! It's enough to tell him that it is his dream, and to let the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of *London* know that they have been enamoured on a vain phantaſme. And yet were it granted him and them, it will never ſerve their turn to prove infant Baptiſm by.

For 1. The command *Gen.* 17. 9. is not in theſe words [thou ſhalt keep the token of my Covenant therefore] but [*thou ſhalt keep my Covenant therefore*] and therefore if according to Mr. *Cs.* expoſition it be *a general duty not fixed upon this or that way of keeping*, and there are other wayes of keeping the Covenant then by keeping the token of the Covenant, the words may be meant of other duties then ſeals, as he cals them of the Covenant, as particularly what is required *Gen.* 17. 1. *to walk before God and be perfect*, upon which God promiſeth to make his Covenant *v.* 2. and ſo the precept *Gen.* 17. 9. may be obſerved without any ſeal at all. 2. But if it be limited to the keeping of the token of the Covenant, yet it follows not it muſt be either baptiſing or circumciſing, there being other tokens of the Covenant beſides theſe, as the Paſſeover, the Lords Supper, and therefore if it command them to obſerve *the token of the Covenant what ever it prove to be*, it ties them to obſerve the Lords Supper, and if it muſt bee obſerved by this rule here, then it muſt be given to infants as well as Baptiſm. 3. Hence ariſeth a further exception, that if it were yeelded, that a token of the Covenant indefinite is commanded, and Baptiſm meant after Circumciſion, yet ſure the command ties not to obſerve Baptiſm after the rule of Circumciſion, but after the inſtitution of Baptiſm in the new Teſtament. And the reaſon is plain, the command *v.* 9. being onely of a general duty, commands not the particular rite, neither Circumciſion nor Baptiſm, therefore there is no rule how to obſerve Baptiſm *Gen.* 17. 9. Then *v.* 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. is by Mr. *Cs.* own expoſition a rule onely about Circumciſion, who, and whom, and when to circumciſe, nor do I think Mr. *C.* dares ſay, that the rule about the manner of circumſtances of circumciſing, is a rule about the manner of circumſtances of baptiſing, for then the houſholder ſhould bee bound to baptiſe all his males of eight dayes old, ſervants, and children, and

and among them himself if unbaptized, none afore eight days old, no female, none but his own house, he should wash not the face, but the privy member. If Mr. C. to serve his turn yet devise another general law about the manner of observing the rites of the New Testament, besides the particular institutions and examples of Christ and his Apostles in the New Testament —— *erit mihi magnus Apollo*, and if Mr. C. or any other, find any institution or example of infant Baptism in the New Testament, I shall believe they can cut a whetstone with a rasour.

4. Saith Mr. C *It is supposed by the words, that when circumcision should cease to be the token of the covenant, it should no longer be a duty, and that circumcision is now abolished.* But 1, if *v.* 9. be a command still in force, and bind to observe still the token of the covenant what ever it proved to be, and that was Circumcision, then it binds still to observe Circumcision. 2. It is said, *v.* 13. *He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money must needs be circumcised, and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant.* Now if *Mr. C's* reasoning be good, the promise is *v.* 8. of an *everlasting possession*, therefore it extends to the spiritual seed even in the New Testament; by the same reason, sith *v.* 14. it is said *Gods covenant shall be in their flesh* (which is by carnal Circumcision) *for an everlasting covenant*, Gods command is in the New Testament to *Abrahams* spiritual seed, true believers of the Gentiles, that they be circumcised in their flesh, contrary to *Gal.* 5. 2. *Act.* 15 24. 5. It is supposed *that Baptism in the New Testament is the token of* Abrahams *covenant*, which is not proved, but is manifestly false: For then by it every believer should be assured of the land of *Canaan*, that Kings shall come of him, *&c.* as is promised, *Gen.* 17. *v.* 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. but that is false, and a meer Jewish conceit. 6. It is said without any shew of proof, *that by the words it is supposed, that what else besides circumcision by the same authority should be made the token of the same covenant, would be the duty in stead thereof*: But neither do the words say, or suppose, that *when circumcision should cease to be a token of the covenant, it should no longer be a duty*; nor that *what else by the same authority, should be made the token of the same covenant, would bee the duty in stead thereof*; there's not a word that tends to either supposal, nor can be either true. For the Jews Circumcision was not abolished by any words *Gen.* 17. but by the Apostles declaration, *Act.* 15. which doth not in the least hint any colection of its ceasing from *Gen.* 17. but from the calling of the Gentiles: Nor is the reason there or any where else of its ceasing, taken from its ceasing to be the token of *Abrahams* Covenant, but from the calling the Gentiles, the comming of faith, *&c.* Yea, the Jewish Circumcision still used ceaseth not to be the token of *Abrahams* Covenant, and yet the command *Gen.* 17 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. bindeth not. Nor is the other speech true. For by the same authority, according to Mr. C. the Passeover, the Lords Supper, were made tokens of the same Covenant, and yet not duties instead of Circumcision. 7. If *when circumcision ceased, there was to be a duty in stead thereof by vertue of the command, Gen.* 17. 9. *and because of the promise of an everlasting possession, v.* 8. *it must extend to the New Testament to the*

spiritual

spiritual seed, and be of a spiritual blessing; by the same reason, Circumcision being made *an everlasting covenant*, *v.* 14. the command *Gen.* 17. 9. should be of a spiritual keeping of Gods Covenant, and the Circumcision that comes in the stead of Circumcision in the flesh should be Circumcision of the heart and obedience, which the New Testament seems to intimate, *Rom.* 2. 26, 28, 29. 1 *Cor.* 7. 19. *Phil.* 3. 3. *Col.* 2. 11, 12. It is supposed, but not proved, that Baptism is in stead of Circumcision. But Mr. *C.* thinks to prove it, onely by the way he takes in to illustrate his conceit about *Gen.* 17. 9. something about the Sabbath, *Exod.* 20. 8, 11. of which he saith thus.

"The like manner of institution we have concerning the Sabbath, "therefore those who deny infant Baptism, oftentimes deny the Sabbath; "and not without cause, for there is the same reason of both, and we "may illustrate the one by the other. The Lord intended in time to "change the day from the 7th. day to the first of the week, as he intended in time to change the token of *Abrahams* Covenant: Therefore in "the 4th. Commandment also, the command is not primarily fixed upon the 7th. or any day to be remembred and kept holy, but upon the "general duty, that the rest day of the Lord be remembred and kept "holy, what ever that day fall to be. Remember the Sabbath day, that "is the rest day, to keep it holy; and the Lord blessed the rest day, and "sanctified it. And the remembrance and keeping of the 7th. day is in "the Commandment made a duty for this reason, because that was declared to be then the day wherein God had entred into his rest after "his making of the world. And upon the same account, when after the "travel of his soul, in the new creation, he entred the second time into "his rest, as is declared that he did, *Heb.* 4. 9, 10. because that was upon "the first day of the week, when he rose from the dead; therefore by "vertue of that command, Remember the rest day to keep it holy, the "first day of the week is now to be remembred and kept holy, in as "much as that is now the rest day of the Lord our God, as formerly "the 7th. day.

Answ. That those who deny infant Baptism do not, or need not deny the Sabbath, is shewed in my *Examen*, *part* 2. *sect.* 8. in my *Practicer*, *sect.* 15. in the second part of my *Review*, *sect.* 3. and what Mr. *C.* hath said for his opinion of inferring the Lords day Sabbath from *Heb.* 3. & 4. hath been examined before, and shewed insufficient for his purpose. That which now he brings from his conceit of the command, *Exod.* 20. 8, 11. is to me very doubtfull, and yet were it certain, would not answer Mr. *C.* expectation. His conceit is doubtfull to me for these reasons, 1. because if his conceit were right, when it is said *Remember the Sabbath day, and the Lord blessed the Sabath day*, the term [*Sabbath day*] should be conceived as a *genus* or *species* comprehending under it the rest day of the Jews and the Christians, and such other rest days as God should appoint to be observed. But 2. if this are there imply'd. 1. That I find not where the term [*Sabbath day*] is meant or applied to any other then the 7th. day of the week. I grant that other days are termed [*Sabbaths*, *Sabbaths of rest*,] *Levit.* 23, 24, 32, 39. but no where that I yet find, is

any

any day besides the last of the week termed the *Sabbath day*. 2. *The blessing of the Sabbath day*, *Exod.* 20.11. was the same with the blessing, *Gen.* 2.3. For it is a narration of what God did in the beginning, and that day was the seventh in order after the six days in which he created his work. 3. Me thinks the Evangelist *Luke* 23.56. when he saith, *they rested on the Sabbath day according to the commandment* (which commandment is that *Exod.* 20.8,10.) and that Sabbath being by the confession of all the last day of the week, doth plainly expound the fourth Commandment of that particular Sabbath which was the seventh day in order from the creation, and the last day of the week. I confess there are difficulties from this exposition, concerning the evacuating of the fourth Commandment, which being besides my present business, I shall not now insist on, it being sufficient for my present purpose to shew why I conceive Mr. *Cs.* exposition doubtfull.

2. Yet were his interpretation granted, it would not serve his turn here. For 1. *keeping Gods Covenant*, *Gen.* 17.9. is without any example or colour of reason restrained to seals (as they are termed) of the Covenant, and made the *genus* to Circumcision and Baptism; as the term [*Sabbath*] may be to all Festivals. 2. If it were, yet *there is not the same reason* of Circumcision and Baptism as of the Sabbath and the Lords day, the one being a moral command, and the other meerly ceremonial. 3. If the meaning were *Gen.* 17.9. that *a duty were commanded in general to keep the token, sign, or seal of the Covenant*, then it is a command concerning any token of the Covenant, the Passeover and Lords Supper, as well as Circumcision and Baptism; and if so, then they are to be observed according to the rule there, *v.* 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. and if so, they are to be applied to male infants of eight days old as well as Baptism, or according to the rules delivered in the institution of each rite; and if so, the command *Gen.* 17.9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. will make nothing for infant Baptism, unless it can be proved out of the institution and practise in the N. T. But to prevent this, Mr. *C.* saith,

SECT. LXXXI.

The succession of Baptism to Circumcision, and their identity for substance to us as shewed to be unproved by Mr. Carter, Mr. Marshal, Mr. Church, Dr. Homes, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Fuller, Mr. Cobbet, from Col. 2.11,12. or elsewhere.

"ably. [Or answer further, it is to be considered, that Baptism is now in "the room of Circumcision, and is the very same for substance to "us, as Circumcision was to them before Christ, namely, the token and "seal of that Covenant made with *Abraham* and his seed, as appeareth "*Gal.* 3.27,29. *As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have "put on Christ. And if ye be Christs, then are ye* Abrahams *seed, and "heirs according to the promise.* By which we see, that whatever we

"have

"have as *Abrahams* seed, we have it all in Christ; and what we have in "Christ, we have it all as *Abrahams* seed; and that we are baptized in-"to Christ, that is our initiation into Christ; and what ever we have as "*Abrahams* seed, is sealed unto us in Baptism. By which it is evident, "that as Circumcision was to them, so Baptism now to us is the token "and seal of that Covenant made with *Abraham* and his seed.

Answ. If this were granted, yet Mr. *Cs.* purpose were not obtained, that the application of the seal to infants were justified by the command *Gen.*17,9,10,11,12,13,14. for the reason before given. But because I conceive these assertions contain errours, such as do mislead Pædobaptists, I shall examine Mr. *Cs.* allegations, and together with them Mr. *Marshals* reply to my *Examen* about his third Conclusion, and what I find material in other of my Antagonists about the point of Baptisms succeeding Circumcision.

Two assertions are laid down here by Mr. *C.* 1. That *Baptism is now in the room of Circumcision.* 2. That *it is the very same for substance to us as circumcision was to Jews before Christ.* Neither of which are true, or proved by any thing brought by Mr. *C.* or any other, though this be the chief thing they alledge for infant Baptism; and Mr. *Church*, p. 50. out of Dr. *whitaker*, tels us, *all the Anabaptists will not be able to resist this argument from circumcision.* Let's try the strength of it. The latter position seems to be this, *That as circumcision was to the Jews, so Baptism now to us is the token and seal of the covenant made with* Abraham *and his seed.* But this is not all one as to be *the very same for substance.* To be *the very same for substance*, is an expression that is scarce capable of good sense; neither Baptism nor Circumcision in proper acception being substances, or having substance, except as the subject of them, as all accidents have. As substance is put for essence, so it cannot be said they are the same for substance, sith cutting is one thing, washing another; and other Pædobaptists usually term them different administrations, Circumcision the old, Baptism the new. I grant Circumcision was the token of the Covenant made with *Abraham* and his seed, *Gen.* 17. but that it was a seal of that Covenant in the sense usually meant by Pædobaptists, or that any ones Circumcision was a seal but *Abrahams*, much less that every ones Circumcision was a seal of the Covenant of grace to him and his seed is more then I find in Scripture, and how often I have proved it false, may be seen in many of my writings, specially the 3d. part of this *Review.* But that Baptism is the seal of that Covenant made with *Abraham* and his seed, is not true. For 1. Baptism seals not at all the promise of the land of *Canaan*, *Gen.*17.8. nor any other of the promises made to the natural seed of *Abraham.* 2. Nor doth it seal the spiritual promises of the comming of Christ the calling of the Gentiles, as they were made to *Abraham*, and by Circumcision assured to be accomplished. For then Baptism, as Circumcision was, should be a shadow and type of Christ to come, and should cease as it did. 3. The Evangelical Covenant, or the promise of righteousness or eternal life by faith, granted to be in the latent sense comprized in that Covenant, I find no where in Scripture said to be sealed by Circumcision.

cumcision, but rather that circumcision did bind persons to the keeping of the Law for righteousnes, *Gal.* 5. 2, 3. nor by baptism but by consequent. The Scripture rather makes it a seal (if it must be so called) of our promise to God, then of Gods promise to us. Nor is there any thing *Gal.* 3. 27. 29. to prove either of Mr. Cs. conclusions, that *Baptism now is the seal of the Covenant made to* Abraham *and his seed*; or *that it is now in the room of Circumcision.* For neither is it said that what wee have as *Abrahams* seed, is sealed to us in Baptism; wee are said indeed to put on Christ by Baptism, but that, whether the putting on be meant of spiritual union, or outward profession it is ascribed to faith, *v.* 26. and our Baptism rather is made our seal to Christ, then Gods to us: nor is there any thing spoken *v.* 29. of any seed of *Abraham* but by faith, & so our Baptism cannot seal that Covenant which was made to *Abrahams* natural seed, which was the use of Circumcision, and therefore that Baptism is the seal of that Covenant, or in the room of Circumcision, is not proved thence. But let's view what is further said for them or either of them.

That our Baptism succeeds in the room, place, and use of Circumcision, is the common speech of Pædobaptists; against it, 1. I argued in my *Examen*, that Baptism was a concomitant to circumcision, it was among the Jew long afore Christ came, and it was by Divine appointment, from the Baptism of *John* till Christs death, now that which succeeds comes after, is not concurrent. To this Mr. *M.* replied, 1. by concession, and thence would gather an argument for infant Baptism, which is enervated in the 2d. part of this *Review*, *sect.* 24. 2. Saith he, *A Lord Major elect succeeds the old, though the old continue after his election for a time, Defence p.* 171.

But this is not true, a Lord Major elect doth not succed till hee bee sworn, in the interim he is no Lord Major in being, but onely in possibility and probability which may never bee. A successour hath no place while the predecessour is present, *Jewel. Defence of the Apol. part.* 2. *c.* 3. *div.* 5.

2. I argued that in no good sense can Baptism be said to bee in the room and place of circumcision; For neither in proper acception have either room or place, nor taking room and place for the subjects circumcising and circumcised, baptizing and baptized, is it true; parents though private persons might circumcise, not so in baptism, women were to be baptized, not so in circumcision. These things are answered by Mr. *M.* either with censures of me, which are but vain, this arguing being necessary to clear truth, or by reference to what he had said before, which is also fully refuted in the third part of this *Review*, *sect.* 18. I further said, If by room and place be meant the society into which the circumcised and baptised were to be initiated, it is not true. For Baptism initiated into the Christian, circumcision into the Jewish church.

To this Mr. *M.* *If you mean onely the several administrations, the Church of the Jewes being Christs Church under one administration, the Christian Church the same Church of Christ under another administration; you speak truth, but not to the purpose; my conclusion never*

said Circumcision and Baptism do initiate into the same administration of the Covenant: but if you mean, that the Church of the Jews and ours are not one and the same Church, you speak pure Anabaptism indeed, and contradict the Scripture expressly, which every where makes the Church of the Jewes and the Gentiles one and the same Church, though under divers administrations. I count it needless to annex any proofs, because I think you dare not deny it.

Answ. I do not mean onely the several administrations, if I had so spoken I might have perhaps been judged to speak non-sence, from which I can hardly acquit Mr. *Ms.* speeches, that Circumcision and Baptism do initiate into different administrations of the Covenant, and yet they are termed the divers administrations, and the Church of Jews and Gentils by reason of them under divers administrations, which kind of expressions, though frequently used by Pædobaptists, yet I can discern little in them but non-sence, or tautologies, or self-contradictings. My meaning was very obvious, That the Christian Church, properly so called, contradistinct from the Jewish visible Church is one society, and that Baptism enters into the visible Church Christian, that the visible Church Jewish contradistinct to the Christian is another society, and Circumcision entred into it, not into the Christian. And these things are so manifest that I thought it needless to bring proofs. Who knowes not that circumcised Proselytes were in the Jewish Church visible, and not in the Christian, and baptised disciples of Christ cast out of the Jewish church, who remained among the disciples of Christ & in his Church; that the Jewish Church visible persecuted the Christian Church visible? Yet this is so apparent that Mr. *M.* both in his *Sermon* p. 27. speaks to the same purpose; *None might be received into the Communion of the Church of the Jews until they were circumcised, nor in the communion of the Church of the Christians until they be baptised, our Lord himself was circumcised as a professed member of the Church of the Jews, and when he set up the new Christian Church, hee would be initiated into it by the Sacrament of Baptism*; And in his *Def.* p. 169. *I reply that the Christian Church was not fully set up and compleated with all ordinances of worship, government, officers, till afterwards, is readily granted, but that it was not in fieri in erecting and framing, and that Baptism was administred in reference to the Christian Church, and that by Baptism men were initiated into this new administration or best edition of the Church, I think no sound Divine did ever question.* p. 172. *I answer* John's *Baptism and Ministry was a præludium to Christ, and was wholly in reference to the Christian church, which then began to be moulded and though there was not a new distinct Church of Christianity set up, yet all this was preparing the materials of it, and John did not admit them by Baptism as members to the Jewish Pædagogy, which was then ready to be taken away, but into that new administration which was then in preparing.* So that what Mr. *M.* terms in me *the speaking of pure Anabaptism indeed*, is no other than his own, and is so manifest as cannot be denied to be true, nor is at all contradicted by the Scripture, which never makes the Church christian visible and the Jewish to be one and the same, but the Church invisible by election and believing of Jews and Gentiles to be one

one and the same mystical body of Christ, *Ephes.* 3. 6. Now this one thing demonstrates that Baptism succeeds not into the place or office of Circumcision, sith they had different institutions, were for Churches, as Mr. *M.* speaks, under divers administrations, whereof the one was national gathered by natural descent, or Proselytism, the other onely by the preaching of the Gospel and faith. As *S. Ignatius* in his *apparatus* to his book *Of the primacy of the Pope* p. 20, 21. proves the modern Bishops neither to succeed into the place of the Apostles, nor the first Bishops because of their different institution, name, function and ordination, so in like manner I prove that Baptism succeeds not in the place of Circumcision, because of its different institution, name, office, and state it hath from it. Which is further proved thus. The command of Circumcision was different from the command of Baptism, the command of Circumcision not inferring Baptism; to which Mr. *M.* replies, *How this follows that therefore Baptism doth not succeed in the room of Circumcision I cannot guess; the Lords day succeeds the 7th day in being Gods Sabbath, but certainly the institution of it was long after the other.*

Answ. This proves that the one is not seated on the command of the other, Baptism on the command of Circumcision, they having different commands *Gen.* 17. 10, *&c. Matth.* 28. 19. and consequently no rule for baptizing in the command of Circumcision, nor the command of circumcising infants a virtual command for baptising, the rules of administring each of these being to be taken from their several commands and approved examples of practise, and no other.

Lastly, that Baptism succeeds Circumcision in the same use and end, is more untrue. For the uses of Circumcision were so far from being the same with the use of Baptism, that they are rather contrary. For the uses of Circumcision were to engage men to the use of the rest of the Jewish ceremonies, to signifie Christ to come out of *Abrahams* family, to be a partition-wall between Jew and Gentile.

To this Mr. *M.* answers. "These all refer to the manner of administration peculiar to the Jews; I have often granted there were some "legal uses of Circumcision, it obliging to that manner of administration; and so they were part of the Jewish Pædagogy, which is wholly "vanished, and therein Circumcision hath no succession; but Baptism "succeeds it as a seal of the same Covenant under a better administration, as a set and constant initiating Ordinance: onely I wonder that "you say Circumcision did initiate into the Church of the Jews, or rather the family of *Abraham*.

Answ. Mr. *M.* grant, that *the uses were part of the Jewish Pædagogy, and that it is wholly vanished, and therein circumcision hath no succession*, doth infer that Circumcision and all its uses are vanished, and have no succession: For it had no uses but what did belong to the Jewish Pædagogy, the initiating was into the Jewish Church, or rather the family of *Abraham*, which speech I used as conceiving that term more comprehensive and more proper, in as much as the family of *Abraham* was it into which Circumcision did initiate first afore the people of *Abrahams* house were termed the Church of the Jews, and that co-

venant which circumcision did signifie and confirm, was peculiar to the Jews, although Christ were typified by circumcision and righteousnes by faith in the latent sense, promised in the Covenant, *Gen.* 17. which yet no more proves Baptism to succeed circumcision then to the cloud, sea, Manna, water out of the Rock, the Ark of *Noah*, the Passeover, the sacrifices of the Law, high Priest, washings, &c. And if then this be all the use that Baptism succeeds circumcision in, to confirm the Covenant so far as it was spiritual, it succeeds as well to all these, and so doth the Lords Supper to circumcision, & from the comands of those rites, a rule might be drawn to administer Baptism by, as well as from circumcision. *Piscator* in his *observat. on Numb.* 28, 29. *makes Baptism to succeed circision and the purifyings to be often iterated*, but the truth is it succeeds to neither. Christ is instead of all these *Col.* 2. 17. and succeeds to them, and to say that Baptism succeeds to the use of circumcision, as it signified the Gospel promise to *Abraham*, must make it to signifie Christ yet to come in the flesh; For which reason *I say still boldly*, though it *were* (as I think it is not) *against all Divines and Churches since the Apostles time, that to say Baptism succeeds in the room and place of circision, is a proposition erroneous and very dangerous.*

Mr. *M.* saith to this *p.* 174. 1. *That hee had confuted before what I say, that the covenant with* Abraham *is not the same with the* New *covenant but in part*, to which there is a full reply before, in all the sections of the third part of this *Review*, wherein the Covenant with *Abraham* is defended to be mixt, to wit, the 4th, 25th, 26th, 27th. 2. *That the Cloud, Sea, Manna, water of the Rock &c. were extraordinary signes, not standing Sacraments to bee used in all generations, and yet so far as God hath made them parallel, what hurt is there in saying Baptism succeeds them?* To which I answer, 1. The sacrifices and purifyings were as much standing Sacraments, and that in more generations then circumcision and the Passeover. 2. That there is this hurt to Mr. *M.* cause, that if he grant that Baptism succeeds to them as well as circumcision, then a rule may be taken from the use of those in the administration of Baptism as well as from circumcision, which is onely proved from the succession of the one to the other, nor is it *wildly said by mee*, if the confirming or signifying the same covenant, prove Baptism to succeed circumcision, it proves the Lords Supper to succeed it, which according to Mr. *M. hath the same general Rate, signification and use*, from which alone Mr. *M.* and other Pædobaptists gather the succession of Baptism to circumcision, from *Col.* 2. 11, 12. & not from the particular use of initiating, and if so a rule from circumcision to give the Lords Supper as succeeding it to infants, as well as Baptism may be drawn, which were absurd in Mr. Mr. conceit. I have hitherto shewed the falshood of Pædobaptists assertion about Baptisms succession to circumcision; Let's review their proofs of it.

Mr. *M.* in his *defence*, 124. saith, "From that clear place *Col.* 2. "to 13. I made it evident, not only that we have the same thing signified "by circumcision, while we are buried with Christ in Baptism, but also "that the Apostle plainly sets Baptism in the same Rate and makes it of

" the ſame uſe to us as Circumciſion was to the Jews; Chriſt onely to " them and us alſo is the author of ſpiritual Circumciſion. The Cir- " cumciſion of the fleſh was the Sacrament of it to them; and now that " is aboliſhed, we have Baptiſm to ſeal the ſame thing.

Anſw. Though I deny not that we have the ſame thing which was ſignified by Circumciſion, while we are buried with Chriſt by Baptiſm; yet I deny that the Apoſtle plainly or obſcurely ſets Baptiſm in the ſame ſtate, or makes it of the ſame uſe to us as Circumciſion was to the Jews: Nor do I find any thing in the Apoſtles words from whence it may be gathered, that the Circumciſion of the fleſh was the Sacrament of it to them, except it be meant onely of Chriſts perſonal Circumciſion. For it is plain, that what is ſaid *v.* 11. that *they were circumciſed with the circumciſion not made with hands, in the putting off the body of the ſins of the fleſh, in* or *through the circumciſion of Chriſt*, is expreſly applied to Chriſts Circumciſion, and not to the Circumciſion of any other perſon but Chriſt: nor can be, ſuch of no mans Circumciſion beſides Chriſts is it true, that we are *in* or *by it circumciſed with the circumciſion made without hands, in putting off the body of the ſins of the fleſh*: Nor are we thus circumciſed by Chriſts Circumciſion as the ſacrament, token, or ſeal of ſpiritual Circumciſion, as that onely which ſacramentally repreſented it, or as a ſeal of the Covenant in which it was promiſed; but as the effectual pattern, according to which by Divine predeſtination we are to be conformed, *Rom.* 8. 29. in whom we are ſaid *to be buried, raiſed, v.* 12. *quickned, ſet in heavenly places, Epheſ.* 2. 5. *crucified, Gal.* 2. 20. *fellow ſufferers, Rom.* 8. 17. *Phil.* 3. 10. Whence I argue, If our Baptiſm be hence gathered to ſucceed in the ſame ſtate and uſe with Circumciſion, then it ſucceeds to Chriſts Circumciſion, for none other is here meant; and if ſo, then each believers Baptiſm is the effectual pattern by vertue of which we have ſpiritual Circumciſion. But this is ſo abſurd, that it is not much ſhort of blaſphemy, therefore the inference of Baptiſms ſucceſſion to Circumciſion from hence is without any ground, and I did truly ſay in my *Examen*, that it was an *ignis fatuus* that hath miſ-led men in gathering it hence. Nor is it true, that there is a word in the Text that intimates, that either our Baptiſm ſeals any thing to us, except our union and conformity to Chriſt, to which though Circumciſion of the heart be antecedent, concomitant, or conſequent, yet it is not the ſame; and therefore the ſealing of the ſame thing by Baptiſm as by Circumciſion, is not rightly hence inferred.

As for what Mr. *C.* ſaith, *p.* 79, 80. that *there is the ſame ſpiritual fruit of Circumciſion and Baptiſm, thoſe onely who are in Chriſt have it, becauſe they have it by the circumciſion of Chriſt, and the like of Baptiſm; that the benefit and fruit of circumciſion, which is the circumciſion made without hands, they had by being buried and riſen with Chriſt in Baptiſm and therefore that they were compleat in Chriſt*, is all granted, and confirms my argument againſt the imagined ſucceſſion of ordinary Circumciſion to ordinary Baptiſm, and of their being the ſame in ſubſtance and uſe. For hereby it is plain, that what ſpiritual fruit is aſcribed to Circumciſion.

sion, it is not ascribed to ordinary Circumcision, no nor to *Abrahams*, (notwithstanding what Mr. *C.* would deduce from *Rom.* 4. 11, 12.) but to Christs: Nor is the spiritual fruit, *Col.* 2. 11, 12. ascribed to Baptism, but to the burial and resurrection of Christ represented in Baptism. As for what Mr. *C.* adds as the Apostles meaning, *that they were compleat in Christ in the Ordinances of the Gospel*, is his own fiction; for the Apostle is so far from saying we are compleat in Christ in the Ordinances of the Gospel, that as I prove, *Exam.* p. 91, 92. out of the Text, the words of *Beza*, *Aretius*, (whose sayings are by Mr. *M.* in his *Defence*, p. 175. owned as true,) and Mr. *Ms.* own words, that the Apostle asserts our compleatness in Christ without any outward Ordinance either of Law or Gospel. And this I think Mr. *C.* himself dare not deny. For such the compleatness is in spiritual benefits, mortification, renovation, remission of sins, as Mr. *C.* acknowledgeth, if we have our compleatness in Christ by Baptism, we have these spiritual benefits by it, and we have them not without it. What Mr. *M.* saith, p. 175. of *my abuse of Aretius*, is answered in my *Apology*, *sect.* 12. p. 60. *Aretius* his testimonies out of the Fathers cited p. 176 prove nothing concerning the meaning of *Col.* 2. 11, 12. though they shew that some of the Ancients conceived of Baptisms succession to Circumcision as he did. To what I argued in my *Examen*, p. 92. that by this doctrine, that Baptism is in stead of Circumcision, the Apostles argument for the disanulling the Jewish ceremonies, both here and *Heb.* 9. & 10. 1. & 13. in the Epistle to the *Galatians*, *ch.* 3. & 4. and *Ephes.* 2. is quite evacuated, who still useth this argument to prove the abolition of the ceremonies of the law, because they have their complement in Christ, not in some new Ordinance added in stead of them; for if there be need of other Ordinances (besides Christ) in stead of the old, then Christ hath not in himself fulness enough to supply the want of them, and this abolition is not because of Christs fulness, but other Ordinances that come in stead of the abolished; and though our Ordinances may be said to imitate theirs, yet Christs onely succeeds them.

Mr. *M.* thus saith. *I answer, it is very true, that whoever should plead (as Mr. C. doth) that we have any of our compleatness in any outward Ordinance would evacuate the Apostles argument, but yet they by his own appointment help us to apply this compleatness, they argue not that all our compleatness is not in Christ, Christ onely succeeds all the Jewish Ordinances as the body doth the shadow: we plead not, as the Papists do, that the Jewish sacraments were types of ours, they were types onely of Christ; but yet ours succeed them to be like signs of the covenant of grace, and so the Apostle doth in this place.*

To which I reply. 1. If it be contrary to the Apostle to plead that we have any of our compleatness in any outward Ordinance, then it is contrary to the Apostle to make Baptism and the Lords Supper to succeed Circumcision and the Passeover, sith that onely *Col.* 2. 10, &c. is made to succeed them wherein we are compleat without them. 2. What Mr. *M.* means by *applying the compleatness of Christ*, and how *Baptism and the Lords Supper help us to apply this compleatness*, I do not readily understand.

understand. I conceive it applied no otherwise then by faith, nor they to help any otherwise then by exciting it, which I am sure they do not to infants, and so Baptism of infants is no help to them to apply the compleatness of Christ. 3. Though Baptism and the Lords Supper argue not that all our compleatness is not in Christ, yet the doctrine of Mr. *M.* that *Baptism is in the same state, and of the same use to us as circumcision was to the Jews, that it succeeds into its place*, doth so argue as I have shewed. 4. If Christ onely succeeds all the Jewish Ordinances, as the body succeeds the shadow, then Christ onely is made *Col.* 2. 11, 12. the successour to Circumcision: for there is no other succession there spoken of, as appears by the phrases of *compleatness in him as the head*, *v.* 10. *circumcised by the circumcision of Christ*, *v.* 11. *buried with him, risen with him*, *v.* 12. *quickned together with him*, *v.* 13. *dead with him from the rudiments of the world*, *v.* 10. so as that *by holding him as the head being knit together the whole body increaseth with the increase of God*, *v.* 19. and chiefly that which is said *v.* 17. *which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ*. 5. If the Jewish Sacraments were not types of ours, then the reason of their ceasing from the succession of ours is taken away, for that rests onely on this, that they were types, and ours the truth. 6. If ours succeed onely in that they are like signs of the Covenant of grace, then they succeed all the sacrifices, washings, annointings of the law as well as these: we may conclude succession of Baptism to *Noahs* Ark, *&c.* But in the administration of an Ordinance we are not to be ruled by bare analogy framed by our selves or delivered by the spirit of God, but by the institution of God.

To this Mr. *M.* saith, *Defence*, *p.* 177. "*I* answer, but when those "analogies framed by the spirit of God, are agreeable to the use and "end of Gods institution, we are to be ruled by them; and the Apostle "shews that's our case here.

Answ. 1. If this were true, then to tie Baptism to the eighth day, to be of all in the family, *&c.* should according to Mr. *Ms.* supposition be right. 2. There's not a word in the Apostle *Col.* 2. to shew that *ours succeed the Jewish Sacraments to be like signs of the covenant of grace.* Yea, *I* urged that the Apostle rather resembles burial to Circumcision then Baptism, and makes the analogy between Circumcision and Christs burial, and cited the words of *Chrysostome* and *Theophilact* on the place to that purpose, *Exam p.* 93.

To this Mr. *M.* "Where is Circumcision compared to burial, and "wherein *I* pray you lies the analogy between them?

I reply, 1. *I* said not Circumcision is compared to burial, but that *Col.* 2. 11, 12. burial rather resembles Circumcision then Baptism, and the analogy is between them. Which is true, sith *buried with him*, *v.* 12. answers to *circumcised by his circumcision*, *v.* 11. and the analogy is, that as the one so the other is the effectual pattern of our mortification; and not between our burial and baptism, as Mr. *M.* And to this are the words cited by me apposite. Nor are the words of *Chrysostome*, *that we put off sins in Baptism*, for Mr. *Ms.* purpose, to prove analogy conceived by the Apostle between the Jewish common Circumcision, or our burial

and

and our baptiſm. 2. I ſaid Baptiſm is named with faith, *Col.* 2.12. as the 2 means whereby we have communion with Chriſt, and are compleat in him. *Exam. p.* 94.

To this Mr. *M.* "But is not this the ſame ſenſe with mine? But your "ſyllogiſm or mighty conſequence I deny, Baptiſm is named becauſe "it is one of the means of Chriſtians being exempted from the School-"maſter, and come to be ingrafted into Chriſt, and to be compleat in "him, therefore it doth not ſucceed in the room and place of Circumciſ-"on, nay rather therefore it doth.

To this is replied in my *Apology, ſect.* 5. *p.* 28. that Mr. *M.* perverts my words, my arguing being no other then this, Baptiſm is alledged as one of the means whereby we come to be compleat in Chriſt, (which Mr. *M.* denies not, but avows as his ſenſe,) therefore there was another reaſon beſides the ſucceſſion of it into the place of circumciſion, why the Apoſtle there mentions it, which Mr. *M.* denied. And this conſequence (however Mr. *M.* in his flout term it) is good, except it were true, that every means whereby we are compleat in Chriſt ſucceeds circumciſion, the contrary whereof is confeſſed by Mr. *M.* in acknowledging faith to be one of the means whereby we are compleat in Chriſt, *Col.* 2.12. which yet ſucceeds not circumciſion, according to him. Mr. *M.* cenſure of my ſpeech, that the miſunderſtanding *Col.* 2.11,12. was an *ignis fatuus*, as *arrogant*, is ſhewed in my *Apology, ſect.* 5. *p.* 29. to be injurious: And what he ſaith in his *Defence, p.* 179. of my poſition, that circumciſion was not a token of the Covenant to the Jews children, is another injury, in that he leaves out the words [in ſome ſenſe] which was ſet down a little before in my *Appendix, p.* 174. which being added, there is nothing in them contrary to the Text, *Gen.* 17. but enough thence to prove my ſpeech true.

What Mr. *C.* urgeth *p.* 81. from 1 *Cor.* 5.7,8. of the Lords Supper ſucceeding the Paſſeover, *That the Apoſtle could not have expreſſed by ſuch phraſes taken from the Paſſeover the celebrating the Lords Supper, had not the Paſſeover and the Supper been the ſame for ſubſtance*, is not right. For 1. that by *keeping the feaſt* is meant *eating the Lords Supper*, is not proved; and *Beza*, *Diodati*, the *new Annot.* with others, paraphraſe the words thus, *Let us lead our life.* 2. Our *obedience, gifts, doing good*, are termed *ſacrifices*, yet theſe phraſes prove not them to be the ſame in ſubſtance in Mr. *Cs.* ſenſe. 3. *Chriſt* is expreſly in the Text 1 *Cor.* 5.7. termed *our Paſſeover*, therefore the Text makes the ſacrifice of Chriſt to ſucceed the Paſſeover, not the Lords Supper.

But Mr. *Drew*, *p.* 31. thinks to prove the ſucceſſion of Baptiſm to Circumciſion, becauſe as he ſaith in my *Exercit. p.* 3. *&c. I readily grant that Baptiſm is an Ordinance ſet up by the appointment of Chriſt to ſerve for the ſame ſpiritual ends that circumciſion did.* To which I ſay, that all I grant there, is, that Circumciſion and Baptiſm ſignified and confirmed the promiſe of the Goſpel, but I added, according to different forms and function, and I aſcribed no more to Circumciſion then to the Paſchal lamb, the rain of Mannah, *&c.* But this is not the ſame with that which Mr. *Drew* injuriouſly impoſeth on me. Yet if it were, it would

not

not prove Baptiſms ſucceſſion to Circumciſion, as is before ſhewed, and if it did it would as well prove its ſucceſſion to the Paſſeover, Manna, the water out of the Rock, &c. which hee will not affert I think. The reſt which hee ſaith, about *Col.* 2. 11, 12. is the ſame with what others ſay, and hath been anſwered in my *Examen* part. 3. ſect. 9. in my *Appendix*, and in this ſection and in other parts of this *Review*.

As for Mr. *Cotton*, who is one of thoſe to whoſe writing Mr. *Drew* refers us for proof of Baptiſms ſucceſſion to Circumciſion, from *Col.* 2. 10, 11, 12. his conceit is grounded upon this miſtake in his book of Baptiſm p. 128. *That the Apoſtle pleadeth our compleatneſs in* Chriſt, *notwithſtanding our want of circumciſion, in that wee enjoy the like fulneſs of benefit in our Baptiſm as the* Jews *did in their circumciſion*, which hath been often ſhewed to bee falſe. For there is no mention of a benefit to the Jews, but to the Coloſſians, and this benefit was not bare outward Circumciſion, or any outward Church priviledge, but the inward Circumciſion *in putting off the body of the ſins of the fleſh*, and this not by the Jews Circumciſion, but *Chriſts circumciſion* in his own perſon, nor is it true that the fulneſs of benefit there is aſcribed to ordinary Baptiſm, nor can bee rightly ſo conceived. And what Mr. *Cotton* ſaith in the ſame place againſt thoſe who ſay that Baptiſm being granted to ſucceed Circumciſion, yet it follows not infants muſt bee baptized, *That ſucceſſion is the ſubſtitution of later things for former things in the ſame ſubject, if the ſubject be changed, ſo far as there is a change of the ſubject there is no ſucceſſion, and therefore if infants be not baptized as they were circumciſed, Baptiſm ſucceeds not circumciſion*, is falſe and againſt himſelf. 1. Falſe, for we know though there were a law made that after infant Kings all ſhould be adult, and after women Queens, all ſhould be male Kings, yet they ſhould be true ſucceſſors, as King *James* to Queen *Elizabeth*, *Henry* the 7th to *Edward* the 5th or *Henry* the 6th. 2. Againſt himſelf, For thereby is proved Baptiſm doth not ſucceed circumciſion, ſith there is a change in the ſubject, women being baptized, who were not circumciſed, and parents or maſters of families being to circumciſe, but preachers of the Goſpel onely to baptize.

As for what Dr. *Homes* (to whom Mr. *Drew* alſo refers) in his *Animadverſ.* on my *Exercit.* p. 28, 29. brings to prove Baptiſms ſucceſſion to Circumciſion, it's upon alike miſtakes. For 1. it is not true that the Apoſtles ſcope *Col.* 2. 12 in mentioning Baptiſm, is to anſwer the objection Dr. *Homes* imagins, and to ſhew that we are as compleat as the Jews, becauſe Chriſt hath appointed another ſign, to wit Baptiſm, in ſtead of the Jews Circumciſion. 2. Nor doth the Apoſtle affirm or intimate, that if we have not Baptiſm in the room of Circumciſion to us Believers and our infants, we are not ſo compleat as the Jews, by Chriſt. 3. Nor is it true that the Apoſtle doth call off the Coloſſians from circumciſion by the conſideration of their Baptiſm as in the room of circumciſion. 4. Nor doth the Apoſtle make ſuch analogy beween Baptiſm and Circumciſion as Dr. *Homes* ſaith he doth. 5. Nor if hee did, would this prove ſuch a ſucceſſion of Baptiſm to Circumciſion as Pædobaptiſts would have, that the command of infant Circumciſion muſt be a command for infant Baptiſm.

Mr. *Thomas Fullers* argumentation for *the succession of Baptism to Circumcision in all the essentials of it*, as he speaks in his *Infants advocate ch.* 7. is alike vain. For there is no inconvenience that I know, to say no ordinance doth succeed Circumcision; his talk of Sacraments being pillars of the Church, is but phrasifying instead of disputing, nor do I know how it can bee true. Nor do I know, that *all* or any *graces* Evangelical *are conferred in baptism* or were *in Circumcision of the Jewes*, much less that *the conferring of such graces is essential to either of them*; nor is it true, that *Col.* 2. 11, 12. *Christians are said by Baptism to bee spiritually circumcised*; and *by the same proportion the believing Jews may bee said by Circumcision to bee spiritually baptized*: For it is not by Baptism but before it, that regularly persons are spiritually circumcised, nor were the believing Jewes by Circumcision to be spiritually baptized but before it; Nor is there *any such affinity*, much less *essential sameneß between them*, as that a command about the one should bee a command to us about the other. Nor do I finde any thing in that Author which needs further answer, hee having added nothing to the cause, but some peculiar words and expressions without any strength.

What Mr. *Cobbet* hath about this point *Just. vindic part.* 2. *c.* 2. *sect.* 9, 10, 11. I shall further examine. *Sect.* 9. he sets down eight propositions, which if they were all granted, yet they do not prove that point, which is in question, that an argument from analogy between meer positive ceremonies, rites or Sacraments is of validity, so as that it may be concluded thus; So it was in a ceremony of the Old Testament, therefore it must be so in the New, without any other precept or example therein: Concerning the insufficiency thereof, I have disputed so largely in the 2d. part of this *Review* sect. 2, 3. as that I need to say no more here. Nor doth any thing Mr. *C.* brings concerning *the fulneß of the Scripture*, *Christ or the Apostles arguing*, prove such kind of arguing good in meer positive rites, however matters of faith and manners are determined and proved by them from the Old Testament. Nor should it bee granted (as it is not) that *there is the same main ground of Circumcision and Baptism*, yet would it follow the rule of the one is a rule about the other, without the like institution. Yet what Mr. *C.* hath set down as *the main ground that God would once have but Covenant of grace* (which he means *p* 201. of the very Covenant of saving grace, not of any meer outward Covenant) *to be to the whole Church and Church seed*; and the rest of his *hypotheses*, *pag.* 195. are so fully shewed to bee mistakes in this *Review*, that I think it needless *actum agere*. And for the tenth section in which he makes a tedious paraphrase, and dictates many things without proof, concerning *Col.* 2. 10, 11, 12, they proceed upon the mistakes above shewed, as if the Apostle answered this objection, If Gentile believers have not an initiatory seal for them and their children they should not bee so compleat as the Jews in outward Ordinances, and that the Apostle answers that they have Baptism in stead of Circumcision. Hee himself more truly saith, *pag.* 199. *That Baptism is named* Col. 2, 12. *as an outward mean whereby bee in*

churches

churched Gentiles especially, come ordinarily to have communion with Christ, and to be compleat in him, and therefore not in outward Ordinances; nor by Baptism can it bee said wee are compleat in outward ordinances, sith himself makes it onely the initiatory seal, but compleatness is not in the enjoyment of the initiatory onely, but of all ordinances.

As for what hee saith Section eleven, for the succession of Baptism to Circumcision, that *it is sufficient to prove it that they agree in their common Author Sacramental nature, and end* (which yet is false) the answer is good that these things prove it not, sith there are the same or more parities of Baptism and the Passeover, and more disparities between Baptism and Circumcision, which are sufficient to shew that the command concerning the one is not a command concerning the other. For 1 the command bind to baptize infants, it binds onely to baptize males at eight dayes old, and not afore; nor is it any answer to say, *The command of Circumcision binds in the substantials of it though not in the circumstantials*; For first, if the command bind it binds in every point as well as in one. 2. The state of infancy is as much a circumstance as the eighth day. 3. In the command of Circumcision, I know not any thing which may bee termed substantial, unless hee mean the act of cutting off the fore-skin of the flesh, which hee will not have us tied to, for then wee must not baptize our infants but circumcise them. As for what hee speaks of the command to seal with an initiatory seal of the Covenant indefinite believers and their children, it is a meer figment, as hath been before shewed. There is nothing else that I conceive needfull to be added in this place, I go on to finish the rest.

SECT. LXXXII.

Notwithstanding Mr. Cs. *allegations of* Acts 2.38,39. 1 Cor.7.14. Rom. 11.16,24. Mark.10.14. Acts 15.10. Matth. 8.19. *the* N. T. *appears to be silent about Mr.* Cs. *additional promise, and infants Baptism.*

HAving more largely noted the unproved dictates and mistakes of Mr. *Carter* hitherto, I shall be briefer in the rest To what he saith pag. 81, 82, 83, 84. there needs no more to bee said but this, that the blessing upon posterity which Mr. *C.* imagines, might have been signified, though adult persons onely had been circumcised, we have plain Scriptures which warrant us to alter circumcision wholly and abolish it, besides which we know no other command *Gen.*17.9. the texts *Acts* 8. 12. *Gal* 3.27 28. do as plainly shew that Baptism is to be of none but believers and that but adult persons are to be baptized, as that women are to be baptized, if Circumcision were a priviledge *Acts.*7.8. we have abundant warrant to take it away; nor doth the text *Rom.* 11.29. hinder it, which is not meant of outward priviledges, which are common to elect

and reprobate (as the priviledge of Circumcision was) but of saving grace, to wit election and effectual calling, and therefore is palpably abused by Mr. *C.* to prove that *God takes not away the outward priviledge from his people now, which was by circumcision*, we justly require a precept or example in the N. T to warrant infant Baptism, no command of a meer positive right of the Old Testament, being a rule to us about a meer positive right of the new, as is fully proved by me in the 2d. part of this *Review*, Sect. 2, 3.

What Mr. *C.* saith pag. 85, 86, 87, 88, 89. *That the* N. T. *is not altogether silent in this matter*, because of *Peters* words, *Acts* 2. 38, 39. is false. For neither is there a word *Acts* 2. 38, 39. of Mr. *Cs.* imagined additional *promise of making every believer a blessing, so as to cast ordinarily elect children on elect parents*, nor that *the application of the initial seal is to signifie this promise*, nor that *the application of it to infants is of the substance of this Covenant* nor that *the command* Gen. 17. 9. *is yet a command that lieth upon* Abrahams *spiritual seed now in the New Testament*, nor that *Baptism is now in the room of Circumcision, and is the very same in substance for us*, nor if Mr. *Cs.* exposition were granted, would any of these follow, but the contrary. For first, if the promise bee the same with that *vers.* 17. out of *Joel*, yet sure it is not the same with Mr. *Cs.* additional promise, the promise of receiving the holy Ghost being not all one with this, that the parent believing shall bee a blessing to his posterity as Mr. *C.* fancies, the promise of receiving the Holy Ghost being of a thing terminated on the receiver, but Mr. *Cs.* additional promise of a thing convayed to posterity, the promise of receiving the Holy Ghost beeing as well, if not chiefly to the children, *Acts.* 2. 17, 18. but the additional promise of Mr. *C.* is onely to the parent. 2. Were the promises the same, yet this would not serve Mr. *Cs.* turn, but bee against him. For if the promise *Acts* 2. 39. be the same with that *vers.* 17, 18. then it is a promise to children of dreaming dreames, seeing visions, and prophesying, but this cannot be meant of infant children, it neither was so fulfilled in the Apostles days, nor in any after time, it would be a prodigy to hear an infant prophesie, much less is it true of the ordinary gifts of the spirit, *v.* 18. 3 The limitation also is against him, For if it be true which he saith p. 88. *That Peter maketh the Gentiles case parallel with the Jews, and saith that the same promise did also belong to them yet with the same limitation, namely, to so many of them onely as the Lord our God shall call, implying that it is an effectual call to faith and repentance, that gave to any such a priviledge, either Jew or Gentile*, and p. 87. *the words of the Apostle cannot be meant, that the promise did belong to them and their children onely as Jews, Abrahams natural seed, but as believers, and upon their conversion* (which I conceive true) then it is false that it belongs to infants as the natural seed of their parents, though believers, and therefore the promise *Act.* 2. 39. is not Mr. *Cs.* additional promise, which is of believing parents being a blessing to posterity, nor is the promise or imagined priviledge consequent thereupon, belonging to infants until they repent and believe. 4. That which hee saith p. 87. that *Act.* 2. 38. *is an invitation*

to repenting and believing Jews to be baptized they and their children, is so far from being *for his purpose*, that it is manifestly against it. For if the invitation be of every one to repent first, and then every of them so repenting to be baptized, then it is not an invitation to infants to be baptized, nor of parents to baptize them. Yea, this is so apparent in the Text that the very words are directed expressly to those persons *who were pricked in their hearts, and said Men and brethren what shall we do, that they should be every of them baptized*, v.38. without so much as mentioning their children in the invitation. Nor doth any thing after done by them, v.41. &c. shew that they understood that they were directed by *Peter* to cause their children, whether infant or adult, to be baptized upon their repentance and believing onely. Yea, if as Mr. *C.* saith, *John Baptist had cleared that point*, *Matth.*3.8,9. that to the Jews as *Abrahams* seed natural Baptism did not belong, it belongs not now to a believers seed. But the truth is, Mr. *Cs.* exposition is in many things false or uncertain. It is uncertain whether the promise *Acts* 2.39. be the same with that which is mentioned v.17,18. or that v.30. of which I have spoken enough before. It is false that the promise *Acts* 2.17,18. can be meant of ordinary gifts. For the Apostle saith v.16. that *what was spoken by the Prophet was the thing they then saw performed*, which was *speaking with tongues* v.4,11. *the great things of God*, which was extraordinary; and if the promise v.17,18. had included ordinary gifts, it had been impertinently alledged to shew the fulfilling of it then in those miraculous gifts. Nor doth Mr. *C.* prove it to be so meant. For 1. though *the last days in Scripture signifie all that space of time from the comming of Christ in the flesh to the end of the world*, 1 *Tim.*4.1. 2 *Tim.* 3.1. *Heb.*1.2. & 9.26. yet it follows not *the promise is yet in fulfilling*, it is sufficient to verifie the prophecy that it hath been fulfilled in any part of the last days. 2. Nor is there any thing v.18. to prove *the prophesying there to be a distinct thing from the prophesying*, v.17. or *prophesying in either to be an ordinary gift*, or *common to all Gods servants*. Nor do *Rev.*19.10. compared *Rev.*12.17. or *Rev.*1.9. prove that *every believer hath the spirit of prophecy*. For *Johns* suffering *for the testimony of Jesus* may be understood, yea being distinct from the word of God *Rev.*1.9. seems to be meant of his giving testimony of *Jesus* as an Apostle or Propher extraordinary; and the having the testimony of *Jesus*, *Rev.*12.17. being distinct from *keeping the commandments of God*, imports the testimony there meant to be of that which was testified by extraordinary revelation, against which the Dragon warred, and a blessing is to the observers, *Rev.*1.3 And that *Rev.*19.10. is meant of those who had extraordinary revelation, is manifest, in that *Rev.*22.9. where the same thing is expressed, and there what is *Rev.*19.10. *thy brethren which have the testimony of Jesus*, is, *thy brethren the prophets*, and *the prophets* are distinct *from them that keep the words of that book*. Besides, if *every believer had the spirit of prophecy*, then every believer should be a prophet, and should be set by God in the Church next after Apostles, afore Teachers; which doth expressly gainsay the Apostle, 1 *Cor.*12.28,29. and fully proves the prophesying mentioned 1 *Cor.*14.

to

to be no ordinary gift, which every believer hath. Nor doth it follow, *the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophesie*, therefore *every testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophesying* the speech being indefinite, not universal; and the words being the speech of the Angel, shewing wherein he was fellow-servant to *John*, plainly intimate he meant it of the special testimony of *Jesus* which he was fellow servant to *John* in, as the Title of the Book shews, *Rev.* 1. 1. *The Revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave to him to shew to his servants what things must shortly be, and sending signified them by his Angel to his servant John.* I omit what *Piscator* conceives in his *scholie* on the place, *that the words are to be read in an inverted order thus, the spirit of prophesie is the testimony of Jesus*, that is, which is received from him. Nor is it true, that the promise *Ioh.* 16. 13. is to all believers, however Preachers do so often misapply it, but to the Apostles. And it may be doubted, whether the words 1 *Ioh* 2. 20, 27. be meant of all believers, or of those that were strong or well instructed by *John* as his little children, *v.* 14. and if it be meant of all believers, yet it must be understood with limitation of all things necessary to salvation, or of all things needfull to withstand the seducers he mentions, not a word that mentions their prophesying. Nor doth *Joh.* 7. 39. prove every believer a prophet; nor may it be gathered from 1 *Thes.* 5. 19, 20. that *such preaching, which we must suppose may bring us something that is not good, is called prophesying*, but that something may be termed prophesying which is not, and therefore *the spirits are to be tried whether they be of God, for many false prophets are gone out into the world*, as *John* speaks, 1 *Epist.* 4. 1.

Nor is it true, that *Peter exhorts the Jews, Act.* 2. 38. *to repent, that is to go on as they had begun.* For though they had some horrour of conscience, *v.* 37. yet not repentance, unto which *Peter* exhorts, *v.* 38. nor doth any word used by *Peter* intimate that *they had begun to repent.* And what Mr. *C.* adds to the clause *to as many as the Lord our God shall call, not onely to them, but also to their children*, is too bold dealing with the Scripture, there being not a word in the Text which implieth that addition, and therefore is not justified by his allegations of *Psal.* 1. 6. *Prov.* 10. 24. What other arguments for Mr. *Cs.* purpose have been urged from *Act.* 2. 38, 39. have been largely answered already. I go on.

Mr. *C.* adds, *p.* 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99. a large discourse, in which 1. there is *p.* 97. a confession which doth invincibly prove infant Baptism to be will worship, and his speech false which he used *p.* 84. that *the New Testament is not altogether silent in this matter*; and it is this. *Whoever shall confine himself onely to the N. T. to find out the law of Gods worship and service, he shall never find it, not onely as to infant Baptism but also to all other Ordinances whatsoever* For if infant Baptism be not to be found in the N. T. then the N. T. is altogether silent about that matter; and if it be not there, then it is will worship, there being no law about a meer positive rite or ceremony in force to us Christian Gentiles now, which was given to the Jews in the Old Testament, as I have proved, *Exam. par.* 3. *sect.* 12. *pag.* 116, 117. *Review,*

par. 3

par. 2. *sect.* 2, 3. 2. There is in the same *p.* 97. a false and dangerous speech, that *Christ spake so little in his N. T. concerning the law which is the rule which he hath set for his service of his house; namely, because he could look upon that, for the greatest part, to be done already, to wit, in the Old Testament.* Which if true, then the laws about the ceremonies of the Jews are our rule, we are still under the yoke of bondage, popish, prelatical ceremonies are still justifiable, a Bishop or Archbishop above Presbyters and Bishops, appeal to Synods, their power to decide controversies, to excommunicate, a national Church constitution, are still to be retained, for these, or that which was proportionable to these, was according to the Rule of Gods house then. Nor is there a word in any of the Scriptures which Mr. *C.* alledgeth, for this his purpose.

Not *Luke* 16. 16. the meaning whereof is not, as Mr. *C.* fancies, *That in the times before* John *was the season to instruct men in the law, since in the Gospel*; but as it is *Mat.* 11. 13. *All the prophets and the law until* John *prophesied*, that is, foretold of Christs comming as future; but *the Kingdome of God*, εὐαγγελίζεται ἀπ' ἐκεῖνου, *Luke* 16. 16. *from then is Evangelized*, or told as good tidings already begun to be, as *Diodati annot.* on *Mat.* 11. 13. Johns *prerogative above the precedent prophets is, that they have only foretold and described things to come, but he hath delivered the present salvation, and in him is begun the Evangelical Ministery, and the legal and figurative Ministery is ceased.* Yet if Mr. *Cs.* exposition were allowed, it proves not that in the Law or Old Testament the rule about the service or meer positive worship of God in the N. T. is set, but rather the contrary; for if that *were the season then for it, and now is the season for another thing*, it follows, that it is unseasonable to take a rule for Gods house in meer positive worship from the Old Testament.

The alledging *Psal.* 78. 1. by *Mat.* 13. 3, 9, 25. proves not that a rule for rituals is to be fetcht from the Old Testament, although it may be usefull for to prove doctrines about the Gospel, Gods providence, moral duties, *&c.*

Though it be granted which Mr. *C.* concludes *pag.* 96. *the general nature of the Law to be one and the same to the people of God under both Testaments*, (which is easily yeilded sith the general nature is invariable, and the same to all for ever) yet it followes not that the Laws about ceremonies are the same to the people of God under both Testaments, if so, we are still under the yoke of Circumcision and the Legal rites, and under the Law. And indeed Mr. *C.* hath in this thing vented many false and dangerous speeches, that *to us in* Christ *the Law hath been as it were incorporated with the Gospel, as thereby become part of the covenat of grace the Law given by* Moses *is called the Testament of* Christ, *as well as the Law given to us by* Christ *himself; that the Old Testament, this the New, and both confirmed by his blood; that in the type by the blood of Bulls and Goats, this in the answer-type by his own blood.* And yet he saith, *the Apostle* Rom. 10. 6 *applieth* Deut. 30. 12, 14. *to the Gospel in opposition to the Law, as in it self considered without the Gospel, or*

as

as a covenant of works; which words are contrary to his former. For if *the Gospel be opposed to the Law by the Apostle, as it is in it self considered without the Gospel, is a covenant of works*; then *the Law is not incorporated with the Gospel*, or *thereby become part of the covenant of grace*, nor *is the Law given by* Moses *called the Testament of* Christ, nor *confirmed by his blood*, but the blond of Bulls and Goats, ill termed Christs bloud, being opposed *Heb.* 9. 12. In like manner it is a dangerous assertion which he hath pag. 95. *In the covenant of workes the Law was, Do this and live; but in the covenant of grace it is, Do this in the strength of* Christ *and live*: which if right, we live, that is, are justified (for so his words following explain it) by the doing the works of the law in the strength of Christ; which (if I do understand it) is the very doctrine of *Bellarmine*, *Tom.* 4 *de justific. l.* 1. *c.* 19. and other Papists, saying the Apostle excludes not works done after grace by faith from justification, but afore faith: Which Protestant Divines commonly refute, as *Pareus* in his *Castigations*, *Ames* in his *Bellarm. enerv. Chamier*, *Tom.* 3. *paustr. lib.* 22. *c.* 2. *Abbots defence of Perkins*, *p.* 502. *Rivet*, *sum contr. tract.* 4. *qu.* 10. *Pemble vind. Fidei*, *sect.* 2. *c.* 3. *sect.* 4. *c.* 1, 2. alledging the Apostles words concerning *Abraham*, who had not to glory before God, nor was justified by works, *Rom.* 4. 1, 2, *&c.* And me thinks Mr. *Carters* next words contradict his former, when he saith, *Our state and condition as subjects of his Kingdome, dependeth not upon our keeping the Law but upon free grace in Christ by faith.* But of this by the way. That which he alledgeth about the term *Gods house*, 1 *Tim.* 3 15. 1 *Cor.* 6. 16. and *separate*, *Act.* 13. 2. 2 *Cor.* 6. 17. *that we cannot understand them without the Old Testament*, though it were true, yet proves no more but this, that in explaining the meaning of words allusive to things there described, the Old Testament is necessary; but not that which is to be proved, that in observing the rites of the N. T. we are to fetch rules and commands by way of Analogy from the ritual commands of the old.

Mr. *C.* adds, *p* 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112. something more about the Texts 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Rom.* 11. 24. *Mar.* 10. 14. *Acts* 15. 10. *Mat.* 28. 19. which having been so largely handled in the former parts of this *Review*, I need onely to refer the Reader thither. Yet I add, it is but said without any proof, that 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. that *children are termed holy, because they come under the word of blessing from God, in as much as that word was confirmed not onely unto* Abraham, *but also to all believers*, *Gen.* 22. 17. 18. *That which God blesseth he sanctifieth, and separateth from that which is common or unclean.* For 1. there's not a word brought to shew that ever any child is in Scripture termed holy by reason of such an indefinite promise to believing parents. 2. Nor that the scope, analysis, allusion in the Text leads to such an exposition. 3. Nor doth it follow, that because *God blessed and sanctified the Sabbath day* therefore what God blesseth he sanctifieth: *God blessed* Noah *and his sons*, *Gen.* 9. 1. yet all of them were not sanctified; yea, many Texts of Scripture apply blessings to unsanctified persons, *Psal.* 107. 38. *Ierem.* 12. 1. much less is it true, that

that who is termed holy or sanctified is blessed, the unbeliever is in the text sanctified as the children holy, yet not blessed. 4. That this exposition is farre from the Apostles scope and arguing, is so largely demonstrated in the first part of this *Review* and elsewhere, that I judge it superfluous to refute further these unprooved dictates heere.

I deny not that the Jews *Rom.* 11. 24. are termed *natural branches by birth according to the Covenant of God with* Abraham, *the Gentiles the wild Olive by nature as neglected by God*, yet it is not true that ever the Gentiles ingrafted are made natural branches, sith they never descend from *Abraham* the root by natural generation, and though it bee true they enjoy saving graces which the believing Jews had, called *v.* 17. *the fatnesse of the Olive tree*, yet it is not true that the Gentile believers children enjoy the outward priviledges the Jews had by birth, or are any of them ingraffed and partakers of the Olive tree but the elect and believers, or that they are to be accounted holy by us, till *God hath purified their hearts by faith*, *Acts.* 15. 9. And as we cannot say certainly any infant of a believer is inherently holy, so neither can we say they are any of them *holy as separated to God and to bee received into Church relation*, till they profess the faith, such promise and purpose of election as Mr. *C.* imagins being no where to be found, and if it were it is not sufficient to make them relatively holy in Church relation, without profession of faith by each person so accounted, there being no rule whereby we are to baptize any but disciples, upon their own profession so judged, no not though God had made such a covenant to each believer as Mr. *C.* imagins: But we are to baptize persons who profess the faith, though wee know not them to be inherently holy, or in the Covenant of grace.

Mr. *Cs.* other reason pag. 103. *why such children are by the Apostle called holy, because they are not onely within the Covenant of* Abraham, *but also are appointed of God to be a subject recipient of the seal of that Covenant* is another unproved dictate and refuted by the same reasons by which the former is refelled.

What Mr. *C.* urgeth against my sense of *holy* that is legitimate, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. that *it had been but affirming the thing*, is shewed to be false in the first part of this *Review* sect. 16. And it is false which he imagins that *the Apostle thus reasoned, that after my exposition except one of the married couple be believer their children are bastards*, or *that he ascribed the sanctification to the faith of the believer*, which and what else hee saith about the scruple from *Ezra* 10. 11. and 9. 12. is so fully answered in the first part of this *Review* sect. 11, *&c.* to the end of the Book, that mee thinks Mr. *C.* should afore hee had printed his Sermons have viewed them, and not thus have printed these stale objections often answered, without shewing the insufficiency of the answers, if hee meant candidly, as one that endeavoured to cleer the truth.

But Mr. *C.* takes notice of this objection against the *basis* of his building, that *upon this account not onely children of believers, but also nations must be reputed holy, because the promise is that believers shall bee*

blessings also unto nations; To this he answers, The case is not the same, for children are immediately under this word of blessing in the family relation, as the people of God in the Church are immediately under that blessing, which the Lord commandeth out of Sion. But as for nations, they are under it in a remote capacity by means of what the Saints are in their families and in the Church. Therefore although such as are of the Church, and the children also of such families are holy, yet it followeth not that therefore the nation should be holy.

Ref. I reply, the objection in form stands thus; They which come under the word of blessing from God, in as much as that word was confirmed not onely unto *Abraham*, but also to all believers, *Gen.* 22. 17, 18. & 12. 2, 3. must be reputed holy. This is the effect of Mr. *Cs* words p. 104. and the main ground of all his discourse for infant Baptism, I subsume. But nations, yea all nations come under the word of blessing from God, in as much as that word was not onely confirmed unto *Abraham*, but also to all believers, *Gen.* 22. 17, 18. & 12. 2, 3. and if the word families bee taken (as Mr. *C.* seems to take it) for households, and all households, then the same objection is concerning, all in households, servants, wives as well as children, they come under the blessing according to Mr. *Cs.* exposition; *Ergo*, according to Mr. *Cs.* arguing and exposition, nations, yea all nations, families, households, all in them are holy and to be baptized, which being absurd his opinion is also absurd. The *minor* is in the texts, and *Gal* 3. 8. as Mr. *C.* expounds them, *Ergo*, the conclusion followes from his own principles. His answer is neither true nor pertinent. Not true, for children are not immediately under this word of blessing in the family relation, nor the people of God in the Church (meaning the visible) are immediately under that blessing, but onely believers in the families or Church, as the Apostle determines, *Gal.* 3. 8, 9. Nor according to Mr *Cs.* exposition are the children more immediately under the word of blessing as confirmed to *Abraham*, then the wife, servants, sojourners, neighbours. For the children are not under the blessing but as the children of believers, and so according to his own exposition pag. 37. *Gods choise shall be by Families and Nations, so that he will ordinarily cast the lot of the Saints in Neighbourhoods and places together*, and if so the blessing or choise is as immediately promised to Nations, neighbourhoods, others in the same house as to children, nor are the nations in a more remote capacitie then the Saints in the families and in the Church. Nor is the answer pertinent if it were true: For the *major* proposition, which is his own, is not limited to them that come under the word of blessing immediately in his sense, for then hee should exclude nations, neighbourhoods, families, contrary to the text, which mentions the blessing of all kindreds and nations, and not onely the children, and to his own exposition which extends it to neighbourhoods and places together.

Mr. *C.* not trusting to this, saith; *To this I add, that children are in the power of parents and at their disposing; and so as when they, by their sanctification, or being made holy, give up themselves to God by faith,*

faith, and obedience to his Ordinances, their children are therein vertually given up also, in as much as a believer in some respect giveth up to God together with himself all in his power. Now this cannot be said of any nation whatsoever.

Answ. But 1. The parents giving up all to God is not that which makes Children to be holy neither according to truth, for they are made holy by Gods act whither of Covenant or other act of consecration or separation to himself, not by mans act of giving up by vow or otherwise to God, yea if the act of mans giving up all in his power to God, makes children holy, it makes servants, cattle holy to God, nor according to Mr. *C.* himself, who ascribes it to Gods election, and word of blessing 2. If this be the way of making holy, by giving up all at his disposing to God, then a believer at his first conversion makes holy to God himself, for he giveth himself to God, makes holy to God persons not yet begotten, and so visible Churchmembers according to Mr. *B.* subjects recipient of the seal of the Covenant, according to Mr. *C. pag.* 103. yea by this reason a believers horse may bee said to bee holy to to God, and baptizable. 3. This addition takes away his former answer. For if the giving up all to God in his power at his disposing by the believer make them holy, children are no more immediately holy then servants, wife, *&c.* all being together given up to God in one act whether vertually or formally. 4. If a believers giving up to God together with himself all in his power, and at his disposing make them holy, then a believing King and State do make the whole nation holy who are their subjects and so the objection stands good, that the whole nation is according to Mr. *Cs.* conceit to be reputed holy

But Mr. C. saith, "It will be objected yet further, that the Jews are "said to be holy, even the whole people of the Jews, who now are unbe- "lievers, *Rom* 11. 16. yet have they no right to baptism; and therefore "that this holiness of the children, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. be it from their interest "in the covenant of God with *Abraham* is no argument for infant bap- "tism, because the unbelieving Jews also are supposed by us to be holy "upon the same account, and holiness to be taken in the same sence in "both places.

Answ. This objection is mine in my *Exercit. sect.* 5. but otherwise then Mr. *C.* here sets it down. For 1 it is not there brought as an objection by it self, but as a reason of my denial of this proposition universally understood, They who are holy with Covenant holiness may be baptized. 2. I did not say the whole people of the Jews, who now are unbelievers, but the elect of the Israelites not yet called are holy in respect of the Covenant, and are not yet therefore to be baptised. Yet neither to the objection as mine, nor as framed by himself, doth Mr. *C.* give a sufficient answer. For he *grants the two places* 1 Cor. 7. 14. Rom. 11. 16. *are parallel, and in that sense they have been both above alledged to prove that branch of Gods covenant with* Abraham *concerning a blessing upon posterity, in order to the multiplying of believers. And yet it is as true, that there is a great difference between them.* Now this grant is enough to prove that persons or people may be federally holy, and yet not baptizable, which

is the objection. Nor doth the difference which he imagines (if there be such a difference) in the two places, any thing at all infringe it. For whether federal holiness in one place bee ascribed to a whole people in respect of a part or to particular persons, the connexion between federal holiness and baptizability, is shewed to be null; and the major denied not true universally understood, and so the objection is confirmed by this grant, not infringed.

Yea whereas Mr. *C.* pretends *the difference to bee great between the places*, the very thing hee assignes makes no difference. He saith, *The Apostle saith expresly* 1 Cor. 7. 14. *of such particular persons that they are holy, but of* Rom. 11. 16. *the scope of the Apostle is to set forth the kind or sort of people, namely Jewes, not the particular persons that should bee called.* But herein hee opposeth himself in the words next before, where hee thus makes the Apostle to intend both; *Thus wee are to understand that of the Apostle* Rom. 11. *when hee saith, of the people of the Jewes that they are holy, namely, what properly and peculiarly belongeth to a part, even to those of them who either then were, or afterwards should bee converted, hee ascribeth to the whole, and in respect of that part hee calleth the whole body of that people holy.* Now if hee call a part holy which should bee called, he sets forth the particular persons. And 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. sets out the kinde or sort of children as well as the particular persons, whether after Mr. *Cs.* opinion, the children of believers, or after mine, the children of married persons. And that which he argues makes against him for me. For if that which is ascribed to the whole people belongeth by a synecdoche to a part, even those who are or shall be converted, then what is said either *Gen* 12. 2,3. or 22. 17,18. or *Rom.* 11. 16,17, 24. of *families, nations, branches, lump*, may be understood synecdochically of a part of families, nations or people, and those believers as *Paul Gal.* 3. 8, 9. determines as converts as Mr. *C.* and so not children of believers, much less infants necessarily included in the families, nations, branches ingrafted, lump that is holy, and consequently all Mr. *Cs.* arguing, made void by his own concession, which hitherto he hath framed from *Abrahams* Covenant to prove infant Baptism. And what he argues, *That the lump which is termed holy* Rom. 11. 16. *and the whole people termed beloved* v. 28. *is to bee understood of the better part, and of those that were then unborn, and of such a lump as should have a being successively, and part after part, and so cannot bee actually holy then when the Apostle spake*, it doth all exactly agree with my explication of the ingrafting of the branches in my *Apol.* sect. 14. in the first part of this *Review* sect. 1, 2, *&c.* And doth well serve to answer the arguments for the ingrafting parent and child into the visible Church christian against the sense I give for the ingrafting into the invisible Church, by giving of faith according to election. Nor did I ever say, *the Apostles meaning* Rom. 11. 16. *was that those particular persons of the Jews who persist in unbelief, or that the whole people of the Jews are now in the times of the New Testament holy in any sense whatever*, but grant they *are broken off from the holy root*, vers. 20. *are cast away*, vers. 15. *are enemies, and so unclean and prophane, and*

therefore not holy, v. 28. yet *this meant, but of some*, v. 17. *a part*, v. 25. *and all* these things do well accord together, and with the perseverance of Saints asserted against Arminians, sith the people of the Jews are not by me asserted to be broken off from the invisible Church of elect and true believers in respect of what particular persons broken off were in their own persons, but in respect of what the particular persons were in a former age of the same nation or people.

Mr. *C.* p 109. imagines that *Christ saith, of little children is the Kingdome of God, because of his* fained *additional promise*: but he brings not a word to prove it, nor doth the Text yeeld any proof that they were believers children; and I have proved *the Kingdome of God* is meant of that of glory. *Review, par.* 2. *sect.* 18.

And for his conceit, that *Christ bid suffer them to come to him because of the additional promise* of Mr. *C.* it is without proof, and not agreeable to Mr. *Cs.* own conceit. For if Christ would intimate, that *this is part of the Gospel of the Kingdome, that believers should be blessings to their children, namely, so as they should be means of their conversion*, he should rather have directed the Apostles to suffer them to be brought to their parents to be educated, then to himself to lay hands on them. And Christs anger against his Disciples argues no such intimation, nor his saying that of them is the Kingdome of God, proves their right to Baptism as doth the receiving the Holy Ghost, *Act.* 10. 47. For that shewed *Cornelius* actually a believer, so did not Christs speech of the little children, which expressed not their present but future estate, as is proved, *Review, par.* 2. *sect.* 19. Nor is there a word brought by Mr. *C.* to prove that *Christs command was given to his Disciples for a perpetual obligation to the Disciples of Christ, in all ages then to come, to bring infants to Christ in an external way, and therefore by Baptism.* For though it were recorded after his ascension, yet it follows not it was recorded to learn this, to have a way of bringing infants to Christ by Baptism, there being something else to be learned by it, and it is rather a sure proof that Christ did not teach that by his command, sith neither then nor after do we find the Apostles did baptize an infant; and the phrase of comming to him cannot import Baptism, sith he did not baptize, *Joh.* 4. 1, 2. and if any standing rule were intended by Christs command, it should be rather laying on hands and praying for infants, then baptizing them.

Though it be granted, that *to whom Christ is a King he is also a Prophet*, yet it follows not, that infants being such as of whom is Christs Kingdome, they are his Disciples as meant *Mat.* 28. 19. much less that *they are made Disciples, when their parents are converted, because they are then in the way of the Spirits teaching*, Christ being a Prophet to other then Disciples meant *Mat.* 28. 19. Nor is there the least hint *Act.* 15. 10. of infants being Disciples, and the notion of Disciples by the parents conversion, or by being in the way of the spirits teaching (which yet is not shewed, but fancied by Mr. *C.*) are meer devised whimzies refuted by me, *Review, par.* 2. *sect.* 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. Nor is any sufficient answer given hereby, or by Mr. *C.* elsewhere, or any other, or ever will be to the argument as brought by me against infant baptism, *Review par.* 2 *sect.* 5. and elsewhere.

What

What Mr. C. saith, "That more might be said about those words "in answer to it, namely, that in the words Baptizing them, Mat. 28. "19. we have by a synecdoche, a part for the whole (an usual form of "speech in the Scripture) for we know the Apostles commission did "extend as well to a setting up of other Ordinances as of Baptism. "Therefore when he saith, Go teach all nations baptizing them, it is as "if he had said, Go teach them, and enter them into the practise of the "worship of the Gospel; of which among other things the application "of the token of *Abrahams* Covenant to infants may be a part, any thing "in that place contained notwithstanding.

Answ. 1. Such a synecdoche in any institution of a rite is nowhere to be found as this which Mr. C. dreams of, *baptizing them into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, that is, enter them into the practise of the worship of the Gospel, not only Baptism*, but also breaking of bread, &c. 2. We know the Apostles commission did extend as well to the setting up of other Ordinances, *viz.* breaking of Bread, 1 *Cor.* 11.23. as of Baptism, but not in the word *baptizing*, *Mat.* 28.19. but in the word *teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you*, v. 20. 3. There is this very thing which Mr. C. himself saith against baptizing infants, *it is as if he had said, Go teach them, and enter them into the practise of the worship of the Gospel*: For sure Christ did not bid them teach infants, nor do I think Mr. C. would have them entred into the practise of the Gospel worship, but onely baptized. And so Mr. C. answer is a strengthening of the argument. Enough in answer to Mr. C. being unwilling to make more exceptions on passages which need correction; why I have said so much, the reason is given, *sect.* 77.

SECT. LXXXIII.

Interest in the Covenant gave not title to Circumcision, as Mr. M. in his 4th. conclusion would have it.

IN the *Defence* of his 4th. and 5th. *concl.* against my *Examen* Mr. M. saith, *he will contract*; and accordingly I shall be brief in my reply. He grants the *order of circumcising infants is repealed*, as I answered in examining his 4th. *concl.* but would have it added, that *by Gods order Baptism succeeds in the room of it*, which I have refuted. Then upon my saying that Circumcision was not a seal of the spiritual part of the Covenant, he censures this as *pure Anabaptism*, leaving out injuriously my limitation, to all that were circumcised, which if fairly added had cleared me; and perhaps if the so called Anabaptists had been rightly understood, they had been found as innocent as my self in this thing: I see enough in Pædobaptists dealing with me, to shew how great likelihood there is that the words of the Anabaptists in *Germany* were perverted.

Mr. M. p. 180, 181. excepts against me for saying that *Abram* and

Esau had no part in the Covenant, denies that *Ishmael* had no part in it, when he himself grants that *they did never partake of the spiritual graces of the Covenant*, which is all one with that which *I* say, that the Covenant of grace was not made to them, they had no part in it; For sure they to whom the Covenant of grace is made, and have part in it, are all partakers of the spiritual graces of the Covenant, or else God keeps not his promise; and for this I bring *Gen.* 17.19,20,21. *Rom.* 9.6,7,8. *Gal* 4.28,29. (though I needed not, having Mr. *M*s own confession) and therefore it is most false he saith, *I bring not one shadow of a proof for what I say.*

But Mr. *M.* thinks to maintain his speech, that *Ishmael had part in the Covenant, in that he was reckoned by circumcision to belong to the Covenant, and obliged to see after the spiritual part of it, to have his heart circumcised, and to believe in the Messiah that was to come of Abrahams seed.*

Answ. 1. It is contrary to *Gen.* 17.19,20,21. to say that *Ishmael* by Circumcision did belong to the Covenant, it runs upon this palpable mistake, that every one that was circumcised had thereby the Covenant sealed to him. 2. Those that were uncircumcised, all the people of the world were obliged to seek after the spiritual graces of the Covenant, to be holy, to believe, yet this doth not prove they had a part in the Covenant, and therefore this answer of Mr. *M.* is frivolous. And so likewise is that which he saith in answer to my words (not rightly set down, my words were not, right to Evangelical promises or any other benefit) that no benefit of the Covenant was the proper reason (I added, and adequate) why these or those were circumcised, but only Gods precept; *though Gods command was the cause of the existence of the duty of Circumcision, yet the Covenant of grace was the motive to it, and these two are well consistent together.* In which 1. he shews not whose motive it was, Gods or mans. If he mean it was Gods to command it, it is nothing to the purpose to shew right to the Covenant of grace to have been the proper adequate reason of the person to be circumcised: if mans motive, it is false, whether we understand it of the circumcised, who were infants, and therefore had no motive to it, but were passive onely, or the circumciser; for in *Abrahams* circumcising *Ishmael* Mr. *M.* saith *I have given a very good instance to prove, that some may receive the outward sign of the Covenant, and a visible standing in the Church, though he who administers the seal might by revelation know the inward grace is wanting.* 2. Were his answer granted, yet it proves not the contrary to my speech, but confirms it, though this point be one of the hinges on which his first & main argument turns: For if it be true that the adequate reason of persons circumcising was not right to the Evangelical promises or other benefit in the Covenant, but Gods precept onely, then the pillar of Mr. *M*s argument falls to the ground, *All that are in the covenant are to be sealed*, it being onely true thus, All in the Covenant, whom God hath commanded to be sealed are to be sealed.

What he saith after, *that I grant what is in controversie, because I grant men may have a visible membership in the Church, though they be not elect or sanctified*, it is alike frivolous, it being never in controversie; But whether

whether any may be said to be in or under the Covenant of grace, or to have the Covenant of grace made to them who are non elect, and never sanctified.

That which Mr. *M.* p.182. calls *a piece of odd Divinity*, that Circumcision should seal righteousnes to them who never are circumcised, not reputed so, nor capable of being circumcised, nor might lawfully be circumcised, being understood as I express it of *Abrahams* personal Circumcision is the Apostles express Divinity, *Rom.* 4.11,12. *whose steps*, say *New England Elders* in *answer to the* 3d. and 4th. *position*, p.65. rightly, *in that place is not to define a Sacrament, nor to shew what is the proper adequate subject of the Sacrament; but to prove by the example of* Abraham, *that a sinner is justified before God not by works, but by faith*, &c. Nor is this any more odd Divinity then Mr. *Ms.* who asserts *women virtually circumcised in the males.*

That which he saith, that *visible professours have a visible right to the spiritual part of Circumcision*, I conceive false: For though they had a right to Circumcision or Baptism, which they might receive of men, yet they had no right at all to forgiveness of sins, justification, adoption, salvation, which are onely from God, and onely true believers had right to.

That which he saith, p.182. that *Circumcision was given the Jews in reference to their Church state, not in reference to their civil state*, is not true, but said upon a mistake, as if the Church state and Civil were different in the Jewish Commonwealth.

That which he confesseth, that *the formal reason of their being circumcised was the command of God*, is enough to shew that interest in the Covenant did not give right to Circumcision, but the command of God; and therefore without shewing a command for infant Baptism, this is no good argument, they are in the Covenant therefore to be baptized, which enervates all Mr. *Ms.* dispute.

But he adds. "The Covenant of grace, or their Church state was the "motive to it, and the thing it related to; and this fully answers the "objection; for it was commanded and observed as that which was a "priviledge and duty belonging to the Covenant, and they used it as "being in Covenant, the objection is wholly taken off.

To which I reply, 1. The Covenant of grace might be in some sense, and the Church state of *Abrahams* house in some respect, that is, to bee a sign of it, might be the end why God appointed Circumcision to *Abrahams* house; but motive, that is, impulsive cause, I see not how the Covenant of grace and the Church state can be termed, there being nothing but his own will, *according to the counsel of which he worketh all things*, *Ephes.* 1.11. that can be rightly termed a motive to him to command it. 2. But be it in the sense I allow it termed motive, or end, and a duty belonging to the Covenant as a sign of it, and the persons who used it, as *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob* used it as being in Covenant; yet neither is it true that all that used it were in the Covenant of grace, nor was it appointed as a duty to be used by them to all and they onely that were in the Covenant of grace, nor did God by the use

uſe of it, ſeal, ſignifie, aſſure or conſer an eſtate in the Covenant of grace to every perſon whom hee appointed to bee circumciſed, and therefore no part of the objection is taken off, that Circumciſion was not the ſeal of the Covenant of grace to all circumciſed perſons, but was appointed to perſons not under the Covenant of grace, and denied to perſons that were, and conſequently Mr. *Ms.* propoſition not true; All that were in the Covenant were to bee ſealed.

When Mr. *M.* ſaid, *perſons were bound to conform to the manner of adminiſtration*, and *this manner of adminiſtration he made to bee temporal bleſſings and puniſhmenst*. I took it he meant they ſhould conform to them.

He tels me p. 183. That though *I confidently aſſerted heretofore, that* Iſhmael, *and* Eſau *and others, were circumciſed for ſome temporal reſpects, that Circumciſion ſealed the temporal or political promiſes, but yet in ſaying they received Circumciſion neither in relation to outward things onely, nor at all either as temporal bleſſings or types, but becauſe God commanded, I do as good as deny it; ſith if they were circumciſed with reſpect to no hing but the command, it ſealed nothing, it was no ſeal at all.* To which I reply, I find not that I aſſerted any where that *Iſhmael* and *Eſau* were circumciſed for ſome temporal reſpects, and though I alledged *Cameron*, ſaying, that *it ſealed earthly promiſes*, yet I never ſaid it ſealed them to *Iſhmael* and *Eſau*: Nor do I count it any abſurdity, to ſay it ſealed nothing to them, or it was no ſeal at all to them. And I conceive that Baptiſm which is no ſeal of ſuch earthly promiſes, nor can be a ſeal of ſpiritual and ſaving grace to every natural child of a believer (of which he will not aſſert p. 116. of his *Defence* there is a promiſe made to them) when it is adminiſtred to reprobates is no ſeal of the Covenant of grace to them, nor any ſeal at all, and that he muſt as well as I do (if he will ſpeak congruouſly to his own doctrine) ſay that ſuch perſons are to bee baptized by reaſon of Gods command and no other. Yet I do not ſay the command of Circumciſion was not in reference to the Covenant of grace, as Mr. *M.* intimates: but this I ſay, though God commanded Circumciſion, that he might ſignifie Chriſt to come, and Evangelical grace by him, yet neither the circumciſer nor the circumciſed did circumciſe, or were to be circumciſed becauſe of the perſons intereſt in the Covenant of grace, as the proper and adequate reaſon of the duty of Circumciſion, but becauſe of Gods command, and yet I nothing doubt but that in the uſe of it, they and others that were neither circumciſers nor circumciſed, as *e gr.* women were by faith to look on the Covenant of grace through theſe adminiſtrations, that is to expect *Chriſt* to come and bleſſing by him, which ſpeeches are very eaſily conſiſtent with my own words and Scripture doctrine, though Mr. *M. did not underſtand it.*

When Mr. *M.* alledged that *Circumciſion could be no ſeal of Canaan to Proſelites*, and I anſwered that yet the Covenant to *Abraham* had promiſes of temporal bleſſings, and that ſome were to be circumciſed who had no part in the Covenant of grace, he tels me, 1. *That he was proving that Circumciſion was no ſeal of the land of Canaan*, which I grant, if he mean it to ſome that were circumciſed, yet if he mean it, to none, it is falſe.

2. He grants *temporal blessings belong to the Covenant of grace, accord-ing to that* 1 *Tim.* 4. 8. But neither this nor any other Text proves, that the promises of a setled abode in a fruitful land with peace, prosperity, and outward greatness, and dominion therein, is promised to a Christian believer now, as it was to *Abraham* and *Israel* after the flesh, Gen. 17. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. but *the promise of this life* is upon the loss of outward things of a recompense in this life by receiving more, yet with *persecution*, *Mark.* 10. 30. which can bee understood of no other then spiritual comforts, which may bee termed temporal blessings distinct from the everlasting life which in the world to come they shall have. 3. *It was not his drift to prove that all that were circumcised had part in the spiritual graces of the Covenant, but that they had a visible membership and right to bee reputed as belonging to the Church.* But this is not that which hee was to prove that they were in the Covenant of grace.

Lastly, when I excepted against his speech [that *Ishmael was really taken into the Covenant of grace, and* Esau, *till by their Apostasie they discovenanted themselves.*] 1. That hee opposed the Apostle *Rom.* 9. 7, 8. *Gal* 4. 28, 29. *Gen.* 17. 19, 20. *Heb.* 11. 9. To this he replies not. 2. That *by this speech he asserts falling from grace, this he denies because but meant by their taking into the Covenant of grace not being under the spiritual grace of the Covenant, but the outward administration.*

But 1. this is but non-sense and delusory. For the outward administration is not the Covenant of grace, Circumcision is not the Covenant of grace, nor visible profession, nor indeed could he mean it without trifling and mocking his reader when he argued, *Infants of Believers are in the Covenant of grace, therefore are to bee sealed with Baptism or Circumcision.* For infants of believers make no visible profession and if his argument were, they were under the outward administration, that is, to be Circumcised or Baptized; and therefore they were to be sealed, that is to be Circumcised or Baptized, is mere trifling, and delusory of the reader, who expects from his words, a proof that Gods promise of righteousness and eternal life by Christ (which is and nothing else the Covenant of grace) is made to every infant child of a believer. 2. If this were Mr. *Ms.* meaning, *Ishmael* and *Esau* did not discovenant themselves, for they did uncircumcise themselves, but shewed that they regarded not the blessing of *Isaac.*

But saith Mr. *M.* "I have no doubt but that all indifferent Rea-"ders well enough understand what I meant, by being taken into the "Covenant of grace, even such a taking in as when the Gentiles were "taken in, instead of the Jews who were broken off, they were under the "outward administration, visible professours, had an external calling, "which is Gods act though a common one.

To which I reply, 1. If they were taken into the Covenant of grace as the ingraffed Gentiles, they were elect and true believers, if *Esau* and *Ishmael* fell from that state of the Covenant of grace *Arminian* Apostasie is asserted. 2. Neither the outward administration of Circumcision to *Ishmael* and *Esau*, nor their visible profession (whatever it were) was

Gods

Gods act (which Mr. *M.* denies not taking into the Covenant of grace to be) therefore by neither of these can they with good sense be said to be taken really into the Covenant of grace. 3. What external call which should be Gods act distinct from the outward administration and visible profession mentioned, from which *Ishmael* and *Esau* fell, I understand not. 4. What ever external calling it be which he means and terms Gods act, though a common one, sure I am Mr. *M.* hath not shewed nor can shew that it is a real taking into the Covenant of grace, which I said truly, nor hath Mr. *M.* disproved or gain-said it, is Gods act, either of election or promise, or some act executing either of these, and the objection still stands good, persons were to bee circumcised who were in the Covenant of grace, *Ishmael* was appointed to be circumcised, though it were declared Gods Covenant did not belong to him, and therefore the reason of Circumcising persons was not the Covenant of grace, but onely the will and command of God to have it so.

SECT. LXXXIV.

The enlargement of our priviledges, proves not Infant Baptism as Mr. M. in his 5th. conclusion, would have it.

MR. *Ms.* 5th. *Conclusion* was, "The priviledges of Believers under "this last and best administration of the Covenant of grace are "many wayes inlarged, made more honourable and comfortable then "ever they were in the time of the Jews administration. For examining of which I set down something about priviledges, which Mr. *M.* grants, and saith, *what's all this to the purpose?* I reply, I told him it was to uncover the ambiguity of his speeches, in which all the strength of his conclusion lay.

To what I said, that if he meant his conclusion of priviledges of the substance of the Covenant of grace, it is to be denied: Mr. *M.* confessed *they were the same both to Jews and Gentiles*; but in respect of the administration I granted it, hee answers, 1. *if this were granted it hurts not him, it's sufficient if the administration be now more comfortable to Believers and their children.* To which I reply, that this grant enervates the argument to which this conclusion tends. For if the priviledges of the Covenant of grace belonging to the substance of it be not enlarged, but the same in substance to Jews and Gentiles, then no priviledges of the Covenant of grace are enlarged; for all the priviledges of the Covenant of grace belong to the substance of it, and to true believers or elect onely, the visible membership, and initial seal contended for, were no priviledges of the Covenant of grace, nor such as all believers could claim for their children, they were personal priviledges to the Church of the Jews, and *belonging to that administration* (as Mr. *Ms* phrase is) or as I would speak to that peculiar national Church state which God vouchsafed that people, out of special ends and respect to that people, of

whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, and consequently by denying those priviledges we deny no priviledges of the Covenant of grace to believers for their children, nor ascribe less grace to them then the Jew had. And if the administration be now more comfortable to believers and their children, it being in that Circumcision and the yoke of the Law are taken away, it follows, it is more comfortable to us, that no such thing as Circumcision was is put on our children. Mr. *M.* and Pædo. baptists do grosly mistake, as if Circumcision did belong to Jewes and their Children because of their interest in the Covenant of grace, which neither is nor ever will be proved.

2ly. Saith Mr. *M. If there be no more honourableness in those priviledges, which belong to the substance of the Covenant, how comes it to pass, that in your answers to those several texts which I and others bring to prove the enlargement of priviledges under this last administration, you interpret them of those priviledges which belong to the substance of the Covenant, or the spiritual part of it?*

Answ. In those answers I do not so interpret those texts of those priviledges which belong to the substance of the Covenant, or the spiritual part of it as more honourable then the priviledges belonging to the substance of the Covenant of grace, or spiritual part of it now then to believers afore Christ, but say that the promises of the new Covenant, which is the Covenant of grace, are better then the promises of the Covenant at Mount *Sinai*, which was the Covenant of works.

Thirdly, saith Mr. *M. Seeing that under this last administration these priviledges are communicated not onely with more clearness, but in greater abundance, I wonder you should say they are no more honourable and comfortable now then they were then, is not abundance of grace more honourable and comfortable then a little grace?*

Answ. It is, but yet not priviledges belonging to the substance of the Covenant of grace. For this clearness and abundance comes not from the substance of the Covenant of grace, but to use his phrase, from the administration, in respect of which *I* granted they are many wayes enlarged and made more honourable.

But then saith Mr. *M. This will serve our turn well enough; for this was a priviledge belonging to their administration, that their infants were under it as well as themselves; yeild that for ours and the controversie is ended.*

Answ. The yeilding that the priviledges of believers under the N. T. are enlarged, more honourable, and more comfortable, in respect of the administration, will not serve Mr. *Ms.* turn, except it be yeilded of this particular, that the infants of Christian believers are visible Christian Churchmembers, and to be entred by Baptism, as well as the Hebrew infants of and into the Church of *Israel* by Circumcision, which would indeed end the controversie if yeilded, but was not so by me, who granted priviledges of believers now more enlarged in respect of the administration, because the preaching of the Gospel, which is that whereby the Covenant of grace is administred, is enlarged to Gentiles as well as Jewes, and more honourable, because preached by

Christ

Christ himself, and more comfortable because in plain words without shadows.

Mr. *M.* adds. "To have nothing in lieu of the administrations "then as they were shadowes of the substance, which is Christ, is "very right: But to say, it is our priviledge to have nothing in lieu "of them as they were external Ordinances to apply Christ, is to say, "it is our priviledge to have no Ordinances to apply Christ to us, and "thereby to make us compleat in him, which were a most absurd thing "to affirm.

Answ. Those external Ordinances applied Christ to them no otherwise then as shadows of the substance, which is Christ; nor doth Mr. *M.* in his *sermon, p.* 10, 11. express their administrations of the Covenant of grace otherwise then as figures, signs, types, and sacraments of spiritual things: so that if we have nothing in lieu of them as they were shadows, but Christ, we have nothing in lieu of them as external Ordinances to apply Christ to us; nor did *they make us compleat in Christ*, nor is it absurd to affirm that no external Ordinances now do.

But saith Mr. *M. Circumcision was indeed a part of that administration, and obliged them to the rest of that manner of administration, as Baptism doth now to ours; but did it not also belong to the substance?* Answ. No. *was it not a seal of the righteousness of faith, of Circumcision of heart, &c.* Answ. *Abrahams* was, not every ones Circumcision. *Doth not the seal belong to the thing sealed? the conveyance and seal annexed to it are no part of the purchased inheritance, but do they not belong to it?* Answ. They do, but not as of the substance of the thing sealed, or the inheritance purchased, or the Covenant whereby it is promised: but as the sign whereby the futurity of it is confirmed. Now surely he should use non-sense, who should term the sign or seal the substance of the Covenant or thing promised, being neither essential nor integral parts of them, but onely adjuncts, without which they may be or not be entirely.

To my saying, That 'tis so far from being a priviledge to our children to have them baptized, to have Baptism succeed in the stead of Circumcision, that it is a benefit to want it, God not appointing it; "I answer (*saith Mr.* M.) then belike our priviledges of the Covenant "of grace are so far from being enlarged by enjoying the Sacrament of "Baptism, that it had been a priviledge to have wanted Baptism if God "had not appointed it; and by as good a reason at least you might "have said, that Circumcision was so far from being a privilegde to the "Jews and their children, that it had been a benefit for them to have "wanted it, if God had not commanded it: Sure that is a strange kind "of priviledge, of which I may truly say, that it had been a greater be- "to them who have it, to have wanted it, if the Donor had not com- "manded it.

Answ. Mr. *M.* by clipping my words hath misrepresented my speech; he hath left out, that Circumcision was a priviledge belonging not to the substance of the Covenant, but to the administration which then was; a priviledge to the Jews in comparison of the heathens, but a burthen in

comparison

comparison of us, which was in that it signified Christ to come, the obligation of the law; for which reasons I judged it a great priviledge to us and our children, that they have neither it, nor any other thing in the place and use of it, but Christ manifested in the flesh, because if we had any thing in the use of it, Christ must be expected to come in the flesh, and *Jesus* denied to be the Christ, and we debtors to keep the whole law. And then I determined absolutely, that the want of infant Baptism is no loss to us and our children; not a loss in respect of duty, God having not appointed it; nor of priviledge, God making no promise of grace to be confirmed by it to the infants of believers; which last words being left out by Mr. *M.* the reason of my words is omitted, and my speech misrepresented; but thus set down Mr. *Ms.* exceptions appear but cavils. For he supposeth *our priviledges of the Covenant of grace are enlarged by enjoying the Sacrament of Baptism*; but I know not any priviledges of the Covenant of grace, but effectual calling, justification, adoption, sanctification, glorification; and if there be any other termed saving graces, or which accompany salvation, and to say these are enlarged by enjoying the Sacrament of Baptism, especially when administred to infants, is as much as to say it confers grace *ex opere operato*. And I grant for us to have wanted Baptism had been a priviledge, God not appointing it, nor promising any thing upon the use of it, nor declaring his acceptance of it, which is the case of infant Baptism. Sure I know none but would think it a burthen to be baptized, or be covered with water, though but for a moment, were it not God commanded it, and accepted of it as a service to him. And the like is true of Circumcision, the want of which, being so painfull, was a benefit, but for the command and promise of God signified by it. Such actions as are no way priviledges, but sins, without Gods precept and promise, it is better to want them then have them, or act them; such is infant Baptism; and if it be in the place and use of Circumcision, it is a heavy burthen, no benefit now, but a yoke of bondage.

I said Mr. *M.* was to prove either that Circumcision did belong to the substance of the Covenant of grace, and he answers, *That Circumcision, though a part of their administration, did yet belong to the substance; not as a part of it, but as a means of applying it*: Which speech how frivolous it is, is shewed before, *sect.* 25. *p.* 165, 166. and in this *section*. Or that the want of Circumcision, or some Ordinance in the place and use of it, is a loss of priviledge of the Covenant of grace to us and our children.

To this he saith, "And I have also proved, that though it be a priviledge to have nothing succeed Circumcision, as it bound to that "manner of administration, yet it is a priviledge to have somewhat "succeed it as a seal of the Covenant, in as much as a Covenant with "a seal is a greater benefit then a Covenant without a seal.

Answ. 1. If it be a priviledge to have nothing succeed Circumcision as it bound to that manner of administration, then it is a priviledge to have nothing succeed it in its use, which confirms my before speech carped at by *M. M.* 2. How vain the talk of Pædobaptists is about Sacraments being

being ſeals of the Covenant of grace, is ſhewed before *ſect.* 31. 3. A Covenant with a ſeal is a greater benefit then a Covenant without a ſeal when there is more aſſurance and better eſtate thereby procured, but if as good aſſurance and eſtate be by a Covenant without a ſeal, it is no greater benefit to have a ſeal, then to have a Covenant without it. 4. There is a ſeal of the Covenant of grace, which ſucceeds Circumciſion as the ſubſtance the ſhadow, and that is Chriſts Cirumciſion, *Col.* 2. 11. and his bloudſhedding, *Mat.* 26. 28. *Heb.* 9. 15. *&c.* beſides the ſeal of Gods ſpirit.

But ſaith Mr. *M.* *the thing I was to prove was that our priviledges are enlarged, not extenuated; which appears, partly, in that we have freedome in what was burdenſome to them in their manner of adminiſtration*: which he meant of Circumciſion by his alledging *Act.* 15. 10. and thereby it is manifeſt that it is falſe which he ſaid before, that *Circumciſion did belong to the ſubſtance of the Covenant as a means of applying it.* For that ſpeech doth imply, that the Covenant of grace could not be applied without Circumciſion, for that which is of the ſubſtance of a thing, what way it is of the ſubſtance of it, is neceſſary to the being of that of which it is of the ſubſtance, otherwiſe it were a common accident, not of the ſubſtance of it: But without Circumciſion the Covenant of grace might be applied, yea, according to Mr. *M.* it is and may be better applied, for otherwiſe our priviledges were not enlarged in being freed from it.

Partly, ſaith Mr. *M.* *becauſe our Covenant is eſtabliſhed upon better promiſes*, *Heb.* 8. 6. To this I anſwered, the Covenant which had not ſo good promiſes was the Covenant at Mount *Sinai*, *v.* 9. which was not the Covenant of grace (for then it ſhould have the beſt promiſes, there being no better promiſes then are in the Covenant of grace, nor could it be broken as that was, nor occaſion finding fault as that did;) but it muſt needs be the Covenant of works as the Scripture doth plainly deliver, *Rom.* 10. 5. *Gal.* 3. 10, 12, & 4. 24. *Heb.* 12. 18. *&c.* and for this I alledged ſome of Mr. *Ms.* own words in his *Sermon*, *p.* 10. *That the Law was added not as a part of* Abrahams *Covenant, that in that giving the Law there was ſomething of the Covenant of works made with* Adam *in Paradiſe.*

To this Mr. *M.* returns an anſwer, bemoaning me *as running into a needleſs and erroneous digreſſion; that he ſaid indeed in his ſermon, that the moral Law was added* 430 *years after the Covenant was made with* Abraham, *not as a part of that Covenant, but as a Schoolmaſter to whip them to Chriſt that they finding the impoſſibility of keeping the Law, might more earneſtly long after Chriſt, exhibited in thoſe ſhadows of rites and ſacrifices, &c. But to ſay that this Covenant mentioned* Heb. 8. *was the Covenant of works, is a moſt erroneous doctrine; look into the Text, and you ſhall find that the Covenant which is there mentioned (which God finds fault with, and calls the firſt Covenant, in oppoſition to this better Covenant) had Ordinances of Divine worſhip, had a Sanctuary a Tabernacle, Prieſts and High Prieſts, Sacrifices, and other rites belonging to the adminiſtration of it. Sir, was this the Covenant of works? I hope you will not own it in your next.*

Anſw.

Answ. It is, and I do still own it in the 43d. *section* of this part of my *Review*, and do requite Mr. *Ms.* pitty of me with the like bemoaning his ignorance, and, if I mistake not, the *Assemblies* errour about this in their *Confession of faith*, *ch.*7. *art.*5. I have looked into the Texts, and I find Mr. *M.* mistaken in the meaning of *Gal.*3.24. perhaps following the unnecessary supplement in our last English translation, where is added [*to bring us*] which the Text hath not, but onely *the law was our boy-leader unto Christ*, that is until Christ, as *v.*23,25. shew, and the meaning is plain, that the Apostle compares the Law to a teacher, or guide, or overseeer of a child in his minority to which the Israelites were confined, not in respect of its severity as Mr. *M.* makes it, *to whip them to Christ*, but as a teacher directing them though imperfectly by figures and types untill Christ, and faith in him were revealed. In like manner he mistakes when he saith, *God finds fault with the first Covenant*, the words being *For complaining of them*, *Heb.*8 8. not complaining or finding fault with it: and when it is translated *v.*7. *if the first Covenant had been faultless*, it is not intimated as if it were faulty, but they were faulty, as *vers.* 8. shews, and the Covenant is termed *non* αμεμπτος not from the fault of it, but of them, which occasioned complaints of them, and therefore it were better translated *without complaint* or *plaintless*, then *faultless*. As for what Mr. *M.* alledgeth from *Heb.* 9.1. it no more proves that the Covenant at Mount Sinai was the Covenant of Gospel grace, and not of works, then because the tree of life was a symbole, type, or shadow of Christ, or our blessed estate in him, therefore the Covenant made with *Adam* in Paradise before his fall, was not a Covenant of works, but of Gospel grace; or *Noahs* Ark typified Baptism, therefore the Covenant with *Noah*, *Gen.*9. was a Covenant of Evangelical grace. The Covenant of grace and of works are denominated from the promise and condition, not from Gods intent in some things commanded. When our Lord Christ, *Mat.*10.19. told the young man of entring into life, he propounded the Covenant of works, yet he had another end therein, to wit, to try and discover him. Though the commands about the Sacrifices, High Priest, *&c.* were to typyfie Christ, yet the Law as it was propounded Covenant wise is manifestly declared to be the Covenant of works, *Rom.*10.5. *Gal.*3.10,12. yea, Mr. *Ms.* own words prove it. For 1. where he cites the addition of the Law, *Gal.*3.17. the Law is not restrained to the moral Law, but contains all the commands of the Sacrifices, *&c.* as well as the moral Law, which were added because of transgressions, not onely to restrain them, but also for the expiating of some offences against the Law, so as to obtain a partial temporary forgiveness by them, as is manifest from *Levit.*4. *&c.* Now the whole Law as delivered 430 years after the Covenant with *Abraham*, is contradistinct to the Covenant confirmed before in Christ, or the promises; therefore as it was a Covenant, *Exod.* 19.5,8. it was a Covenant of works. 2. If it were not a part of the Covenant with *Abraham*, it was not the Covenant of grace, for such was *Abrahams* Covenant; but according to Mr. *M. the Law was a part of that Covenant*, Ergo. 3. That which was a Schoolmaster to whip,

whip, was not the Covenant of grace, for the Covenant of grace doth not terrifie or whip, but such is the Law according to Mr. *M. Ergo.* 4. That which was impossible to bee kept, was not the Covenant of grace, for that is never broken, but such was the Law or Covenant at Mount *Sinai* according to Mr. *M. Ergo.* 5. If in the giving the Law there was something of the Covenant of works made with *Adam* in paradise, then it was a Covenant of works, this he must grant, unless he will have a mixt Covenant, partly of grace and partly of works, which he opposeth in his answer to me about *Abrahams* Covenant; But *in the giving that Law according to Mr.* M. *there was something of the Covenant of workes made with* Adam *in Paradise, Ergo.* 6. That which God finds fault with is not the Covenant of grace, but according to Mr. *M. God finds fault with it, Ergo.* 7. That which is termed the first Covenant *in opposition to this Covenant* is not the Covenant of grace; But such according to Mr. *M.* is that at Mount *Sinai, Ergo.* 8. The Covenant of grace is the better Covenant, But such was not that at Mount *Sinai,* according to Mr. *M. Ergo.* And truely I finde so many Protestant Divines terming the Covenant at Mount *Sinai* the Covenant of works, *Perkins* on *Gal.* 4. 24. *Pemble* of *Justification* sect. 4. c. 1. *Cotton* in his *way of Congregational Churches cleered* p. 46, 47. however in some respect hee will have it to have been a Covenant of grace, yet to the carnal seed saith, it *was a Covenant of workes, and proves it out* of *Paul*; And adds, *And so have the chiefest German Divines as well as* Piscator *and* Polanus, *taken the Covenant on mount* Sinai *to bee a Covenant of works.* See *Piscator* Ezek. 16. *observat. ult. in v.* 60. and 62. and *Polanus ibidem.* and *Synt. To. l. 6. c. 33. Pisc. observ. e v. 6. Heb.* 8. *Dicson paraph. Gal.* 4. 21, 22, 23, 24. *Hebr.* 8. 6, 9. *Beeman. Th Exercit.* 5. *p.* 67. *De fœdere operum aut legis legimus,* Exod 19. 5. *Deut.* 5. 2. 1 *Reg.* 8. 21. *Jer.* 31. 32. *Heb.* 8. 8, 9, 10. To whom I add my Antagonists Mr. *Geree vindic. vindic.* p. 9. Mr. *Baillee* in his *Anabaptism,* pag. 141. and might do many more if it were necessary. This is enough to shew my doctrine to have been unjustly termed *most erroneous* by Mr. M. beeing *Pauls,* Mr. Ms. and others named, and therefore rightly owned by me.

To my words *Exam. p.* 103. The next Scripture you thus express, *The glory of theirs had no glory in respect of ours,* 2 Cor. 3. 10. But this passage is plainly meant of the Covenant at Mount *Sinai,* which is called *the letter,* v. 6 *The ministration of death written and ingraven in stones so glorious, that the children of* Israel *could not stedfastly behold the face of* Moses *for the glory of his countenance, which glory was to be done away,* v. 7. *The ministration of condemnation,* v. 9. which I suppose you do not understand of the Covenant of grace, and therefore it is impertinently alledged, Mr. M. answers thus. "Sir, I wonder at your confidence "in it: the Reader will easily discern that the whole scope of that "Chapter clearly holds forth the preheminence of the Ministery "of the Gospel above the Ministery of *Moses* his vailed Ceremo-"nies: belike then with you, *Moses* Ceremonies were the Covenant "of works.

Answ. I wonder that a man of such note should wonder at that of which the reason is given, and should take upon him to defend his own Sermon, and yet pass by my reason against his allegation without rehearsal or answer to it. In form it stands thus. That which was the letter which killeth, written in Tables of stone opposite to the New Testament, and the spirit which giveth life, the ministration of death, of condemnation by *Moses*, was the Law or Covenant of works, for it is onely the Covenant of works, not that of grace how darkly soever delivered, of which these things can be said. But such was the Law or Covenant at Mount Sinai, *Ergo.* 'Tis true, it *was the Apostles scope to hold forth the preheminence of the Ministry of the Gospel*, but not barely above the Ministry of *Moses* vailed Ceremonies, for the Apostle prefers it before the Ministry of the Letter written and ingraven in stone, *v.* 3, 7. which was the moral Law, but above the Ministry of the whole Law, which comprehending all the commands *Mosaical* promulged Covenant-wise, and not singly *Moses* ceremonies, are by me termed the Covenant of works, and of this I am still confident.

Mr. *M.* skips over his impertinent allegation of *Gal.* 4. 1, *&c.* and grants 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. *the spiritual part to belong onely to the invisible Church*, of which he denies not the whole *v.* to be meant, but onely tels me, *the whole nation of the Jews who had the honour to be termed holy, the children of God*, Deut. 14. 1. *to have the adoption*, Rom. 9. 4. *were not inwardly holy, or effectually called*; which I readily grant, nor need I prove that *Rom.* 9. 4. *Deut.* 14. 1. were not *priviledges which the visible Church of the Jewes enjoyed*, having not denied it, but do expressly grant of *Rom.* 9. 4. *that it speaks of peculiar priviledges of the Jews*, and prove thence the Jewes had some priviledges above us, and that the want of some priviledges they had may bee recompensed by some priviledges wee have, and thence gathered that is a feeble reason, from the Jewish priviledge of infant Circumcision, to prove infant Baptism; yet nothing that Mr. *M.* brings, shews 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. to bee meant of any other then the elect, nor that believers priviledges of the Covenant of grace are enlarged.

What he saith, that *the comfortable manner of administration, and baptism are enlarged beyond circumcision, to females, and all nations*, is granted; but this groves not priviledges of the Covenant of grace to be enlarged to each believer now, although there are more believers now. And for *Gal* 3. 28. the words [*there is neither male nor female*] are not added to shew Baptism to be administred to whom Circumcision was not, for then [*neither bond nor free*] should be added for the same reason, which had not been right, for bondmen were circumcised formerly, as well as then baptized; But to shew a general equality of all believers in Christ, and therefore that passage is meant onely of true believers.

Having shewed the impertinency of Mr. *Ms.* allegations for his 5th. conclusion, I answered the argument drawn thence for infant Baptism thus. 1. It is no good argument, God gave such a priviledge to the Jewes,

Jewes, *Ergo* we must have such a priviledge too, without Gods institution, but arrogant presumption to claim it. 2. That God gave many peculiar priviledges to the Jewes which we have not, as that *Abraham* was the father of the Faithfull, *Mary* the Mother of CHRIST; no family out of which CHRIST came but *Abrahams*, no nation that God hath promised after many hundred years rejection to re-ingraff besides the Jewes.

This Mr. *M.* endeavoured to prevent in his Sermon, by saying, *These were personal priviledges belonging to some particular persons, not the whole Church of the Jewes, nor from the Covenant, but that to have infants belong to his Church, and to have the initial seal are, and if that we have it not for ours, the grace of God is straitned as to our posterity, which he counts absurd,*

Hereto many things are replied by me. 1. That this was never a priviledge to believers, that their children should be in the Covenant of grace, God never made such a promise to every true believer, that he would be God to every believer and his natural seed, nor commanded that wee should repute the infants of believers to bee in the Covenant of grace. This hath been largely handled in my review of Mr. *Ms.* second conclusion. 2. That the pretended priviledge of a Believers infant childrens visible Churchmembership and title to the initial seal was not from the Covenant of Gospel grace, but from the peculiar dealing of God towards the nation of the Hebrews, out of peculiar reasons concerning that Churchstate which that people were to have until Christ came, which is largely discussed in answer to Mr. *Baxters* second main argument Section 50, *&c.* of this part of the *Review*. 3. That even then when it was a priviledge to the Hebrew people, yet title to the initial seal was not common to all Believers children, not to those under eight dayes old, nor to females, nor to Proselites of the gate, as *v.g.* to *Cornelius* and his children. 4. That a priviledge there is to the Jewes, even to the Nation, and that arising from Gods Covenant of Gospel grace, that their posterity shall after some hundred years rejection bee re-ingraffed, and yet this not to any Gentile Believer, Prince, Preacher, or Martyr concerning their posterity, and therefore it is no absurdity to say, that in some respect the priviledges of the Covenant of grace, even of the substance of it, were more large to some of the Hebrew Believers, then to the Gentiles in respect of posterity. 5. That the personal priviledges of *Abraham*, *Mary*, &c. were more truely pertinent to the Covenant of grace, though not common to all Jews, then infants visible Chvrchmembership and title to the initial seal. 6. That priviledges are meer arbitrary things, and that no reason why they are given to some and not to others, is needfull to be assigned besides the donors will. 7. That there is no more reason to say Gods grace is less now, because infants are not visible Churchmembers and baptized, then it is to say it is less because Christ is not descended from them, they are not Fathers of the faithfull. 8. That there were many priviledges which the Jews had which we have not, as those *Rom.* 3.1. *&* 9.4. to have a Temple, High-Priest on earth, *&c.* 9. That the

want of these is abundantly recompensed by Christs comming without any particular thing of the same kinde in the stead of them, and therefore the want of Churchmembership and initial seal, may in like manner bee said to bee recompensed by his comming. 10. That the priviledge the children of *Levi* had, that their posterity should inherit the Priesthood, be maintained by the offerings of the people, be exempt from many burthens, is not now to Ministers children, nor any thing instead of it, and yet there is as much reason from the Covenant of *Levi* why Ministers children should have this priviledge, or somewhat instead of it as from the Covenant of *Abraham*, that our children should have Baptism in stead of Circumcision. 11. That young children were to eat the Passeover, and yet children of three or four years old are not admitted to the Lords Supper; and consequently after the rate of Mr. *Ms.* reasoning, the grace of God is straitned to us in respect of our posterity. 12. That the grace of God is not denied by not baptizing infants, for that would infer that it did give grace. 13. That by denying infants visible Churchmembership and Baptism, wee do not put them out of the Covenant of grace, or Church of God. 14. That Baptism is a duty rather then a priviviledge. 15. That the use of it is rather for us to seal to God by it, that is, to testifie the repentance and faith of the baptized, then for God to us, as assuring by it the promise of Gospel grace. 16. That by baptizing an infant the parent is not assured that the child is in the Covonant of grace. 17. That through the want of infants visible Churchmembership, such as the Jews children had, wee have no loss of priviledge, but rather benefit, it being a state of imperfection. 18. That the want of the initial seal which the Jewes had is a benefit it having a burthen annexed to it. 19. That children have no less of the grace of God by their want of Christian visible Churmembership and Baptism then the Jewes infants had. 20. That parents have as much cause of comfort concerning their children without these as they have by them.

Mr. *M.* p. 191. speaks thus; *I think indeed it would take with no sober Christian thus to argue: The Jewes had it, therefore we must have it. But Sir to argue thus, God gave such a priviledge to the whole Church of the Jewes, that their infants should be reputed to belong to his Church, and have the initial seal. Therefore if hee have not granted to Christians that their infants shall also bee reputed to belong to his Church, and partake of the initial seal; then his grace to Believers under the N. T. is straitned as to their posterity. This argument appears so clear to me, that I must confess my self one of those dull ones, who know not how to deny the consequence.*

Answ. Mr. *M.* hath ill recited my frame of the argument, which he rejects, by leaving out the chief words [without an institution]. Yet his new frame mends not the matter, but indeed is in effect all one with that which he saith would take with no sober Christian. For [the Jewes] and [the whole Church of the Jewes] are the same, and [had it] and [must have it] expressed but the same which Mr. *M.* saith in more

more words: Nor doth he put in any thing of Gods will or inſtitution to have it ſo, and therefore there is no more reaſon why his new frame ſhould take with any ſober Chriſtian, then the former. Yet I ſhall view it as it is. And 1. I deny the antecedent, *God did not give the priviledge to the whole Church of the Jews, that their infants ſhould have the initial ſeal*, meaning it of all. 2. I deny the conſequence, if by [grace] he mean Goſpel grace; though infants of Chriſtians be not reputed to belong to the viſible Church, nor are baptized, yet the grace of the Goſpel, that is, remiſſion of ſin, ſanctification, adoption, glorification (which is that the Scripture makes Goſpel grace) is not ſtraitned to Chriſtians as to their poſterity. And the reaſons of this denial are ſo plain to me, that I ſee no clearneſs in it, but ſhould take my ſelf dull if I ſhould not diſcern its weakneſs. For the infant viſible churchmemberſhip being by reaſon of the peculiar national churchſtate of the Jews, and circumciſion of infants by reaſon of that which was proper to the Hebrew people, or policy, into which proſelytes were admitted, not from the Covenant of grace common to all believers in all ages, it is eaſie to perceive that notwithſtanding the altering of theſe (which God hath done,) the grace of God is as much now to our children as to theirs.

And here I think meet to anſwer Mr. *Geree's* argument as he frames it, *vindic. Pædobapt. pag.* 38. I do grant the ſequel of the *major*, *If children of Chriſtian parents be excluded the Covenant, then are the priviledges of the N. T. more reſtrained*: But that we exclude them from the Covenant of grace is falſe, we onely deny the fictitious Covenant of Pædobaptiſts, that God hath promiſed to be the God of believers and their ſeed: nor is it any *harſh divinity, or derogatory from the incarnation of Chriſt*, to ſay, the Jews converted, whoſe infants had the birth priviledge of memberſhip in the Jewiſh Church by natural generation, have not the priviledge of memberſhip in the Chriſtian, which is by ſpiritual regeneration. Nor doth the term [*natural branches, Rom.* 11. 21, 24.] ever agree to Gentiles ingrafted, but that they are ſtill branches of the wild Olive by nature, nor any of them in the true Olive without faith or election.

Nor doth Mr. *Geree* ſhew how he that *denies baptiſm to infants denies the grace and mercy of God to us*, if the grace of God be not tied to the Sacraments. Nor doth he ſhew that the priviledges of believers young children of 4, 5, or 6 years old are not as much ſtraitned if they who were admitted to the Paſſeover are not admitted to the Lords Supper. For though *the reception into the Covenant and Church were ſufficiently done in Baptiſm*; yet they ſhould not have the priviledge of growth and nutrition, which the Jews young children had by the Paſſeover, if Pædobaptiſts doctrine of the Paſſeover, and Lords Supper be right. But I return to Mr. *M.*

Mr. *M.* tels me, *That though I ſay my inſtances of* Abrahams, *the Virgin* Mary's *and Jews priviledges not being now to us, do preſs his concluſion; yet that I ſpeak no word to vindicate them from his anſwer, and therefore he gathers that by this time I ſee that now ſome perſonal priviledges which a few of the Jews had, may be denied us; yet it makes nothing againſt his argument,*

argument; but if the common priviledges which every one of them had were denied us, our priviledges were straitned.

Answ. Mr. *M.* doth not rightly say *I spake not a word to vindicate my instances from his answer.* For besides all or most of those twenty things either in my *Exercit. sect.* 3. or in my *Examen, par.* 3. *sect.* 3, 4, 10, 11, 12. and elsewhere, which do enervate his answer, I did directly reply, that neither was his priviledge of the initial seal to infants any other then personal, not a *branch of the Covenant of grace common to all in Covenant, for which by vertue of the Covenant they might rely upon God*, and for this I alledged the faithfull before *Abraham*, *Melchizedek* and *Lot* in his time, *Job* and *Cornelius* after his time; and therefore if the want of priviledges personal, as he terms them, doth not shew a straitning of Gods grace to us now, neither doth the want of infant visible Churchmembership and Baptism now shew it.

That of Melchizedek, Lot, and *Job*, Mr. *M.* saith, *hath been often answered*; but he hath no where shewed, that they were not in the Covenant of grace, or that by vertue of the Covenant they and their infants had right to the initial seal. And as for *Cornelius*, I never intended to prove, *that he was a member of the Church of the Jews, nor that the priviledges and churchmembership of these proselytes of the gate were as honourable as those of the proselytes of the covenant*, but that though he were in the Covenant of grace, yet he had not the priviledge of churchmembership in the Church of the Jews, nor circumcision; and therefore these priviledges, whatever they were, *were not branches of the Covenant of grace common to all in Covenant for which by vertue of the Covenant they might rely on God*, as Mr. *M.* asserted.

To what I said, to be Father of the faithfull, Mother of Christ, the priviledges *Rom.* 9. 4. & 3. 2. do as much belong to the Covenant of grace as Circumcision, Mr. *M.* answers nothing. Upon the words by me used, that the phrases *Rom.* 11. 21, 24. do seem to me to import, that the Jews had this priviledge to have their children reckoned in the outward administration, as branches of the Olive by their birth, which the Gentiles have not, (which speech I have altered in the first part of this *Review*, p. 64, 93.) Mr. *M.* asks, *But if we Gentiles have it not, then are not we, I pray you, straightned in that particular?* Answ. Yea. *And I demand further, when we are graffed in and so naturalized with them, do we not partake of all the fatness or priviledges of the Olive with them? what Scripture ever denied it?* Answ. That we by ingraffing are made natural branches, is denied. it is granted, we are partakers of all the fatness and priviledges of the Olive, to wit, spiritual graces, but not of the priviledges which the natural branches had by birth.

Mr. *M.* adds. "I demand yet further, did the many ten thousands of "Jews who were baptized in the Apostles days, by their comming un-"der this best administration of the Covenant, and thereby kept their "former growing in the Olive with advantage; did they thereby de-"prive their children of that which you say was their natural privi-"ledge? if you think so, produce your evidence to prove it; if they were "not, then it seems the Jews who believed in Christ, and kept their sta-

"tion

" tion, had a greater priviledge for their children then the Gentiles, who " grow to togethe with them, have for their children.

Answ. The natural priviledge which I say the Jews had, was, that their children were in the visible Church Jewish, and their males to be circumcised; this by their Baptism they were deprived of, it being then no priviledge, after Christ exhibited in the flesh and preached, to be in the visible Church Jewish opposite to the Christian, and to be circumcised. Nor is it true, that the converted baptized Jews were in the Olive afore they believed in Christ, or kept their station in the visible Church Jewish, but were cast out, or that they should have had greater priviledges of the Covenant for their children, if they had continued in the visible Church Jewish, and been to be circumcised, then the Gentiles, whose children were not visible Christian visible churchmembers, nor to be baptized, as is abundantly proved by me from Scripture and otherwise in the foreparts of this *Review*.

To Mr. *Ms.* speech, *as if we expunged infants out of the Covenant*, it was answered, that it was a calumny, whereto he replies, *But do not you avouch, that the infants of the Jews had this peculiar priviledge and birthright to be under the administration of the Covenant, which ours have not?* Answ. I still avouch it in the sense the phrase seems to be taken for being Jewish visible churchmembers, and to be circumcised; but what he adds, *which you know is the onely thing controverted betwixt us*, is manifestly false, it being never so much as questioned by me. He adds, *May not I boldly say, that once the infants of all covenanters had this priviledge?* Answ. No. *May I not also exact of you to shew when and where this was taken away?* Answ. It hath been often shewed, infant-male circumcision in the Synod, *Act.* 15. 24, 28. infants churchmembership *Matth.* 28 19. were taken away, of which there is enough said before, *sect.* 50, *&c.* where infant visible churchmembership is proved to be altered, and yet infants not expunged out of the Covenant of the Gospel, as Mr. *M.* suggests. On the contrary, Mr. *Ms.* conceit as if the denying them visible churchmembership and baptism were putting them out of the Covenant of grace, I intimated to come too near the Popish opinion, of the necessity of infants baptism to their salvation, which I thought worth answering, sith it is all one in my conceit to say, that by denying baptism to them we put them out of the Covenant, and to say we damn them, it being certain none are saved but those who are in the Covenant of grace.

To that which he saith *of our doctrine bringing discomfort to parents, in that we leave their infants in the state of infidels, account them actually to belong to the visible Kingdome of the Devil, deny them the benefit of the promise I will be the God of thee and thy seed, acknowledge no more promise for them, then for the children of Turks*. I answer, these are meer calumnies sufficiently discovered to be so, *Exam. par.* 2. *sect.* 10. *Apolog. sect.* 14.

SECT. LXXXV.

Mr. Cobbets *dictates*, Juſt. Vindic. par. 2. ch. 1. *touching childrens baptiſmal right, are examined and refelled.*

MR. *Cobbet, Juſt. vindic. par.* 2. *ſect.* 1. ſets down this as his poſition, *That the initiatory ſeal follows the covenant*; but he proves it not: And whereas to the objection againſt it, that from *Adams* time to *Abrahams*, there was no initiatory ſeal to thoſe who were in Covenant; nor in *Abrahams* time to *Melchizedek*, *Lot*, *Job*; he anſwers, *That ſuch extraordinary caſes and times are very impertinently urged by ſome to infringe the force of ordinary rules and principles*: I ſay, his anſwer is inſufficient. For 1. this onely is an anſwer where it is proved that there is ſuch an ordinary rule and principle from which theſe caſes ſwerve: But no ſuch rule or principle can be ſhewed of an initiatory ſeal belonging to perſons in Covenant, from which this ſhould be counted an exception; therfore this is not an extraordinary caſe. 2. Beſides, extraordinary caſes make a juſt exception from an ordinary rule for ſome, by reaſon of ſome peculiar accident not happening to others: But to all in Covenant from *Adam* to *Abraham*, there is not, nor can be ſhewed any ſuch peculiar accident which happened not to others, which was the reaſon of omitting an initiatory ſeal by thoſe in Covenant: *Ergo*, it was not becauſe of extraordinary caſes that it was omitted, but becauſe there was no ſuch rule. 3. Extraordinary caſes are few and rare, but the omiſſion of an initiatory ſeal was conſtant, and univerſal by thoſe in Covenant until *Abrahams* time, therefore it was not an extraordinary caſe. 4. Extraordinary caſes and times are but for a little while: But this omiſſion was for above 2000. years, which one thinks Mr. *C.* ſhould not ſo dote as to count an extraordinary time; ſure the time wherein Circumciſion was in force was ſhorter, and it was in that time often omitted, and therefore we may by Mr. *Cs.* dictates as well ſay, the initiatory ſeal was extraordinary, and the ordinary rule was, that thoſe in Covenant were not to have an initiatory ſeal, ſpecially conſidering that even in *Abrahams* time, and after, it was omitted by *Melchizedek*, *Lot*, *Job*. Nor is it of any weight to ſay that *there was not a viſible political Church* then; For 1. no doubt in their families were viſible political Churches as well as in *Abrahams*. 2. The initiatory ſeale, as they call it, might and was to be to perſons without a viſible political Church as to the Eunuch *Acts.* 8. to *Moſes* children in *Midian &c.* Nor is it of any weight to ſay *theſe Churches were not to continue*: For 1. that is not ſo certain as to be taken for granted. 2. *Abrahams* poſterity were not to continue ſtill the Church of God, though they were to continue longer then the poſterity of *Job* and *Lot*. 3. But if this were a ſufficient reaſon, why they ſhould not have an initiatory ſeal ſolemnly inſtituted for them, becauſe they were not ſucceſſively to continue, then ſhould not

not the Churches which were not successively to continue (of which doubtless there were many from whom the Candlestick was quickly removed) have had baptism instituted for them. 4. By Mr. *Cs.* reasoning, his rule *the initiatory seal followes the covenant* must bee thus limited, *in ordinary times and cases when and where there is a visible political Church which is successively to continue.* Which if it were granted him, yet it will never serve his turn to prove this universal proposition, from which Pædobaptists infer infant Baptism, *All that are in the covenant are to have the initiatory seal or to be baptized.* But neither is it true in ordinary times, where there is a visible political Church successively to continue. For it is not true of those in Covenant in *Abrahams* house, neither the females, nor males of seven dayes old onely were to have the initiatory seal, though in Covenant. To that which is said, that *the females had not a superfluous fore-skin,* besides what hath been said before to the contrary; *I* say 1. this however infringeth Mr. *Cs.* rule, that *in ordinary times in visible political Churches successively to continue, the seal initiatory follows the covenant,* for it doth not so in the female *Hebrews.* 2. If Gods will had been as Mr. *C.* would have it, he could have appointed an initiatory seal common to females with males. But what saith M. *C.* to the instance of the males of 7. days only to infringe his rule? I find nothing except this be an answer, *in that case of the females as in some other, that law of circumcision had something peculiar in it, albeit it had other things in common with that of Baptism,* which *I* take to be a sufficient proof against him, that the rule of Circumcision is not a rule to us about Baptism; and that his proposition is not true, *that in ordinary times and cases, respecting the political visible Church and its administrations, such little ones as are of parents in such visible church-state, they have external right unto the injoyned initiatory visible seal, of which they are outwardly capable, and ought not to be denied the use and benefit of it.*

There is also an objection against the principle fore-mentioned, *All that are in covenant are to have the initial seal,* or as Mr. *C.* speaks, *the initiatory seal followes the Covenant,* that if the connexion bee between seal and Covenant, it is as well beſween the after seal as the initial, and so they may as well plead for infants comming to the Lords Supper, as in *Cyprians* time, and as the young ones of the Jews did partake of the Passeover. To this Mr. *C.* saith, *Male infants were not to appear at the Passeover, if so, then they must appear at the Feast of Tabernacles & must carry boughes, from* Deut. 16. 16, 17. *compared with* Levit. 23. 34, 35, 38, 39, 40. *that though persons have a covenant right in general, yet their jus in re is to be suspended and not elicited in case of incapacity, or of extream coldneß of the countrey, or sickneß. &c.*

Answ. 1. If infants were not to appear at the Passeover, yet young children not to be admitted to the Lords Supper were, nor doth the text tie them all to carry boughs who were to appear. 2. The objection holds as much concerning the yong ones at *Jerusalem,* who were to eat the Passeover, and by Mr. *Cs.* reasons such yong ones should be at the Lords Supper, as having Covenant interest and therefore *jus ad rem,* nor is there any such incapacity or danger to them in eating the Lords

Supper to ſuſpend their *jus in re*, as is to be baptized in *Greenland*, or in extreme weakneſs and ſickneſs; and therefore by Mr. *Cs*, reaſons they ought not to be denied the Lords Supper. 3. If infants Covenant-right to the Lords Supper be ſuſpended becauſe of their defect of underſtanding to examine themſelves, their Covenant-right to Baptiſm is as juſtly ſuſpended til they repent and believe, which are as much and more required to Baptiſm as ſelf examination to the Lords Supper. And if it be true then Mr. *Cs*. poſition is not right, that *infants ought not to be denied the uſe and beneſit of Baptiſm*. 4. If it were in *Cyprians time a corruption to give infents the Lords ſupper*, ſo it was to baptize them, being on the ſame reaſon of no greater antiquity. But let's view what hee ſaith for the clearer handling of *his Theſis*.

Sect. 2. He ſaith, that *mixt commands of God having ſome part circumſtantial and vaniſhing, ſome part ſubſtantial and abiding, the later is binding to us ſince Chriſts time, albeit the former be not*; and he inſtanceth in a 7th. day Sabbath: But neither he nor any other have yet proved any ſuch ſubſtantial part abiding in the command of Circumciſion, and how little the inſtance given is to his purpoſe, is ſhewed before, §. 77, 80, 81.

That which Mr. *C*. ſaith ſect. 3. is granted, that *conſequential commandements grounded on Scripture are Scripture commandements*, but that any command of a poſitive rite in the old Teſtament is a command to us about a poſitive right of the new, or that in mere poſitive worſhip that ſhould not be excluded which is not expreſſed, is not granted; to the contrary ſomewhat is ſaid in the 2d part of this *Review*, §. 2, 3, 5. and elſewhere. I have often ſaid prove infant Baptiſm by good conſequence, and I ſhall yeild.

That federal ordinances, ſuch as are the ſeals, are as well priviledges as precepts, which Mr. *C*. ſect. 4. aſſerts, when they are rightly adminiſtred, is granted; but it is denied that the Paſſeover, Baptiſm, the Lords Supper, are federal ordinances or ſeals of the Covenant of grace in Mr. *Cs*. ſenſe, who *p*. 131. makes *Circumciſion in the nature of it to bee a ſeal of the righteouſneß of faith*; and in like manner thoſe other, which he cals *federal ordinances, ſeals of the promiſe of the Covenant of grace, of the righteouſneſs of faith in their nature*. There's not a word *Acts* 7. 2, 8. by which it may appear that *circumciſion* of the child *was reckoned as the Fathers priviledge*, nor their own circumciſion as their priviledge, but only of *Abraham* that God *gave him the Covenant of Circumciſion*, whereby he was aſſured of a ſon by *Sarah*, & ſo *he begate* Iſaac *and circumciſed him the* 8th. *day*, which priviledg was peculiar to *Abraham*, and to none other I know, except *Zachary John Baptiſts* father be ſaid to have the ſame priviledge. nor is *Rom* 3. 1, 2, 3, 4. any whit to M. *Cs*. purpoſe, to prove that *circumciſion is reckoned as the Fathers priviledge*. For 1. it is manifeſt that *Rom*. 3. 1. *Circumciſion* is to be underſtood metonymically, as *v*. 30. for the circumciſed, ſuch it is not ſaid there was much profit by Circumciſion, but of *Circumciſion*, as before, *what advantage of the Jew?* nor was the priviledge *v*. 2. the committing the oracles of God to them, the priviledge of Circumciſion in the abſtract, or by circumciſion as the means by which it was, but the priviledge of that people who were circumciſed. 2. If it were

gran-

granted that the priviledge were by Circumcision, yet that it was the Fathers priviledge by reason of the childs Circumcision rather then his own, is a vain fancy. Nor doth *Acts* 2. 38, 39. yeild any more to his purpose, but is most grosly abused by Mr. *C.* as is shewed before §. 22, 23. Nor are the passages which he alledgeth p. 132. out of my *Examen*, *dissonant to any passages before or any after*, except those words of my *Examen* p. 108. which I alter in the first part of this *Review*, p. 94, 95. And to his many questions from my words. I answer, that he hath not proved the Covenant of grace, wherein God promiseth to be a God to them and theirs, to belong to every Jew but onely to *Abraham* and his seed, that is, so far as it is Evangeliacl onely to his spiritual seed whether of Jewes or Gentiles, and therefore I deny it was a priviledge which every Jew had, *to be a God to them and theirs*; and yet grant that *Deut.* 29. 14. with 6. *was a priviledge*, and so I yeeld to have been what God promised *Ezek.* 36. from the 17. to the end, and *Deut.* 14. 2. and that sundry infants of the Jews base born were in the Covenant of saving grace and Church-priviledges, and that it was a priviledge to them, and that the promises of the Covenant of grace are priviledges, and the same now to believers and as large and honourable as then, and that the promises to their children mentioned *Deut.* 30. 6. were of the substance of the Covenant of grace, in respect of the thing promised, but not in respect of the persons to whom, for God doth not promise to all his elect or true believers, that which he promised then in that case to the Israelites for their seed, and I yeild that even base-born children may bee in the Covenant of saving grace, and yet these promises are not made *to Church children*, (as Mr. *C.* speaks) as such, but onely to the elect. Nevertheless I grant the same promises now to bee made to believers, which were then, to wit, righteousness and life eternal by faith, yea that they are larger now, not intensively in respect of the thing promised, as if a greater degree of righteousness and eternal life, were promised now then was then, but extensively in respect of the people to whom the Gentiles now being called, and that more amply then the Jews, nor do I or any thing I say, exclude believers children out of the Covenant. But I still say, the Covenant of grace was not made then universally to a Believer and his natural seed, nor now, but onely to the elect of them. Yet this is not an exclusion of any in particular from the Covenant of grace, nor an inclusion, but onely a suspension of any determination of either, who are elect, and who not, being onely known to God. And therefore to Mr. *C.*s question *why are belie ers children then excluded the Covenant?* which injuriously insinuates as if I did exclude them, I say, let him answer it that doth so. And though I grant that our priviledges now are inlarged, in respect of the administration of the Covenant, in that the Gospel is preached to more nations and more clearly, and confirmed by the blood of Christ &c. then before Christs coming (which is my meaning in that speech) yet it neither follows that I count *that administration of the Covenant initiatory seal* (which is Mr. *C.*s terms not mine) *as such, to their children was no priviledge: or there must be such a like priviledge and not straitned, at least not wholly excluded, as that of a like, though Mr. C. so*) not the

the same, but a like administration of the initiatory Covenant-seal, to in-churched believers children now, as Mr. *C.* in his gibberish speaks. And though I say we have nothing in lieu of Circumcision, but Christ come in the flesh; yet I do not say, nor need I, that Baptism is no priviledge to believers now: but I deny it to be a priviledge in lieu of Circumcision, and say that as Mr. *C.* grants it *a priviledge to believers, that now they have not that manner of initiation by circumcision*, so it is a priviledge to them that they have no manner of initiation in lieu of it. What he saith he hath shew'd before from *Ez.* 37.25,26,27. is examin'd before.

Sect. 5. Mr. *C.* saith, *Baptism is a seal of the Covenant, no bare badge of Christianity as some have said, albeit the more judicious of our opposites yeild this, that the Covenant of grace is said properly to be sealed in Baptism, and that Baptism since Christs incarnation is the appointed seal of God to such as enter into covenant with him.*

Answ. It is true that I said *Exam* p. 149. the Covenant of grace is sealed properly in Baptism, but Mr. *C.* might have taken notice, that 1. I used not this phrase as mine, but as Mr. *Ms.* 2. That I did yeild this but three lines before with this caution, Baptism seals the love of God in some sense properly. 3. That not long after I say, that in exactness of speech it seals no grace properly, taking it for propriety of speech, but improperly, because metaphorically, as sealing is taken for assuring. 4. I say as properly, notes propriety of right, or title, or possession, in opposition to anothers, or that which is alien, it seals as much the second as the first grace. And indeed this is my meaning, that though in propriety of speech Baptism may not be said to be the seal of the Covenant of grace properly, sith it is but a metaphor or term translated from another thing, and so shews not what the thing is, but what in some respect it is like to: yet it may bee thus termed the seal of the Covenant of grace properly, that is, as the seal of a deed assures the thing conveyed in it to him that hath propriety in it, so Baptism in that thereby we put on Christ, doth signifie to the true Believer that he hath union and communion with him, and that he hath thereby a propriety of right to righteousness and life by Christ, according to the Covenant of grace. But this doth no whit contradict what I have disputed before sect. 31. against Mr *Ms.* and others doctrine, about Sacraments being seals of the Covenant of grace. Nor did I use the words, that Baptism since Christs incarnation is the appointed seal of God to such as enter into Covenant with him, *Exam. p.* 83. as mine own expression, but as Mr. *Ms.* though I granted the thing meant by it. Yet had I so said of my self, it had not been for Mr. *Cs.* turn, who will have it a seal of Gods Covenant to us, whereas those words as *I* yeild them, rather import it to be our seal whereby we enter into Covenant with God, and engage to him, which is the most genuine use of Baptism, and in that respect rightly termed a badge of Christianity. But Mr. *C.* would prove it a seal of the Covenant in another sense, thus.

And it appears so, saith he, 1. *in that it agrees in the essentials with circumcision as an initiatory seal, Col.* 2.11,12. which speech is ambiguous, and yet in no sense, I conceive, true. It is doubtfull whether he mean that to

to be the initiatory seal is the essentials of Circumcision, and of Baptism, but this sense is false: For to be a seal is not essential either to the one or the other, the circumcision of the *Sichemites* was circumcision, though it were no seal to them of the Covenant of *Abraham*; and *Simon Magus* his baptism was baptism, though it were no seal to him of the Covenant of grace, much less is it of the essence of either to bee initiatory, for if there were or might be another initiatory seal (as doubtless there might be if God had so appointed it) yet circumcision and baptism had not been circumcision and baptism, now what may be or not be without the ceasing of the thing to be is but an accident to it, not of the essence of it. Besides, to be the initiatory seal of the Covenant of grace, doth more truly agree to the spirit of God, then to either of them. Or whether he mean, that they agree in those things which are the essentials of each, but that is more palpably false, for it is essential to Circumcision that the fore-skin be cut off, but that is not essential to Baptism, there may bee Baptism without it. Nor is there a word *Col.* 2. 12. that either expresseth this thing or yeilds any ground for proof of it, as is shewed before by me here §. 81.

As vain is that which follows, *whence baptized Gentiles are said to be of the circumcision*, Phil. 3. *and Jews said to be baptized*, 1 Cor. 12. For neither are Gentiles, *Philip.* 3. 3. termed *the circumcision*, because they were baptized, nor the Jews said to be *baptized*, 1 Cor. 12. 13. because they were circumcised, or because of the agreement of these in the essentials. But the converted Gentiles, not all that were baptized; but onely those, who were true believers are termed the Circumcision in opposition to the Judaizing Teachers termed befor *v.* 2. *the concision* by a figure of speech, termed Euteliſm, or slighting them in that in which they gloried; and they are termed the Circumcision, because they were truly circumcised before God in heart, and were his people. And the Jews 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. are said to be baptized no otherwise then the Gentiles who believed, who were not circumcised in the flesh, and therefore could not be termed baptized because circumcised; but Christian believers, whether Jews or Greeks, bond or free, are all said to be baptized, and to be made to drink, because they were baptized with water, and did partake of the Lords Supper, as 1 *Cor.* 10 17.

Mr. *C.* adds more of these toys. *Hence first instituted for a seal to the circumcised Jews; to shew it was in the essentials of sealing* Abrahams *covenant to them but the same with circumcision in a manner; onely as that sealed it to them visibly in Christ, as to come, this did it in like sort in reference to Christ as come; that was the seal of the righteousness of* Abrahams *faith, or that whereon his faith acted to righteousness of justification, Rom.* 4. 11. *even the promise of grace in Christ, Rom.* 10. 6, 7. *with Deut.* 30. 14. Wherein 1. he dictates, without any pretence of proof, that Baptism was first instituted to the Jews to shew that which he says; nor is there the least intimation thereof in Scripture. 2. He seems to me to unsay by his limitation [*in a manner*] what he said before, *it was the same in the essentials.* For that which is the same in the essentials is altogether the same, and not in a manner. 3. It is false that *baptism was the same in the essentials of sealing* Abrahams *covenant to the Jews with circumcision*

circumcision: For it was as much in the essentials of sealing *Abrahams* Covenant to the Jews (if I may use Mr. *C's.* gibberish) that Circumcision sealed the promise of the land of *Canaan*, *Gen.*17.8,9,10, *&c.* as that it sealed Christ to come; but surely Baptism never sealed the promise of the land of *Canaan*. 4. That which I find of *the seal of the righteousnesse of faith*, *Rom.*4.11. is meant of *Abrahams* personal Circumcision, and of no other, and therefore is ineptly applied to prove sameness of sealing of others Circumcision and Baptism. 5. I conceive it somewhat inconsiderately said, that *Circumcision was the seal of the righteousnesse of* Abrahams *faith*, which would imply, that it assured that *Abraham* faith was righteous, whereas the meaning is, that it assured that *Abraham* had righteousness by faith before he was circumcised, as *v* 10. he had asserted. 6. The other explication is worse, for it insinuates as if the Apostle meant that the righteousness of faith ascribed to *Abraham* is so termed, as that *whereon his faith acted to righteousnesse of justification, even the promise of grace in Christ*; whereas the meaning is not that it sealed the righteousness he was to obtain by acting faith in a promise, but that it was a seal of the righteousness of faith which he had many years before he was circumcised.

Mr. *C.* goes on in the same vein of dictating thus. *Hence when Christ is called the minister of circumcision, it is thus explained by the end of the sign administred*, (viz. *to confirm the promises made unto the Fathers*, *Rom.* 15.8. *Act.*7.8. *Gen.*17.11. Which speech seems to insinuate, as if Christ were termed *the minister of circumcision*, as if he did minister Circumcision to that end, *to confirm the promises*: But that is too absurd for such a man to vent, sith he ministred Circumcision to none; and the meaning is plain, that he was *the minister of circumcision*, that is of the circumcised Jews among whom he preached and lived, as *Peter* is said *Gal* 2.8. to have had *the Apostleship of the circumcision*, that is, of the circumcised Jews: And in this sense *Beza*, *Willet*, *Diodati* the *new Annot.*, *Dicson*, *Piscator*, *&c.* expound it. Now this being premised, it is easie to perceive how impertinently this Text, which mentions not at all Baptism, nor any use of Circumcision at all, but onely the end of Christs ministry among the circumcised is alledged, to prove *that Baptism agrees in the essentials with Circumcision as an initiatory seal*. The Texts, *Act.* 7.8. *Gen.*17.11. are as little to the purpose, there being no mention of Baptism, and they onely proving what is not denied, that Circumcision was the token of *Abrahams* Covenant. As little is that which follows, *Hence the promise premised and then Baptism annexed as the seal*, *Act.*2.38. For neither is it proved, that the promise there is the same with *Abrahams* Covenant, and how impertinently Mr. *C.* mistakes the meaning of it is shewed before, *sect.*12,13. nor a word about Baptism as a seal annexed to the promise, but an exhortation to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for remission of sins and assurance of the gift of the Holy Ghost, which are annexed to repentance as much as to baptism.

What he adds, *Hence that washing annexed to the word*, *Ephes.*5.25, 26. But that *the word* there is the word of promise, much less of *Abrahams*

hams Covenant *Gen.*17, or that it is mentioned as ſealed by Baptiſm, or that therein it agrees with Circumciſion, is not proved. *The word* is the Goſpel preached by which men are made believers, and then baptized, and ſo purified, as *Act.*15.9. *Tit.*3.5. *Act.*10.32. *&* 26.18. *Joh.* 3.15. *&* 17.17. *&c.* Nor is it any more pertinent which follows.

2. Saith he, *It's a baptizing in the name or covenant-fellowſhip of God the Father, Son, and Spirit: he having exalted his word above all his name, Pſal.*138.2 Wherein 1. he ſeems to expound *baptizing, Matth.* 28.19. *into the name of the Father, Son, and Spirit*, thus, into the Covenant-fellowſhip; which is ſomewhat ſtrange, there being neither there, nor elſewhere (where the like phraſe is uſed) any mention of Covenant, or Covenant-fellowſhip; and his arguing, *God hath exalted his word above all his name, Pſal.*138.2. *Ergo*, baptizing is in the name and Covenant-fellowſhip of God the Father, Son, and Spirit, *is a baculo ad angulum.* 2. But were his expoſition allowed, yet what this is to prove that Baptiſm is a ſeal of the Covenant, *Gen.*17. or any other Covenant, I am yet to divine. Is baptizing all one with ſealing? is Covenant-fellowſhip all one with the Covenant?

3. Saith he, *It's a ſeal of the remiſſion of ſins, and therefore of the promiſe tendering the ſame, hence joyned, Act.*2.38,39. *Act.*22. But neither is the promiſe there joyned as a thing ſealed by Baptiſm, but as a motive to the duties of Repentance and Baptiſm; nor is the remiſſion of ſins mentioned as ſealed by Baptiſm, but as a conſequent obtained by Repentance and Baptiſm as conditions pre-required thereto; nor is a ſeal of remiſſion of ſins all one with a ſeal of the Covenant.

4. Saith he, *The nature of it ſheweth the ſame, it being a Goſpel Sacrament, and that is a viſible ſeal, and the ſeal is to the Covenant; hence called by the name, Act.*7.8. 1 *Cor.*11.25.

Anſw. 1. The term Sacrament, as it is applied to the rites of Baptiſm and the Lords Supper, is no Scripture term, nor any other anſwerable to it in that uſe; it's a term, as I ſaid rightly in my *Plea for Antipædobaptiſts, ſect.*1. invented by the Latine Fathers meaning for that uſe. Mr *Craggs reply* in his pamphlet, termed *The arraignment and conviction of Anabaptiſm*, that *it is uſed in the twelve tables, in Tully pro Milone*, ſhews he had a mind to cavil rather then to anſwer fairly; nor is the book throughout any other then a fardle of miſtakings in Logick, and meaning of Scripture, and of cavils againſt my words, mixt with much Poetical lightneſs, and ſcoffing, to which there's no need I ſhould return any more then the Archangels words, *The Lord rebuke thee.* 2. Nor is there any common nature of Sacraments that I know of delivered or intimated in Scripture, either that of the Schoolmen out of *Auſtin*, that *they are viſible ſigns of inviſible grace*: or of the Proteſtants who are termed *Calviniſts*, that *they are ſeals of the Covenant of grace*: And therefore Mr. *C.* ſhould firſt prove that to be of the nature of a Goſpel Sacrament, as the term is uſed, afore he inferred ſo much as he doth from it. 3. A ſeal, it is true, is to a Covenant ſometimes, and ſometimes it is to a decree, writ, letter, record of a thing done, and ſo it is taken *Rom.* 4.11. where *Abrahams* Circumciſion is not ſaid to be a ſeal of the Cove-

nant

nant wherein ſomething further was promiſed, but *of the righteouſneſs of faith* which he had before attained. 4. *Act.* 7. 8. the Covenant of grace is not called by the name of a Goſpel Sacrament, but the Covenant made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. is onely termed *the covenant of circumciſion*, becauſe it was ſignified by it, which was no Goſpel, but a Law rite. The Cup in the Lords Supper, 1 *Cor.* 11. 25. is termed *the New Teſtament in Chriſts bloud*, wherein there ſeems to be an *hypallage* and inverſion by the words as they are in *Matth.* ch. 26. 28. *Mar.* 14 24. and by conſidering that of the bread he ſpake thus, *this is my body*, and therefore the words of the cup ſeem to be moſt fitly thus placed and expounded, *this cup*, that is the wine in it, *is my bloud*, that is ſignifies my bloud, *which is the bloud of the New Teſtament*, that is by which the New Teſtament is dedicated as the old was by the bloud of calves and goats, *Heb.* 9. 18, 19, 20. Now herein is the notion rather of a Teſtament then of a Covenant, and what is ſaid is ſaid of the cup onely in the Lords Supper, not of Baptiſm: Nor is it named the Covenant, but *the bloud of the New Teſtament*, or *the New Teſtament in Chriſts bloud*; nor is the term *ſeal* there uſed, and therefore there is not a word to prove Baptiſm to be in its nature a ſeal of the Covenant of grace, in this or any other of the Texts Mr. *C.* alledgeth.

I paſs over that which he ſaith, ſecondly *Baptiſm is an initiatory ſeal*, as agreeing with him in the poſition, that Baptiſm is that which is to be firſt afore the Lords Supper, though his phraſes be miſliked. I agree with him alſo, that *Baptiſm being once adminiſtred, needs never be renewed*, if done according to Chriſts inſtitution. Yet what I ſaid, *Exam. par.* 2. *ſect.* 4. ſeems to me to ſtand good, notwithſtanding any thing here ſaid by Mr. *C.* nor do I think it fit to queſtion whether it be *the onely initiatory ſeal*.

The 6th. Section contains nothing but dictates without proof, and what is ſaid by way of proof is anſwered either *ſect.* 38, *&c.* in the animadverſions on the 3d. *ch.* of the firſt part of Mr. *C's.* book, or in anſwer to Mr. *Carter*, *ſect.* 80. In which it is ſhewed, that there is no reference made *Gen.* 17. to a Church Covenant diſtinct from the Covenant of grace, nor any command given *Gen.* 17. 9, 10. to a Gentile believer and his ſeed, nor any general law about an initiatory ſeal never repealed, as Mr. *C.* and others faſn. And for his ſpeech he uſeth, that *the Hebrew Church albeit* quà *ſuch a political Church and national*, &c. *differ from congregational Churches*; *yet* qua viſibilis Eccleſia politica & ordinaria *ſo it was eſſentially the ſame with ours*; it ſeems to intimate, that the Church of the Hebrews, though as ſuch a political Church it was national, yet not as a viſible Church political and ordinary, as if it were any otherwiſe a viſible political ordinary Church then as ſuch a Church: And when he ſaith, *as a Church viſible political ordinary it was eſſentially the ſame with ours*, he can mean it no otherwiſe then of the ſame numerical eſſence; for as viſible and political the eſſence is determined to *hic & nunc*, an univerſal generical or ſpecifical Church is not viſible and poliſical. But that is falſe, ſith if the perſons be not the ſame, they cannot have the ſame numerical eſſence: Nor can he mean it, that it is *eſſenti-*

ally

ally the same with ours as visible in the same form of government, for then he must make ours Pontificial; nor in the same title to Church-membership, for then he must make ours national: nor can he avoid it if he will maintain this plea, that the Jewish Church was essentially the same with ours, and as their infants were circumcised as children of Churchmembers, in a Church visible, political, ordinary, which was national, so ours upon the same reason are to bee baptized, but that hee must set up a national Church by natural generation, nor can they of *N. E.* justifie their way of excluding such children from the Lords Supper for ignorance, if they may for scandal. The old objection, which Mr. *C.* falsly terms *cavil touching covenant females*, is not yet answered, nor ever will be, it will still infringe this universal proposition, All that are in Covenant with reference to Church-covenant are to have the iniriatory seal for a time, and so will also that of *Jobs* family, which why it should not be counted a visible political ordinary Church, as well as *Abrahams* house in his time I see not, and if none are to be baptized but such as are in an *ordinary visible political Church to abide*, how can they of *N. E.* baptize the infants of such Churchmembers, as whether in *N. E.* or old do not abide, but are quickly dissolved as we see by experience? And if *None but those who are in the covenant of grace in reference to Church covenant are to be baptized, but though believers because in* Rome *or* India *they are not a formed matter of a political visible Church, but they are as* materia informis, *they are* quoad homines *actually without, and not within any political visible Church*, how was the Eunuch baptized *Acts* 8? And if *the covenant of grace nakedly considered giveth a person which is actually in it, a remote right to the initiatory seal, but it doth not give an immediate right thereto, for so the covenant of grace as invested with Church covenant onely giveth this proximate right to that seal. God being the God of order, will have that his Church seal to be attained in a way of order; as of old strangers might not be circumcised, but with some submission to that Church order explicitely or implicitely, and so now*, and the order be as Mr. *C.* in the 5th. section determines, *to be observed of communion in breaking bread after they were baptized*, how do those of *N. E.* admit to breaking of bread, those who who onely as born in a Parish were baptized in infancy, without another baptism? That either *Matth.* 28. 19, 20. or any where else *the orderly and ordinary dispensation of the seal is committed to the visible Church*, is more then I finde; nor do I know it *necessary to right order that believers must be of a particular visible Church afore they be baptized. If Catechumini in covenant and visible Church estate might bee hindered from Baptism for trial for a time*, much more should infants of whom we have no knowledge concerning their future or present estate, be in prudence put off from Baptism till there be some trial of them, if their right were, as Mr. C. doth, though falsly, imagine.

Sect. 7. Mr. C. speaks thus, *And because in this particular some stress of the main case is put, 1. I shall endeavour yet further to confirm it, that covenant interest carrieth a main stroak in point of application of that seal, to persons interested therein, and not uncapable thereof in any bodily respect.*

Answ. This proposition being that in which *some stress*, or as I conceive, *the whole stress of the main case is put*, should have been delivered more clearly, and confirmed more fully, but as now it is, it is delivered ambiguously, and so is fitter to delude a Reader then to instruct him. That seal which was last mentioned was Baptism, but the proofs following shew that he meant it of Circumcision, and as if there were the same reason of Circumcision and of Baptism (which neither he nor any Pædobaptist ever proved) what is said of Circumcision is by him meant of Baptism, and so the Reader merely mocked. The application of Baptism or Circumcision may either refer to Gods appl ing it by way of command, or mans by way of administration, and in this I think Mr. *Cs.* speeches are delusory, sometimes meant of Gods application by way of command, and sometimes of the administrators act in circumcising or baptizing. The phrase of *carrying the main stroak* is likewise ambiguous, and so delusory, it being uncertain whether it carry the main stroke with God as his motive to appoint it, or with the administratour as his rule and warrant to do it. And when he terms it the *main stroak*, it had been requisite hee should tell whether there be not some other thing which carries a stroak if not the main, yet so great, as that without it the application of the seal is not warrantable, as profession of faith by the person to whom it is to bee applied. Hee might have understood by my *Examen*, which he had to answer, that I took it a great fault in Mr. *M.* that hee did not more distinctly tell what hee meant by *the Covenant*, *being in covenant*, which hee speaks of infants of believers. And sure if Mr. *C.* had meant to deal rightly, as one that sought truth, and to shew my errour, he should have cleared what Covenant hee meant inward or outward, the Covenant of Gospel grace purely delivered, or the mixt Covenant made with *Abraham Gen.* 17. what the Church covenant is, how the Covenant of grace is invested with it, when a Church is a political visible body, how a Church covenant is the form of it, who and what persons and how they are interested in it, whether by Gods promise, their own faith or profession or anothers, or by the Churches admission. All which, or at least many of them, are requisite to bee distinctly declared, that a reader may clearly understand his meaning, and so examine his proof. And whether the exception of *incapacity in any bodily respect*, be meant onely because of the females circumcision, or thereby infants are excepted from Baptism, who have not the use of their tongues to profess the faith of Christ, and are not well able to brook that dipping or plunging (which for all Mr. *Cs.* scriblings, is and will be found the onely way of baptizing appointed by Christ) is uncertain. This were a sufficient reason for me to answer no further to this proposition, but to wait till his Bill be mended. Yet I shall examine his proofs of this, which should be his meaning, if he spake to his purpose; That the interest which a person though an infant hath to the Covenant of grace, in that he is a believers child by vertue of the promise of God to a believer and his seed, when that believer is a member of a visible political Church by Church covenant explicit or implicit, is a sufficient warrant to that visible political

Church

Church to admit, and to the Elder to baptize that infant without any other revelation of God, or profession of the infant. Let's now see what Mr. *C.* brings for proof of this.

First, saith he, *then it is the ground-work given to the general Law about an initiatory Covenant duty*, scil. *application of some injoyned initiatory seal, and therefore must be of like force in the particular branches and ways of such initiatory sealing, as circumcision and baptizing.*

Answ. Such a general Law is a mere fiction, and what is meant by the ground-work of it is uncertain. *Gen.* 17.9,10. is no other Law but about circumcision, the word rendred [therefore] may bee otherwise translated, if it were the onely reading yet the sense might be this, because I make this Covenant thou shalt therefore circumcise thy males to keep it in remembrance, or to assure thee and thy posterity that I will perform it. But that there is any such intimation as if the persons circumcised were circumcised as and for their interest in that Covenant is a mere dream often refuted by mee, much more is it a dotage to assert, that according to a persons interest in that Covenant or a part of it, as Mr. *C.* conceives, so they have right to Baptism in the Christian church.

Secondly, saith Mr. *C. the Covenant in such sort invested with Church covenant, now it is the form of a political visible Church body; giving therefore, both a Church-being as I may say, as natural forms do a natural being, and withall the priviledge of a member of such a church-body, suitable to its memberly estate, as if this of the Church initiatory seal, even to the least member thereof, although they are not yet so perfect in all actual energy of compleat members, and so neither in all actual priviledges of such compleat members. I suppose what ever others deny this way, yet our opposites do not deny, that Church-covenant explicit or implicit is the form of a visible political Church as such; so that till that bee, they are not so incorporated as to bee fit for Church dispensations, or acts of peculiar Church power over each other, more then over others, over whom they can have no power, unless they had given explicit or implicit consent thereto: as reason will evince.*

Answ. This reason as I conceive goes upon these suppositions, which Mr. *C.* conceives will not be denied. 1. That there is a Church-covenant over and besides Gods covenant of Gospel grace, and mans believing and professing of faith in him through Jesus Christ, whereby the members of a visible political Church do engage themselves to walk together in Christian communion, and to submit to their rulers, and to each other in the Lord. Now such a Church covenant, though I confess it may be according to prudence at some times and in some cases usefull to keep persons, who otherwise would bee unsetled, in a fixed estate of communion, yet I find not any example of such a Church covenant in the old or new Testament, and in some cases it may insnare mens consciences more then should be. 2. That *the Covenant of grace*, whether Gods promise to us or ours to God *invested with Church covenant*, that is, as I conceive Mr. *C.* meaning to be, together with it, *is the form of a visible political Church, which gives it the being of such a Church, as such, so that*

till that be they are not so incorporated as to be fit for Church dispensations, or Church power. In which I conceive are many mistakes. 1. That the Sacraments are seals, or church dispensations are committed to the Church, which are not committed to the Church, which consists of men and women, but to the guides and over-seers of it. 2. That Church power, or as Mr. *Cotton* in his *treatise of the keyes of the Church*, *the power of the keyes* is committed or given to the Church; in which are mistakes that either censures Ecclesiastical, or as the Schoolmen and Canonists term it, the power of ordination and jurisdiction Ecclesiastical are meant by *the keyes*, *Matth.* 16. 19. or that they were given to *Peter* as representing the Church: the Scripture doth no where commit Church dispensations or power to the Church, but to the guides, and overseers and rulers of the Church for the Church. 3. That till a company of believers be a visible political Church, they are not fit for church dispensations or censures: which I conceive not true, there being examples in Scripture of their breaking bread together, *Acts* 2. who were not such a political visible Church of fixed members under fixed officers united by Church covenant, as Mr. *C.* describes. Nor were Christ and his Apostles such a Church when first they did break bread. Nor did Christ appoint Baptism *Matth.* 28. 19. to be onely in and with such a Church; nor do the exampls *Acts* 2. or 8. or 10 or 16. or 18. intimate any such condition, but rather the contrary. 4. That the covenant of grace with a church covenant fore-mentioned, give the being of such a visible Church political. But the Covenant of grace of it self doth not give any actual being, it is a promise of something future, and therefore puts nothing in actual being *extra causas*, but assures it shall bee by some cause in act, which in this thing is the calling of God, from which the Church and each member have their being as from the efficient, from faith in the heart as the form of the invisible Church and each member, from profession of faith as the form of the visible Church and each member, as *Ames. Med. Th. lib.* 1. *cap.* 32. *Sect.* 7. that which makes it political is the union under officers and lawes, without a Church covenant it is a political visible Church, if there bee but at present an union or conjunction in the same profession of Christian faith under officers and lawes of a number of Christians they are a Church visible political, though they should be dissolved the next hour, and though they enter into no covenant of Church-fellowship or subjection for the future, and therefore church covenant is neither of the form of such a true Church, nor (as Mr. *Weld* in answer to Mr. *Rathbard*) *of a pure Church*, but it is a good means in prudence to conserve a Church so constituted, that they may not divide and scatter from each other, but may continue in communion. 5. *That by this incorporating they have peculiar Church power over each other, and without the Church covenant they can have no power.* But neither do I conceive this true. For the power which Christians have is to reprove, admonish, censure, shun society, chuse officers, reject false teachers, &c. this power they have by the laws of *Christ*, without a church covenant. 6. *That Church dispensations and acts of peculiar Church power are limited*

to

to those particular persons who joyn with us by Church covenant. But this I conceive not right nor agreeable to such Scriptures as these, 1 *Cor.* 3. 22. & 10. 17. & 12. 13.

3. It is supposed by Mr. *C.* that *the Covenant with Church covenant gives the priviledge of a member of such a church body suitable to its memberly estate, as is this of the Church initiatory seal.* But in this sure Mr. *C.* is quite out and besides their own practise, who do not give the initiatory seal after they are members by church covenant, but baptize them or suppose them baptized in infancy, and then joyn them as members by church covenant; now if church covenant did give the priviledge of the initiatory seal, then they should first enter into church covenant, and then have the initiatory seal or be baptized.

4. It is supposed by Mr. *C.* that *there are such little churchmembers by such a covenant as are to have the priviledge of the initiatory seal though they be not compleat members, so as to have the actual priviledge of the after seal, and other church power.* But sure the Scripture acknowledgeth in the Christian church no members, but what partake of the Lords Supper as well as baptism (as is manifest from 1 *Cor.* 10. 17. 1 *Cor.* 12. 13.) and have church power as others of their sex and rank.

Now all these suppositions though they were granted (except the last) would not prove the thing Mr. *C.* aims at, and that which he makes the main reason from whence he would infer the conclusion, namely, *the Covenant with Church covenant gives being and priviledge of the initiatory seal,* makes against him, infants making no such Church covenant, nor according to their own discipline doth their parents Church covenant serve instead of the childs; sith afore the child can bee admitted to communion of breaking of bread, and other power of a member, and bee taken for a member, hee must himself enter into church covenant.

"Thirdly, saith Mr. *C.* even in doubtfull cases, where the extent of "the command is questionable, yet interest in the Covenant casts the "scoals. As for instance, in strangers which proved religious, albeit "not of their family servants, and so under the Law, *Gen.* 17. 12, 13. "they might be circumcised if they desired other Church ordinances, "*&c.* yet were they else free, unless in such a case of their own de- "sire that way, *Exod.* 12. *end.* Hence *Cornelius* a godly Gentile, li- "ving near the Jews yet not circumcised, *Acts.* 10. 1, 2, 3, 4. com- "pared with chap. 11 3, 14, 15, 18. yea but if the command bound "them why were they circumcised? suppose *Exod.* 12. gave some li- "berty to the Church guides that way, for such strangers as more usu- "ally dwelt amongst them; yet such as 1 *Kings* 8. 41, 42, 43. which came "from far, in a mere transient way, for some temporary religious wor- "ship at the Temple, as that prosely ted Eunuch *Acts* 8. 27. those "were surely circumcised, else how admitted to Temple worship? "Since that was counted an abomination, for any other so much as "to come there, *Acts* 21. 28. and if circumcised at any time by any "of the godly Church guides consent, what gave them right to it?

"not

" not the commandment, *Gen.*17.12,13,14. no nor that *Exod.* 12.
" What was that to an Eunuchs case and others which never sojourned
" with them for any space? were they then unlawfully circumcised?
" No verily, no whisper of that in Scripture; God allowed of that
" passage in *Solomons* prayer, touching the strangers Temple service,
" 1 *Kin.*8. & 9. explained. It was then their external interest in Gods
" Covenant, which gave rise to that application of the seal, and not
" the commandment; contrary to what some say, that not the Co-
" venant, but the commandment of God onely, was the ground of Cir-
" cumcision.

Answ. That which I said in my *Exercit.* p.4. Hence I gather, first, that the right to Evangelical promises, was not the adequate reason of circumcising these or those, but Gods precept as is expressed *Gen.*17.23. *Gen.*21.4. Secondly, that those terms are not convertible [federate and to be signed] and in my *Examen*, p.38. that nothing but Gods will manifest in his institution can be a warrant about Circumcision, p.97. that the Jews received Circumcision as appointed them from God, under this formal reason, and no other, I have shewed before to have been acknowledged by Mr. *M.* in his *Defence*; p.92. when he said, *The command is the cause of the existence of the duty:* and p.182. *The formal reason of their being circumcised was the command of God.* Nor is it at all infringed by this reasoning of Mr. *C.* Those that were not bound without their desire to eat the Passeover, and so not to be circumcised, yet if they would eat the Passeover they were bound by an express command to be circumcised, *Exod.*12.48,49. whether their sojourning was constant, or for a time onely, which likely was the case of the Eunuch, *Act.* 8.27. who it's probable was circumcised, because there is no mention of the baptizing any uncircumcised till *Cornelius*, though there be no certainty whether the Eunuch were a Jew by birth, or a proselyte of the Gentiles, or whether he formerly had his constant abode among the Jews, either in *Palæstina*, or elsewhere, or whether then he did sojourn among the Jews then in *Æthiopia*. But if he were a meer proselyte of the gate, yet he might come to the Temple into the Court of the Gentiles to worship, as all acknowledge. Dr. *Lightfoot* of the *Temple service*, *ch.*1. Mr. *Mede Diatr.* on *Act.*17.4. &c. And therefore there is no proof from hence, that a person was circumcised by reason of the Covenant, and not of the command: Yea, though *Cornelius* were in the Covenant of grace, and had external Covenant interest, in that he was known to worship the true God, yet was he not by reason thereof bound by God, or taken by the Jews as one that was bound to be circumcised, or ever blamed for want of it; which shews that neither was the Covenant interest indeed, nor taken by the Jews for the warrant or rule, or reason of circumcising, but the command of God.

" Fourthly (*saith Mr.* C.) it appears from the nature of an initiato-
" ry seal of the Covenant, which must be as large as the Covenant, and
" so reach all the parties comprehended actually by vertue of Cove-
" nant, according as such children are, as before declared: especially,
" since it is the seal of Gods people and visible Church as before shew-
" ed

"ed, given first for the Church, in giving of Pastours and Teachers "onely to the Church, which alone can administer the seals in ordi- "nary dispensations, *Matth.* 28. end, and giving them withall to the "Church, as from her to be dispensed by her Officers, to such as desire "the same.

Answ. In stead of proofs here is a heap of dictates, 1. That Baptism is the initiatory seal of the Covenant in its nature. 2. That it must be as large as the Covenant. 3. That Pastours and Teachers given onely to the Church can alone administer the seals in ordinary dispensations, *Matth.* 28.19,20. 4. That the seals are given to the Church, as from her to be dispensed by her Officers, to such as desire the same. None of which will be yeelded by me, without better proof then I yet meet with. Sure *Matth.* 28.19,20. yeelds no proof for any of them. It proves Baptism was to be administred by the Apostles, not every seal by Church Officers.

He goes on, "Now Gods people are known, either by actual pro- "fession and confession of their own, as adults are; or by Gods promise "and by parents avouching God as theirs in Covenant and their chil- "drens, *Gen.* 17.9,10. thou shalt do thus, and thus, and thy seed also; "to which he submitteth afterwards, and so his also with him and af- "ter him.

Answ. That Gods people are known by Gods promise, and by parents avouching God as theirs in Covenant, and their childrens, is another dictate, which Mr. *C.* brings not a shew of proof for out of the New Testament; nor doth that which he brings from *Gen.* 17.9,10. prove it concerning the infants of the Jewish Church. For though there be a command to *Abraham* and his posterity to circumcise, and this is termed *keeping Gods Covenant*, yet there is not a word of parents profession, or Gods promise as making known who are Gods people, no not in the Jewish Church, in which there were many to whom God made no promise, nor parents avouched for them, who were known as Gods people by vertue of Gods taking the whole nation for his Church, even when the Kings and people were Idolaters. But if it were true that it were as Mr. *C.* would, this proves nothing concerning the people of God in the Christian Church, in which none are known to be Gods people, but by their own confession of faith.

But Mr. *C.* adds, *Besides the main in the initiatory seal to be firstly and properly attended, as it is a covenant and Church seal is covenant and Church interest. Hence called by the name of covenant, when yet it is but a sacramental sign and seal of it, Gen.* 17.13. *Act.* 7.8. *that is first held out and sealed, as the convoy of all other desired good,* 2 *Pet.* 1.4. *But especially in that initiatory seal the signation of the covenant, is of more considerable weight, then the external symbole, ceremony and circumstance: either of cutting or washing absolutely or relatively considered. If washing of a person in the name of the Trinity, be a clearer and easier symbole then that of cutting the flesh, yet not of such weight as is the covenant sealed both by the one and the other. And to shew that the covenant is the main thing considerable therein; hence it is that the covenant is first propounded as the ground-*

work

work of the commandment it self, as of Circumcision, so of Baptism, and much more of the application of either, to any in covenant, Gen. 17.9,10,11. *Therefore*, scil. *because I have said I will be your God, I command you to do thus and thus; not because I have commanded you, that I therefore promise to do this for you; or do you thus and thus at my command, and then on, therefore I will do so and so for you.*

Answ, After the rest of his dictates, he here tels us, *the main in the initiatory seal to be attended is the covenant*, which I grant; but deny that it follows therefore, that the rule which the administrator is to observe, according to which he is to administer it, is the persons interest in the Covenant, so as that he must administer it to all and onely those who are in Covenant, or to whom the promise is made by God. For, besides the many reasons to the contrary, even concerning Circumcision before given, Mr. *Cs.* own reason is against him. For it *the main in the initiatory seal to be firstly and properly attended as it is a Covenant and Church seal, is Covenant and Church interest, and therefore infants in Covenant to be circumcised and baptized*; by the same reason infants in Covenant are to be admitted to the Passeover, and to have the Lords Supper, sith they are seals, they are Covenant and Church seals, infants have Covenant and Church interest, in the initiatory seal these things are to be attended as it is a Covenant and Church seal, and therefore in every Covenant and Church seal as well as the initiatory. As for what he saith about *Gen.* 17.9,10,11. though I have sundry times observed that the reading [*v.9. therefore*] is not necessary; yet omitting that exception, I grant what he saith of that Text, but withal note, 1. that the command is inferred not onely from the promise *to be their God*, but also from the promise of the land of *Canaan*, *v.8.* and therefore it might as well follow, They to whom God will give the land of *Canaan* are to have the initiatory seal, as that they to whom he promiseth to be God. 2. That which is said *Gen.* 17.9,10,11. is onely of circumcision. 3. If it were granted that the covenant is *the groundwork of the command it self, as of circumcision so of baptism*, yet it follows not, *much more of the application of either to any in covenant*. For though the covenant were Gods reason, why he would appoint circumcision, yet that's no rule to us, but his command onely; a reason of the will of the commander is not always a direction about the command, certainly not about each point in the command, as *Mat.* 28.18. it follows not, *All power is given to me*, therefore preach and baptize all over whom power is given to me. Besides, in this very thing the covenant could be no direction whom to circumcise, ordinarily, sith ordinarily the circumciser could not know to whom in particular the promises, whether Evangelical, or domestical, did belong, when they were to circumcise them. Yea, though *Abraham* knew *Ishmael* had no covenant interest, there being no promise made to him in it, but the contrary declared, *Gen* 17.19,20,21. yet he was to circumcise him, and did so. The like may be said of *Esau* and others.

Mr. *C.* adds, "So the Gospel prophesie and promise is prefaced and "put in the preamble to that injunction of their baptism, by *John, Luk.* "3.3,4,5,6, *&c.*

Answ.

Answ. It is true that the propheſie of *John Baptiſts* comming and work, and of Chriſts comming, *Iſa.*40.3,4,5. (which I acknowledge to be a Goſpel promiſe) are ſet down as the warrant of *Johns* preaching the Baptiſm of repentance unto remiſſion of ſins; but this doth not prove that this was his rule in baptizing, to baptize every one, even infants, and thoſe onely who had this intereſt in the Covenant of grace, that to them and each of them God promiſed remiſſion of ſins. Yea, ſith *Johns* Baptiſm is termed the Baptiſm of repentance, it is clear he required repentance of the baptized as the antecedent to his Baptiſm, and therefore not barely ſuch Covenant intereſt as Mr. *C.* aſcribes to all infants of believers onely in profeſſion.

He goes on thus. *Hence the Goſpel, and ſo the Covenant of grace, held out as grounding Baptiſm, Act.*2.38,39. *And childrens Covenant right, was held out as one branch of that Goſpel, as we proved; and from the ſame principle, that they were alſo to be ſealed by Baptiſm; yea, albeit the Apoſtles urged repentance, yet the ſeal is propounded as to the promiſe; Peter ſaid, be baptized, for the promiſe is to you: And this was no meer moral motive, but a Scriptural groundword inforcing it, as it was a Scriptural groundwork virtually injoyning and requiring them to repent, for the promiſe is to you.*

Answ. [*Hence*] ſhould, if there were any good ſence in Mr. *Cs.* ſpeech, refer to ſomething precedent, from whence that which he ſpeaks is derived, which I diſcern not, but a dark way of dictating, fitting ſuch as love to puzzle, not to inform a reader. It is before largely ſhewed, that neither childrens Covenant right external from parents faith hath been held out by Mr. *C.* as one branch of the Goſpel, *ſect.*44. of this part of my *Review*, nor that barely from this principle they were to be baptized; but that repentance in each perſon to be baptized is made the antecedent to Baptiſm, *ſect.*22,23, and elſewhere. That *Peter* ſaid not as Mr. *C.* ſets down his words, is apparent from the Text *Act.*2.38,39. that the promiſe is urged as a motive to thoſe to whom *Peter* ſpake to do their duty of repenting, and being baptized, is ſo plain, as that Dr. *Thomas Goodwin* upon the reading the firſt part of my *Review*, *ſect.*5. did acknowledge it, and it is proved ſo *ſect.*21. here and elſewhere: Nor doth Mr. *C.* here or elſewhere ſhew it to be any other Scripture groundwork then as a motive to the baptized each of them firſt to repent, and then to be baptized, no rule by which the baptizer is to adminiſter it, or the baptized to claim it as his right without his perſonal repentance, and declaration of his faith in Chriſt into whoſe name he is to be baptized.

He adds. "So *Act.*10. *Peter* ſaith, there is no let to their Baptiſm; "and thereof he maketh the viſibility of that Covenant grace, although "common to reprobates alſo in thoſe firſt times, his groundwork ſ ga-"thering thereby, that they were not as formerly prophane, unclean, "and outlaries from the Covenant, as *Epheſ.*2.11,12. but clean and nigh "as they themſelves were.

Anſ. It is true there was no let to *Cornelius* his Baptiſm, and thoſe other who were with him, yet not meerly becauſe of their extraordinary gifts,

but because those gifts were manifested by their glorifying God, and as may be gathered from *Act.* 11.17,18. their glorifying God contained expressions of faith in Christ and repentance, which whosoever should do as they did, it is without doubt they should be baptized. But Mr. *Cs.* Covenant interest of infants, who make no shews of faith and repentance as they did *Act.* 10.46. yeelds no warrant for their Baptism.

He goes on, "Washing of regeneration is not grounded on any "thing in us or without us, so much as on Gods grace, and so Covenant "favour, *Tit.* 3.5.

Answ. It is true, this is the inward impulsive cause why God regenerates; but Gods grace, and Covenant favour is no rule to a Minister to baptize by, sith it is an unknown thing, which agrees not with the property of a rule.

"Hence also (*saith Mr.* C.) by Baptism persons are not sealed into "any thing in them so much as into the name of the Father, Son, and "Spirit, even into the Covenant name of grace, whereby he is known, "and into Covenant fellowship with the blessed Trinity, to which every "baptized person, prove he elect or reprobate, yet is thus externally "sealed.

Answ. The terming of baptizing sealing, and the name of the Father, Son, and Spirit, the Covenant name of grace, are Mr. *Cs.* new-minted phrases; if this be his meaning, that every person rightly baptized, whether he be elect or reprobate, is sealed by God, that is in Baptism assured of fellowship with the Trinity according to the new Covenant of Gospel grace, I deny it; if onely that he professeth his communion to be with them, I grant it; but this proves not that Covenant interest of infants, who make no such profession, intitles them to Baptism.

Again, saith he, "That fellowship with Christ, as head of the visible "Church by the Spirit in the judgement of verity or charity such; it is "all but Covenant grace and blessing.

Answ. Be it so: yet what this is to prove such fellowship to be a rule to baptize infants, I see not.

"Of old (*saith Mr.* C.) the consequent cause of the seal was grace "in them and theirs; but the antecedent cause was Gods Covenant "grace to them and on them, *Gen.* 17.7,8,9. *& Deut.* 30.6. and so "now, that part of *Abrahams* Covenant was not then appliable to in-"fants, *scil.* walk before me, *&c.* but yet that was then appliable; I "will be their God, I will circumcise their hearts, and that sufficed them, "as *Deut.* 30. the Analogy holds now.

Answ. What may be said to be a consequent cause, I do not yet conceive, the rule of Logick I have learned is, that the cause is before the effect: Yet what ever it be Mr. *C.* means, though it might suffice for Circumcision, it doth not for Baptism; nor is that to be regulated by Analogy of Circumcision, as is shewed in the second part of this *Review*, *sect.* 2, 3.

Yet again, "In a word, the seal is a seal not of nor to the command-"ment, but covenant; this therefore is the main and principal in the "application of it.

Answ.

Answ. If Baptism be a seal, it seems to me not a seal of or to the commandment or covenant, but the profession of the baptized; and therefore this is the main and principal in the application of it.

Yet more, *It is the covenant which hath the main instrumental force, in the fruit of the initiatory seal and the application of it, Ephes. 5. 25, 26. and why shall not the external interest in the covenant, have chief influence into the external interest, as well of the application of the initiatory seal?*

Answ. I understand not what fruit of the initiatory seal he means, nor what is the external interest in the Covenant; *the word, Ephes. 5. 25. 26.* Is meant of the word preached, which is not instrumental to infants for any sanctification or cleansing their meant. The want of Gods appointment is the reason of not applying Baptism to infants.

Once more, *By external interest in the Covenant, persons so interested come to have external interest, at least to the final causes of Baptism, as Covenant mercy and blessing, the Spirit, Christ resurrection, &c. Tit. 3. 8. and 1 Cor. 12. 12, 13. 1. Pet. 3. 21. And therefore as well so farre inrighted in the initiatory seal of it, whether they are adult or infants.*

Answ. 1. *External interest in the covenant, external interest in the final causes of Baptism,* are notions I understand not. 2. *Covenant mercy and blessing, the spirit, Christs resurrection,* are not final cause of Baptism, for then when the end of Baptism is attained, they should be effects of Baptism, for the end in intention, is the effect in execution; But this is too absurd. 3. *An inrighting so far in the initiatory seal,* which intimates a man may have an inrighting so far to such a measure and no further, is another new notion I understand not. 4. If Mr. *Cs.* antecedent had sense or truth, yet the consequence is to be denied, no other interest external is inrighting to Baptism, but that which is according to the institution, *Matth. 28. 19.* discipleship, or profession of faith.

To the 8th. Sect. I answer by denying that the Covenant priviledge of grace Evangelical, hath such distinction of principal and less principal counterparties, as Mr. means *C.* (unless he understand by Christ the principal, and the elect and true believers the less principal, as *Gal. 3. 16.*) and that the Covenant priviledges of grace Evangelical belong to any other then the elect: yet I grant the Covenant *Gen. 17.* and many priviledges of Divine grace which were not Evangelical, did belong to many of the Israelites, *who made no good use thereof.* The Covenant Evangelical was never sealed personally to *Ishmael.* That which Mr. *C.* dictates without proof about *the everlasting covenant, and the initial seal in its generical nature,* is answered here sect. 80. and the point about the ordinance of infants visible Churchmembership unrepealed sect. 50, *&c.* and the non-inclusion of infants *Matth. 28. 19.* under the term *nation* is shewed there, and in the second part of this *Review* sect. 9. The position of Mr. *Cs.* sect. 9. may be granted, though *Acts 2. 38, 39.* make nothing for it. Sect. 10. Mr. *C.* proves nothing but that parents were to take care that their children were circumcised; that which he saith of the children begotten on prohibited women, *Ezra. 9.* and *Timothy* begotten on a Jewish woman by a Grecian husband, that they were circumcised, *Act. 16. 1, 2, 3.* proves this, that the children, who

were not of the Congregation of *Israel*, and so no visible Churchmembers were to be circumcised, nor had Covenant interest. The case controverted 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. was onely concerning the persons unequally yoked, not concerning their children. *Acts* 2. 38, 39. Is not a word to prove parents are to take care of the infants baptism, nor *Gen.* 7. 1. with 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. there being not an infant in the Ark, nor typical Baptism being a rule concerning formal Baptism of Christians; if it were, Masters must take care to baptize their house, yea their married children though as prophane as *Cham*, and their wives with them. How impertinently 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. is alledged, is shewed in the second part of this *Review* sect. 21. What Mr. *C.* observes out of *Exod.* 12. 44, 48, 49. that *a stranger was not to eate the Passeover, except all his males were circumcised*, if it be right, yet it makes nothing for proof of parents duty to see their infants baptized, there being no such institution about Baptism and the Lords Supper, as was about Circumcision and the Passeover. It is granted that the words [*Exod.* 12. 40.] *will keep the Passeover to the Lord*] are meant onely of an adult person, yet it is true also, which I say in my *Examen* part. 4. sect. 6. That males not come to years of discretion fit to receive the Lords Supper were to eat the Passeover, and consequently (if Mr. *Cs.* dictates were of any of any validity) parents should see they eate Lords Supper. I grant, That *God made Abraham* Gen. 17. 7. *a common person as well in reference to us inchurched Gentiles, as to the inchurched Jewes and Proselytes in point of Evangelical covenant interest*, but that hee should be so made *in point of ingagement from covenant interest, unto the receiving of the initiatory seal by parents and children*, Gen. 17. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. is but Mr. *Cs.* fancy sufficiently refuted by this, that if it were true, then we Gentiles are bound to circumcise our infants, (which is the onely initiatory seal there meant) contrary to *Acts* 15. 24. *Gal.* 5. 1, 2. That *which is true of* Abraham *and his natural seed, must be applied to* Abrahams *spiritual seed, true Believers of the Gentiles and their natural seed*; is but Mr. *Cs.* vain dream dictated without proof. My grant in my *Examen* part. 3. sect. 1. pag. 37. (as the words shew) was not that children might be baptized vertually in their parents in exact speech, so as to receive it in their own persons, but onely in that sense in which Mr. *M.* said women were circumcised vertually in the males, yet so as they might not be circumcised in their own persons: which being considered, my words yeild Mr. *C.* no advantage.

To the 11th. section I grant, that *Matth.* 28. 19. ties not the Baptizer to know the baptized *to be internally and savingly interested in the covenant*: But that it sufficeth, that *that sort or species of infants*, scil. *such like infants are in deed and truth of Christs Kingdome*, I utterly deny. For then any infant in the world might be baptized, because *he is of that sort or species of infants*, scil. *such like infants are in deed and truth of christs Kingdome*. Dare any say of no unbelievers infants is Christs Kingdome? However it is true of Belivers though not inchurched, and yet Mr. *C.* denies the right of the child, if the parent be not inchurched. Mr. *Cs.* reason are vain, neither is our Lord Christs saying, *Luk.* 18. 16.

any

any rule to us about baptizing; nor was the rule of circumcising infants that some of that sort had the internal saving interest and efficacy of this promise, I will be the God of thy seed, but the command of God, without which it is better to exclude all infants, then upon our own heads to bring on our selves the guilt of will-worship by taking them in. Which must of necessity fall on infant Baptizers after Mr. *Cs.* rule. For Christs appointment was to baptize infants no otherwise then persons of years. There is no difference in the words *Matth.* 28. 19. between the reason of baptizing one and the other. But persons of years were not to be baptized by Mr. *Cs.* rule, in that *they are of that sort or species of persons*, scil. *such like persons are in deed and in truth of Christs Kingdome*, but onely upon their own discipleship or profession of faith, as the practise thoroughout the *Acts* of the Apostles shews: Therefore neither are Believers children to bee baptized after any other rule. And yet *infants are no more left in the wide wilderneß*, or any whit less *folded up in the Church* by their non-baptizing, then they are by their baptism. If they of *N. E.* do *fold them up in the Church*, why do they keep them from Church-communion till they bee made members by Church-covenant? If it *be better 99 who happily have not so peculiar a title thereto, be folded up in the Church, then that one of such lambs be left out in the wide wilderneß*, are not they guilty of too much strictness in leaving out of the Church in the wide wilderness, many weak lambs who are weak in faith, because they do not satisfie the Church in the declaration of their experiences? But this is the guise of men who are strict in their own inventions, as in Church-covenant, declaration of experiences for admission to Church-communion, &c. to bee loose about Gods commands, as this of baptizing disciples of Christ is. Enough in answer to these cloudy dictates of Mr. *C.*

SECT. LXXXVI.

The 13th. *and* 14th. Chapters *of Mr.* Rutherfords *first part of the Covenant, are examined; and found to make nothing for Infant Baptism.*

AFter the finishing the most of this part of the *Review*, my learned and godly brother Mr. *John Skynner* of *weston* in *Herefordshire* (who hath written a solid Treatise against Infant Baptism, entituled, *Corruption corrected*, in answer to one Mr. *woodward*) acquainted me that Mr. *Rutherford* had written for infant Baptism in a Book of his *of the Covenant of grace part.* 1. *chap.* 13, 14. which having read, I found (as he foretold me) no more strength then others had brought for it, and it is written rather like a Sermon then a Scholastique Dispute, and with so many unproved dictates, such a number of obscure expressions, (many of which I cannot discern good sense in, so that they have need rather of

construction

construction then refutation) so many incoherencies and inconsequences, as that I do not jhdge it worth while to answer him. Yet because of the name of the man, and my words sect. 1. of the 2d. part of this *Review*, I shall add some animadversions on those two chapters.

Ch. 13. he tels us, that *persons are in Covenant with God externally by visible profession*, which I grant, if meant of their own personal profession; but deny, 1. That *this promise* Gen. 17. 7. *I will bee thy God and the God of thy seed, is a tacit and implicit profession*, or *makes* (of it self) *parties in Covenant* externally. 2. *That infants born of covenanted parents are in covenant with God, because they are born of such parents as are in covenant with God*, Gen. 17. 7. What is said *Deut.* 4. 37. *Deut.* 10. 15. is meant onely of the people of *Israel*, as the very words [*brought out of Egypt as it is this day*] shew; nor is there a word in those verses, of their being in covenant with God because born of such parents, but of Gods special choise of that people. It is false which he saith that the Apostle *Acts* 2. 39. *speaks in the very terms and words of the Covenant, Gen.* 17. 7. It is true rather, that hee speaks in never a term or word there used. It is as false that *the Apostle commanded any other to be baptized* Acts 2. 38. *then whom he commanded to repent.* Did he not presume that Anabaptists, as hee terms us, were very Blockheads, hee would not not presume, that wee should believe his vain dictates, when the very copulative term shews the same are spoken to in one and the other command, and the words being an answer to the question *v.* 37. shew they are directed to those who spake *v.* 37. And the word [*you*] used in the precept of Baptizing contains the same with those who were to receive remission of sins, and the gift of the holy Ghost, and are distinct from their children, *v.* 39. and therefore cannot be meant of their children, much less of their infant children, whom it had been ridiculous for *Peter* to have commanded to be baptized. How pertinent the answer had been as I expounded it, is often shewed before; though *their children crucified not the Lord Jesus, nor were concerned either in the evil of their parents, who crucified the Lord of glory, nor in the good of their repentance more then stones*; yet I know no Anabaptists whose grounds infer, *that the Jews children who crucified Christ were not visibly in Covenant with their parents, not capable of actual hearing the word, mourning for and repenting of their sins*, as Zach. 12. 10. Matth. 3. 8, 9, 10. *nor concerned either in the evil of their parents, nor in the good of their repentance more then stones*; nor do I conceive it true that *the opposites of infant Baptism say, that Covenant promises are no more made to children, then to stones*; but that these are vile calumnies of Mr. *Rutherford*, unfit for such a man as he is taken to be.

How *Isa.* 2. 2, 3. & 19. 24, 25. *Psal.* 22. 27. *Revel.* 11. 15. *Isa.* 60. 1, 2, 3, 4. *Mal.* 1. 11. *Psal.* 2. 8, 9. & 72. 7, 8, 9, 10. are to be understood of persons adult onely, and yet infants not cut off from the Covenant, is shewed *Review part.* 2. *sect.* 9. and elsewhere. It is not *contrary to Acts* 2. 39. to say, *that Covenant promises are not to the children of Believers*, and yet *it hath been fulfilled, that the Gentiles and Heathen are become the Lords people.*

What

What he ſaith out of *Exod.* 20. 6. *Pſal.* 37, 26. & 112. 2. *Deut.* 28. is anſwered here ſect. 64. 70, 71. It is not true that *Paul, Rom.* 11. 16. *ſaith the ſame of the Jews root and branches, Fathers and children, which he ſaith* 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. of the unbelieving yoke fellowes ſanctification in the yoke fellow, and their childrens holineſs. Nor is it true, that *the ſame Covenant which was made with* Abraham, Gen. 17. 7. *was made with the Corinthians,* 2 *Cor.* 6. 16. or any of the texts he cites, there being none of them that promiſe, that God would bee a God to them and their ſeed.

His allegations from *Heb.* 7. 22. *Heb.* 8. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. are ſhewed to bee frivolous here, ſect. 66. and elſewhere. What he talks *of a Father having no warrant to offer the Covenant of grace to one Pagan more then another, if children be not in covenant,* is vain, the offer of the Covenant of grace being nothing elſe but the preaching of the Goſpel, which is to be to all, *Mark* 16. 15. whether in Covenant or no. The allegation that the promiſe *Gen.* 17. 7. is made onely to the elect, *Rom.* 9. 8. is a plain proof of this poſition, that the natural children of *Abraham,* and conſequently Believers children now, except elected, have not that promiſe made to them, and therefore are not in covenant by Gods act of promiſe to them, which doctrine Mr. *Rutherford* himſelf taught in his *Apologetical. exercit.* 2. *c.* 2. *p.* 306. when he ſaid; *The elect alone are ſaid in Scriptures federate, ſons and heirs of promiſe,* Rom. 9. 8. *And to Chriſt alone the Prince, and leading heir, are the promiſes made,* Gal. 3. 16. Pſal. 89. 26, 27. *in him, to his ſeed and children given to him of the Father,* Heb. 2. 13. Nor can he here deny, that *the ſons of the promiſe are the choſen of God, in whom the word takes effect.* Which if true, then it is moſt falſe, that a Believers ſeed not choſen is in covenant with God, by vertue of that promiſe *Gen.* 17. 7. and his allegation of it, and *Acts* 2. 39. and other places for baptiſm of believers infants, whether elect or not, as having that promiſe made by God to them, is manifeſtly impertinent. Nevertheleſs we need not ſay, that *there are none covenanted with God but the choſen under the New Teſtament,* or that *there is no ſuch thing as an external viſible covenanting with God under the New Teſtament:* but ſay, that no infant doth viſibly externally covenant with God, ſo as thereby to be entitled to Baptiſm, ſith no perſons are to bee baptized by Chriſts appointment, but ſuch as in their own perſons do profeſs the faith.

The priviledges mentioned *Rom.* 3. 1, 2. & 9. 4. Mr. *Rutherford* himſelf appropriates to the Jews, *Due right of Presbyteries ch.* 4. *ſect.* 5. *pag.* 192. What he ſaith *pag.* 77, 78, 79, 80. is all anſwered before, chiefly in anſwer to Mr. *Blake, Review par.* 2. *ſect.* 9. or here, *ſect.* 46, 47, 48. or in anſwer to Mr. *Baxter* and Mr. *Marſhal.* And if it were not, yet the Reader may diſcern its impertinency, ſith the thing hee endeavours to prove, is an external viſible covenanting in the New Teſtament (which can be onely on mans part) and being in covenant thereupon, and right to Baptiſm, and is not denied, whereas his poſition he ſhould prove is, that *the Covenant choiſe on Gods part is extended to the ſeed of Believers as ſuch in the New Teſtament,* p. 73. His words *pag.* 80. *They cannot be*

baptized

baptized but as in covenant with God, are true, if meant of being in covenant by their profession externally: but so infants are excluded; if of Gods covenanting or promise, are false, and so are those other words, *we are the same way in covenant as the Jews were*, and *our visible Church now, and the visible Church then are of the same constitution.*

I call not the Covenant *Gen.* 17. civil, but mixt, containing some promises civil, some spiritual or rather the same promises, in one sense spiritual, in another civil. I doubt not to say the Covenant to *Adam* and the Jews at Mount *Sinai* were two Covenants of works, a third in the Gospel I know not. The Covenant with *David*, *Psal.* 89. 2 *Sam.* 7. so far as it was Evangelical, was the same with that to *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. and *Adam Gen.* 3. 15. as they were Evangelical, but so far as it was Oeconomical, it was different from both, and another Covenant then those to *Adam*, *Abraham*, or the Jews at Mount *Sinai*: The promise of working miracles, was not the Evangelical Covenant of grace, but that of remission of sins and eternal life to the repenting believers, under which was *John* Baptist as well as the Apostles, was it: yet I know no absurdity to say, the Apostles were both under the Covenant of grace with *John* Baptist, and another Covenant *Mark* 16. 17, 18. different from that *John* Baptist and many Believers were under. I find no promise *of the blessings of their land*, as *Gen.* 17. is to *Abrahams* seed of *Canaan*, to all believers in any of those texts, *Ezek.* 36. 25, 26, 30, 31. *Jer.* 31. 31. *compared with* 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43. *Matth.* 6. 31. *Luke* 12. 31. 1 *Tim.* 4. 8. *Heb.* 13. 5. 6. Infants elect are in the same Covenant Evangelical with *Abraham*, shall have a Covenant Resurrection and Salvation, by Christ, yet not in the visible Church, but are saved without it. It is no *New Testament ordinance that Ministers preach the Gospel to every creature*, without limitation, or explication restrictive to the intelligent of them, or *baptize all nations* simply, whether disciples, or believers, or not, but the disciples or believers in Christ of all nations. That *faith doth not sanctifie in every subject*, *but* in subjecto capaci, *and so not an unbelieving whore*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. proves, that the sanctifying or holiness there, is not ascribed to the faith of the one parent, as to the formal reason, but to the conjugal relation, contrary to Pædobaptists exposition of federal holiness, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. which Mr. *Baxter hath neither solidly nor learnedly vindicated*, as might have been discerned by reading the first part of this *Review* sect. 22, *&c.* which if Mr. *Rutherford* read with the rest, it's likely he would not say so unadvisedly as he doth, *that the dispute is at an end now.* If *God made the Covenant* Gen. 17. 7. *to* Abraham *not as a Father onely, but as head of a family, and covenant holiness is of societies and houses under the New Testament as in* Abrahams *house*, then should infidels infants, yea infidels in a believers house be baptized by Pædobaptists rules; then is it no priviledge to believers and their seed, then doth the Apostle after Pædobaptists exposition of 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. say false, that the children were unclean, that is, without federal holiness, if neither parent were a believer. Most false is that which he saith without colour of proof *pag.* 83. *Not any are baptized in the New Testament* (*except the Eunuch and* Saul *Acts* 8. 39.) *who*

were

were baptized firstly, but they were baptized as publike men representing a seed; The contrary appears from *Luk.* 7. 29. *Joh.* 4. 1. Nor is it true, that *societies as such, were baptized, nor* any such thing intimated in the words, *Matth.* 3. 3. *Mar.* 1. 5. *Lu.* 3. 21. but onely that a great number of people came to him and were baptized. Yea in those places, as also *Joh.* 3. 22, 23, 26. it is plain none were baptized, but such as came to hear *John*, and by confessing their sins shewed their repentance. No more needs be said to the stale frivolous allegations of baptizing households, then is said *Examen* part. 3. sect. 14. *Review* part. 2. sect. 20. nor to *Rom.* 11. 16, 17. then in the first part of the *Review* sect. 1, *&c.* The Lord sends the Gospel arbitrarily to a City, household, or single person, as to the Eunuch, *Paul*, *Sergius Paulus*, as he pleaseth, and wee are to *enquire whether the faith of the person be real*, afore he is to be baptized, *though the Gospel be come to the nation, house, or society.* Nor is there any truth in it, no not according to the Apostles doctrine, as 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. is expounded by Pædobaptists, and they dispute from *Gen.* 17. 7. *if the friend, not a father, be in the house or society and profess the Gospel, hee and his servants and friends obtain right to Baptism.*

Mr. *Rutherford* pag. 85. enquires, *what is the formal reason and ground that any hath right to Baptism?* The terme of the question seem to me to intimate, as if he with other Pædobaptists, took Baptism onely for a priviledge derived from a grant or Covenant of God, which I take to be onely a duty both in the baptized and baptizer, by reason of a command of Christ (though there be also a priviledge consequent upon it) and so the formal reason of it is the command, and the qualification which the baptized is to have, when hee is baptized, is believing with all his heart; which if he wants he sins, yet not so as that the person, if after a dogmatical faith he become a sincere believer, is to be baptized again, but to repent of his former sin, as *Peter* advised *Simon Magus*. The qualification, which the baptizer is to baptize upon, is a sober, intelligent, serious and free profession of faith in Christ, upon which persons are termed disciples of Christ and believers, and is the rule to the baptizer, *Matth.* 28. 19. compared with *Mar.* 16. 15, 16. which warrants his action, he being not able to look into the heart. Mr. *Rutherfords* objection from *Mar.* 16. 16. is answered *Review part.* 2 *sect.* 7. *p.* 115. It is false, *that none are to be baptized, but covenanted ones*; as *Acts* 2. 39. meaning by Gods promise, his promise of remission of sins and salvation to them by Christ, nor doth *Acts* 2. 39. prove it. If *all infants, even of Pagans, and all aged are not to be baptized*, how is it true, that *all nations* are to be baptized without any other circumscription, as Mr. *Rutherford* cites the command *Matth.* 28. 19. here pag. 84? I like his words. *All in Covenant are not to be baptized. For such as are onely really and invisibly in Covenant, and do make no profession of Christ at all, are not warrantably by the Church to be baptized. Onely these whether old or young that are tali modo visibili federati, such as professedly and visibly in Covenant and called, Acts* 2. 39. *are warrantably baptized. Hence they must be so in covenant, as they be called by the word of the Covenant; for they cannot be baptized against their will*, Luk. 7. 29, 30. Which if Mr.

Rutherford will ſtand to, the controverſie may be ended; and I promiſe him, that if he can prove, or ſhew that infants make any profeſſion of Chriſt, are profeſſedly and viſibly in covenant, are ſo in covenant, as that they be called by the word of the Covenant, and that they are willing to be baptized, I ſhall yeild to baptize them. But this is frequent with Pædobaptiſts (as I have oft ſhewed in Mr. *M.* Mr. *B.* and Mr. *Bl.*) to let fall ſuch paſſages, eſpecially in opening the inſtitution, *Matth.* 28. 19. in oppoſing Papiſts, Prelatiſts, Antibaptiſts, as overthrow their diſputes for infant baptiſm, and therefore they will not ſtand to them, when they are urged againſt them, but by ſome ſhift elude them.

It is falſe which Mr. *Rutherford* ſaith, that *this propoſition, Thoſe to whom the promiſe of the Covenant does belong, theſe ſhould be baptized* (if univerſally underſtood) *is Peters* Acts 2. 38, 39. or that *this aſſumption, The promiſe of the Covenant is to you and your children, is the expreſs words of* Peter. *The offer of Chriſt in the preached Goſpel*, is not *the call*, meant *Acts* 2. 39. nor are *all ſuch as to whom the offer is made externally in covenant, and ſuch to whom the Covenant is made and ſhould be baptized*; though I grant, if they *give a profeſſed conſent to the call of the Goſpel*, they are baptizable. *Calvins* words are no proof, againſt thoſe who yeild not what he ſaith of the Anabaptiſts of his time. Mr *Rutherfords* words are too vain for a man of his name, which ſay, *that believing children are not children, but men of age*. My expoſition of *Acts* 2. 39. neither excludes ſucking children, nor is the incluſion proved by him from *Matth.* 2. 18. 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. the ſenſe Mr. *Rutherford* makes *the onely ſenſe of* Acts 2. 39. *the promiſe and word of the Covenant is preached to you and your children in you*, is falſe, for then it had been true, that it was preached then to all afar off, which is manifeſtly falſe, and vain; for it had been no comfort to them, ſith it might bee preached without their benefit, nor *is this to be externally in covenant* (except in Mr. *Rutherfords* gibberiſh) *both under the Old and New Teſtament*. In the Old perſons were ſo by birth, without preaching; in the New, they onely who profeſs faith.

The other ſenſe Mr. *Rutherford* ſets down is none of mine, nor is it needful I ſhould anſwer the objections againſt it and the terms, *the Lord hath internally covenanted with you*; I take to be non-ſenſe, no covenanting with us being an immanent, but a tranſeunt act. My ſenſe is fully ſet down here Sect. 13, *&c.* and proved. I grant *no more Covenant favour holden forth to their children*, Acts 2. 39. *then to the Pagans children*, except in priority of tender. I make not *external covenant holineſs, ceremonial holineſs out of date*, nor can he *cleer it*, or that by any thing I ſay, *the words* Acts 2. 39. *muſt be in a contradictory way expounded, to wit, the promiſe is no more made to your children ſo long as they are infants, then to Devils*; which ſeeing hee mentions Mr. *Ms.* words but a little before, I have reaſon to conceive reflect on my ſelf; and if ſo, they have too great a ſhew of Diaboliſm. *Right to hear the preached Goſpel, and a Covenant or Goſpel warrant peculiar to believers children*, is ſuch talk as I underſtand not. I think hearing is a Duty obliging all,

Pagans

Pagans have not onely warrant, but alſo command to hear it, it is not onely lawfull but neceſſary. The children of the moſt holy Chriſtian Gentile believers, are not Chriſtians till they believe, and both they and their parents when they believe are ſtill Heathens; the term Heathens, being all one with Gentiles contradiſtinct to Jews, and ſo uſed here by Mr. *Rutherford* himſelf pag. 74. in words before cited, and I ſometimes admire that ſome learned men ſhould ſuggeſt this to Readers and hearers as a hainous thing to term them Heathens, when they muſt be ſo, if they be not Jews, though moſt holy Chriſtians. The term *Pagans*, if it bee all one with profeſſed infidels poſitively, I grant it belongs not to our children; yet they are infidels negatively, till they believe, and are ſo accounted of them that admit them not to the Lords Supper, as well as of thoſe that admit them not to Baptiſm, unto which actual profeſſion of faith is as well required as to the Lords Supper. To neither hath a man any right by Covenant, although by the Covenant he hath right to the benefits of the Goſpel. Baptiſm and the Lords Supper are neither of them formally benefits, or ſeals of the Covenant of grace; though by conſequent, in the right uſe of them, ſuch benefits accrue to men by them. They are both rites appointed by Chriſt, the one to be the baptized his ſigne, whereby he profeſſeth repentance and faith in Chriſt, and engageth himſelf ſolemnly to adhere to Chriſt as his diſciple, the other whereby hee ſignifies his remembrance of Chriſts death, both our duties, and a right to duty, ſounds to mee like nonſenſe.

I know no *Anabaptiſt that ignorantly confounds the promiſe and the thing promiſed, the Covenant and benefits covenanted*; But this I aver, that when God promiſeth and covenanteth they are connex, there is no man to whom Cod promiſeth or covenanteth, but he hath or ſhall have the thing promiſed or covenanted. And this I learn from the Apoſtle *Rom.* 9. 8. who makes onely *the choſen ſons of promiſe*, as *Mr. Rutherford* here pag. 77. expounds him; and that is, as *Gal.* 3. 16. he expreſſeth himſelf, *to* Abraham *and his ſeed were the promiſes made or ſaid, that is Chriſt* perſonal or myſtical, or both, and to no other. And ſure the Apoſtle *Rom.* 9. 6. did think it blaſphemy to ſay, that God had promiſed, and thoſe he promiſed to ſhould not have the thing promiſed; for then *Gods word ſhould fall*, and he be a liar. If Gods conditional promiſe be a Covenant, yet it is made onely to them that perform the condition. *He that believeth and is baptized ſhall bee ſaved*, is not an univerſal promiſe to all men, whether believers or not; but onely to ſo many as ſhall believe. 'Tis true we can exclude none, becauſe we cannot exempt any from believing, and therefore we are to make an indifferent offer to any, but God in his intention excludes many, and his promiſe is not made to them whom he excludes, nor are they under his Covenant, or in covenant with him, in reſpect of his act of promiſing; though they may be ſaid to bee in Covenant, or under the Covenant in reſpect of their own act of promiſing; I grant *the command is to perſons whether they believe or not, obey or not*, for that is not an enunciative ſpeech, that ſignifies any thing true or falſe, but is in the imperative

mood, and extendeth to all men whatsoever, so as whosoever doth not as the command bids, sins: But when Mr. *Rutherford* saith, *the promise is to you, and so are the commands and threatnings, whether ye believe or not; whether ye transgress or transgress not*: (if an Anabaptist falsly so called may have the boldness to tell a Professour in Divinity in an University in *Scotland* of ignorance) I should tell him, he is mistaken, in saying, *the promise is to you whether you believe or no, the threatning is to you whether you transgress or no.* For they being enunciations in the indicative mood, if meant so, should bee false; which to impute to God, would asperse him with falshood and injustice, which is *horrendum dictu.* And in my apprehension it savours of ignorance which Mr. *Rutherford* saith pag. 91. *Nor is it true, that the promise is made to the aged upon condition of believing. The promise is made to them absolutely, whether they believe or not. But the blessing of the promise and Covenant of grace is given and bestowed onely conditionally if they believe. The promise is absolutely made, it's called conditional from the thing conditionally given.* For either I have lost my wits, or else a conditional promise is a conditional proposition, expressing something that shall be, if some other thing bee put; and sure a conditional proposition is so termed from the words, not from the event. A promise is a promise absolute or conditional, as soon as the words are spoken, long before the thing promised is given, yea though it be never given. The giving or not giving upon performing or not performing the condition, may make the promise true or false determinately, but not conditional or absolute. I forbear to uncover any further Mr. *Rutherfurds* nakedness in this speech, and refer him to Mr. *Baxter* to correct him for that speech; nor is it true, that *the promise is not made to the aged upon condition of believing.* And as for his speeches, of the saving of infants of believing parents dying in infancy, and our giving evidence thereof, there is so much said before of it, especially against Mr. *Baxter* Sect. 73, 74. and elsewhere, that I need say no more here. As for what he saith, *of our want of warrant to pray for them without their being in Covenant*; though it hurt not me, who grant of so many as are elect that they are in Covenant; yet I think I have a warrant to pray by a general command, 1 *Tim.* 2. 1, 2, 3. and in faith by a general promise, *Matth.* 7. 7, 8. the knowledge of Gods goodness, and the goodness of the thing asked.

In the rest of the Chapter, Mr. *Rutherfurd* endeavours to find a way, according to which infants of believers may be said to bee within Covenant, and the words *Acts* 2. 39. meant of them, and their title to Baptism thence inferred: for which end hee useth many words with distinctions, which are vain, without good sense, or good consistency, or any thing to his purpose.

Four ways he conceives infants of believers may be said to be in Covenant. 1. In that God maketh the promise of a new heart to them; but this he grants is true onely of the elect; and not of all commanded to be baptized, *Acts* 2. 38, 39. And pag. 86. he granted persons invisibly in Covenant without profession, are not warrantably to be baptized. 2. In that God promiseth forgiveness of sins, and eternal life upon condition

of

of repentance and faith. Thus infants may be in the Covenant of grace, but no otherwise then or rather not so much as professed unbelievers, to whom it is tendred, who yet are not to be baptized, and if the promise be meant so *Acts* 2. 39. it proves not a right to Baptism thence till the condition be performed, which when infants declare they do, I shall baptize them. 3. That they are in Covenant because they are under the command, for thus he speaks pag. 94. *The Covenant must be considered* in abstracto, *and formally in the letter as a simple way of saving sinners, so they believe, so all within the visible Church are in the Covenant of grace, and so it contains onely the will of precept.* In which he is mistaken, 1. in that he saith, *the Covenant formerly in the letter is a simple way of saving sinners, so they believe*; for such a speech is not the Covenant in any sense, much less formally in the letter *in abstracto*; such a speech as this, men are saved if they believe, or the way of saving men is upon condition of believing, is not the Covenant sith it is not a promise, but a Covenant is formally a promise, or an aggregate of promises. 2. In that he saith, *the Covenant formally contains only the will of precept*; whereas the Covenant formally contains not at all the will of precept, the will of precept containing onely the command of what should be done by another, but the Covenant is a promise of what the Covenanter will do; the one is expresst in the imperative mood, the other in the indicative; nor is the will *of precept in the letter as a simple way of saving sinners, so they believe*; for such an expression is no command at all, but a declaration of event. 3. In that he saith, *so all within the visible Church are in the Covenant of grace*, which he seems to mean thus, they all and they onely. But sure either infants are not at all this way in the Covenant of grace, who never hear the command propounded to them, or if they be, they are no more in it then the *Americans* out of the visible Church, who never heard of Christ, nor so much as professed unbelievers to whom the Gospel hath been preached; and therfore this way infants have not right to baptism. So that this speech of Mr. *Rutherfurd* hath, as many of his expressions, nothing but ignorance and impertinency. 4. A person may be said to be in Covenant, in *that he is really covenanted and engaged by his consented profession, to fulfil the Covenant*; as Mr. *Rutherfurd* speaks pag. 92. This way *I* grant intitles to Baptism; but sure infants are not so in Covenant, nor is the meaning so *Acts* 2. 39. where the promise is Gods promise to us, not our promise to God; nor is this the Pædobaptists plea, when they argue infants are in Covenant, therefore to be baptized; for they mean by being in Covenant, that God hath promised to be a God to them as the seed of believers, *Gen.* 17. 7. And therefore Mr. *Rutherfurd* hath not yet shewed any way, according to which infants of believers are intitled to Baptism, by vertue of the Covenant of grace; or from *Acts* 2. 38, 39. notwithstanding all *his blooding of it*, to use his own term. Let's view what is in Ch. 14.

Neither is it true, that *God saith persons should be circumcised because of Gods promise, Gen.* 17. 7. Nor, *that women were circumcised in the males*; nor *was* Peter *sent to baptize all the circumcised*; nor *are infants to bee Baptized by the ground of Circumcision*; nor *is there any thing*

Acts

Acts 2. 38, 39. *that faith, because the same promise is made to fathers and to children must infants bee baptised.* Neither do I know what Mr. *Rutherfurd* understands by *Theological essence*, or *formal effects*; nor do I conceive any truth or sense in Mr. *Rutherfurds* talk of *Circumcision and Baptism being the same in the substance, nature, and Theological essence, and in the formal effects*; much less that *the Lord hath any such argument*, Gen. 17. 7. And though I should grant *all are to bee exhorted to be baptised, who are under the same Covenant*; yet not without repentance and faith foregoing their Baptism, without which the promise warrants not Baptism. There is no such command *Gen.* 17. 7, 8. that *all these in Covenant should be marked with the initiatory seal*; nor is *Baptism instituted in place of Circumcision*; and if it were, yet more is needful to warrant infant baptism.

There is as plain precept *Acts* 2.38. & 8.36, 37. *Mark.*16.16. *Matth.* 28. 19. against infant Baptism, as is against infant Communion 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. Wee have good consequences out of the word against infant Baptism, without arguing from the Covenant of grace; which Mr *Rutherfurd* may see in the 2d. part of this *Review* sect. 5 and none *against the Holy Ghost*, but from him. That *the promises of the Covenant of grace are expresly to infants of the New Testament*, is more then I find *Acts* 2. 39. or elsewhere. Dipping in rivers need not be onerous, and may be without danger, to women with child, Virgins, some sorts of diseased persons in winter, in cold countries, and it will require more strength in dispute, then either Mr. *Baillee*, or Mr. *Baxter*, have shewed, or I finde yet in Mr. *Rutherfurd*; to prove dipping in rivers (though Baptism be not necessary to be done in rivers) to be *against the word, the second, third, and fourth Commandements.* And against sprinkling, or perfusion instead of Baptism, there is so much said in my *Addition to the Apology* against Mr. *Baillee*, Mr. *Rutherfurds* Colleague, and delivered to Mr. *Rutherfurd* himself, and since printed with a Letter to him, as is for ought I know, yet unanswered. All Mr. *Rutherfurds* talk pag. 98, 99. that *now infants of believers are casten out, for no fault, of the Covenant of grace*, and his aggravations thereof, are to be taken for meer calumnies, and since the printing of my *Examen*, there is reason to judge them to be thus wilfully vented by Mr. *Rutherfurd*, and till he name the Anabaptists, and cite the place, I can take it for no other then a false accusation, which he saith *of the Anabaptists that they teach infants to be born without sin.*

Mr. *Rutherfurd* dictates without proof pag. 100. that *they were covenanting parents and believers, that brought the little children* Mark 10. 13, 14. that *they were not diseased or possessed*, that *he would have the whole spece of infants at all time to come to him*, and those infants might bee blessed as elect ones, though *no marks were given to parents or others, whereby to discern elect children*; there being no direction for them to bring children to Christ under that notion. It is false that *Anabaptists rebuke persons that bring children to Christ as the disciples did*, Mar. 10. 13. Or that *Christ instates infants of believing parents as members of the visible Church.* What Mr. *Cobbet* hath said of that act of Christ is refelled *Review*

view part. 2. sect. 19. and that *the Kingdome of God is* that of glory, is made good against Mr. *Blake* there, sect. 18. and not refuted by me: I know no absurdity in it, to say, *Christ might bless infants of Pagans*. What designe Christ might have, or had, besides Mr. *Rutherfurds* conceived *purpose to hold forth the common interest of the whole spece of infants within the visible Church*, is shewed there sect. 17. against Mr. *Baxter*. I do grant *the blessing*, *Mark* 10. 16. to be personal, and the chiefest blessing beyond visible Churchmembership; and though we finde not proof that *Christ blessed the whole race of infants of covenanting parents*, yet it is false that *we make them blessed onely as symboles of humility*; or that *the blessing was some complemental salutation*; or that (as Mr *R.* saith of Anabaptists after his calumniating manner) *wee will have them without Christ and the Covenant*, and *under the curse of God*; but grant that they were blessed with the blessing of the Covenant of grace, and that many other infants are so. Whether they were parents, *or believers in Christ as the Messiah*, who brought the children, *Matth.* 19. 13. is uncertain; nor do I say, or need I, *they had a faith grounded upon a possibility of election separated from the Covenant*; nor do I deny, that *infants have their share of salvation by the Covenant*; or that *a covenanted seed is prophesied to be added to the Jews, under the New Testament*; nor doth any thing I say infer, that *the children of believers under the New Testament must be a cursed seed*; yet there is none of the Texts Mr. *Rutherfurd* brings, which proves a prediction, that the natural seed of believers as such, shall be blessed and in the Covenant of grace, nor that their infant seed shall be visible Churchmembers in the Christian Church: But they are all impertinently alledged, some being meant of the Jews increase in *Judea* after their return from *Babylon*, some of the effectual calling of the Gentiles; and most of them so far cleared before, that I count it needless to make answer to each of the Texts by themselves. And Mr. *Rutherfurds* discourse is so loose and full of impertinencies, and incoherencies, that *I* shall onely animadvert on some passages, till the whole bee brought to some distinct Scholastique form.

He tels us pag, 168. "That external covenanting goes before internal covenanting, as the means before the end, and the cause before "the effect: for faith comes by hearing of a sent preacher, *Rom.* 10. 14. "and the preaching of the Gospel is a saving means of begetting a new "heart, and of a new spirit. Hence 1. All must be first externally in "covenant, before they can be internally and really in covenant. In which speech he seems to conceive external covenanting, to bee either preaching or hearing a preacher, else his reason had been vain. But what non-sense scribling is this, to term preaching or hearing covenanting? A person may, and we may conceive some do, preach and hear, who never externally covenant. Sure covenanting is promising, but so is not either preaching or hearing. And if Mr. *Rutherfurds* words be true, no infant can be internally and really in Covenant, who doth not preach or hear.

His talk is as vain, *Of the Lord being a God simply to some, and no more but a God to them in regard of outward Church-priviledges, but to*

others

others were then a God in truth and righteousneſs; not to all, as if God might be a God to ſome not in truth and righteouſneſs, or the being a God to his people, contained not the greateſt bleſſings, contrary to *Lu.* 20. 37, 38. *Heb.* 11. 16.

His further talk pag. 109. from *Matth.* 19. 14. is without proof, and all ſhewed to be vain, in the places before cited. Though *the houſhold* ſometimes comprehend infants, yet not ſo ſtill, nor *Acts* 16. as is ſhewed *Review* part. 2. ſect. 20. Anabaptiſts neither do nor muſt grant, *if infants be in Covenant, they ought to receive the ſeal of the Covenant.*

If *Rom.* 11. 16. be meant of *holineſs onely intentionally*, and not giving actual right to Baptiſm, then *the holineſs* there proves not infants to be baptizable. That the Covenant *Deut.* 29. 14, 15. ſhould *be made virtually radically* with us Gentiles, is a dotage with a witneſs: nor onely the expreſs words *v.* 1. but alſo the paſſages all along Ch. 29, 30. ſhew it was the legal Covenant renewed with the people of *Iſrael* and their poſterity, to engage them to obſerve all the Law of God given by *Moſes*: not the Covenant made to *Adam*, *Abraham*, *David*, *the New*, or *better Covenant*. If *the Covenant may ſtand in one*, then it is not neceſſary that a people, nation, ſeed, body, ſhould be in covenant, and conſequently it may ſtand without infants. The Apoſtle ſaith not *Rom.* 11. 16. *the Fathers were the root*. But Mr. *Rutherfurd* adds.

"Hence Anabaptiſts, without all reaſon, ſay that hee ſpeaks not of "federal and external holineſs, but of real, internal, and true holineſs, "onely of the inviſible body predeſtinated to life: for though inviſible "holineſs cannot be excluded, except we exclude the holineſs of *Abra-* "*ham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*, who were without doubt a part of the "root.

Anſw. Anabaptiſts, if we muſt be ſo named, do ſay that the holineſs *Rom.* 11. 16. is meant of real, internal and true holineſs; and conſequently the perſons there ſaid to be holy, are all of the inviſible body predeſtinated to life, and no other but ſuch there meant: yet they deny not, that the holineſs of the Covenant and Church there meant were made viſible by its working, the collective body of the Jewes predeſtinate to life; and that it is not ſaid without all reaſon, might have appeared to Mr. *Rutherfurd*, if he had read my *Examen* part. 3 ſect. 7. my *Apol.* ſect. 14. pag. 67. *Review* part. 1. ſect. 1, *&c.* part. 3. ſect. 75. yea if there were nothing elſe ſaid but what Mr. *Rutherfurd* here yeilds, that *inviſible holineſs cannot be excluded, except we exclude the holineſs of* Abraham, Iſaac, *and* Jacob, *who were without doubt part of the root*, that which Anabaptiſts ſay, is not ſaid without reaſon, and that demonſtrative. For if *inviſible holineſs cannot be excluded*, then it is included, and if included together with external viſible holineſs, then the holineſs there meant is not external holineſs alone; nor they who have meerly external federal holineſs, are there ſaid to be holy, and conſequently no reprobate, but onely the predeſtinate to life. And if *Abraham, Iſaac and Jacob, be part of the root, and therefore inviſible holineſs cannot but excluded*, then the reſt of the root and the branches which are made in the text alike holy, muſt have inviſible holineſs alſo. But *Mr. Rutherfurd* adds.

"Yet

" Yet he muſt be taken to ſpeak of that holineſs of the Covenant and " Church, as made viſible, and of the viſible collective body of the " Jews, not of onely real and inviſible holineſs. 1. Becauſe this was " true in the days of *Elias*, If the root be holy the branches are holy; " And it is a New Teſtament-truth of perpetual verity, If the Fathers " be holy ſo muſt the ſons. The Fathers have Church-right to Circum- " ciſion, to Baptiſm, to the Paſſeover, and the Lords Supper, ſo have " the children: but it is moſt falſe of the inviſible myſtical body and " root onely, and of real and internal holineſs; For neither in Old or " New Teſtament is it true, if the Fathers be predeſtinated to life, ju- " ſtified, and ſanctified, and ſaved, ſo muſt the children be.

Anſw. The term [holy, *Rom.* 11. 16.] notes onely real and inviſible holineſs in that place, though the perſons ſaid to bee holy have it made viſible, and it agree to the viſible collective body of the Jewes. And the propoſition of Mr. *Rutherfurd* to the contrary, *If the Fathers be holy ſo muſt the ſons*, is moſt falſe, not onely being underſtood of inviſible, but alſo of viſible holineſs, of Churchright to Circumciſion, to Baptiſm, to the Paſſeover, and the Lords Supper. Though the father were holy viſibly, by profeſſion of the God of *Iſrael*, yet had not hee nor his child right thereby to Circumciſion, and the Paſſeover, without being a Proſelyte of righteouſneſs, taking on him the precepts of *Moſes* to obſerve, and joyning to the policy of *Iſrael*, and yet even then the child of age, who did not avouch the God of *Iſrael*, had no right thereto. Nor by Pædobaptiſts own principles hath the child of age right to Baptiſm, or the Lords Supper, without his own profeſſion, though the parents be Chriſtians; nor the infant of a believer baptized (as they conceive) right to the Lords Supper.

Mr. *Rutherfurd* is groſly miſtaken in making every believing parent the *root* meant *Rom.* 11. 16. and every natural child a branch; For then every believing parent ſhould *beare* his child: *v.* 18. and every natural child ſhould derive holineſs from his believing parent; *Abrahams* natural children at this day are not in the Olive, nor ſhall be till re-ingraffed. *Abraham* is *the root*, not as a natural father, but as *Father of believers*, and none are *branches* or *holy* as the Apoſtle there means, but through faith according to election. Nor are hereby the diſtinctions of *Jew inward and outward*, *child of the fleſh* and *promiſe* taken away; nor *whole Iſrael certainly ſaved*. Nor by *the branches be meant all the viſible body of the Jews old and yong*, which he might have imagined would be replied to his argument pag. 114. Nor is it *new Divinity*, but old, *That none are to be baptized but ſuch as are under actual exerciſe of their faith*, which *may be diſcerned*, by their profeſſion, *in thoſe that are come to age*. It is neither my Divinity, nor follows (though Mr. *Rutherfurd* conceives it doth) on it, that *predeſtination to life and glory*, *muſt bee propogated and derived from the lump to the firſt fruits* (he meant from the firſt fruits to the lump) *from the root and parents to the branches and children*; *But this* I ſay, that faith, and righteouſneſs are propagated and derived from *Abraham* as an exemplary root to all his ſpiritual branches or ſeed by conformation to him.

I do not say, that *the Apostle* Rom. 11. *speaks of an invisible body*, but this I say, the Apostle *by branches* means two sorts of people, the one Jews, who were then broken off from the Olive tree, which is the invisible Church of the elect; the other Gentiles, then grafted in, yet not all the Gentiles, nor one nation wholly and entirely, but a great part of them in comparison of what were formerly in the Olive very numerous.

How these branches were *an elect seed and yet fell away, were preached to, had a national election and external calling, were in the room of the Jewes, and partake of the fatness of the Olive*, is so fully opened in the places before cited, that I think it unnecessary to add here any more. Onely whereas he makes it an absurdity, that *the infants of baptized actual believers should be all heathen as well as the casten off the Jewes*; it is to me and absurdity unfit for any learned man to vent, that knows that Heathen in English is all one with Gentiles and ἔθνη, to conceive otherwise, as if a Jew because cast off were become a Heathen, or any Gentile believer or his infant, were or could bee by believing and baptism any other then an heathen, or a Christian of the Gentiles did not still continue a heathen notwithstanding his Christianity. I do account Mr. *Rutherfurd* and my self Christians, and yet Heathens. There's not a word in the Text, that *warrants us to say of the children of the ingrafted and called Gentiles that they have right to baptism*; but what if the words be expounded as Mr. *Rutherfurd* does, of the whole visible body of the nations will allow the baptizing of infidels. *Abrahams* children were never taken into covenant-fellowship universally. *Abraham* was indeed *a moral not a physical root*, yet not *as a believing Father*, nor *as a believing head of children, of servants and strangers under him*, but as Father of believers after him. And in this respect, neither *Adam*, nor any other then *Abraham* is the *root*, and none of *Abrahams* natural seed are *branches* or *holy intentionally*, but such as are elect, and shall be conformed to him in believing and justification. Nor doth the Apostle when he saith, *the Jews are beloved by reason of the Fathers*, make *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob the root*; but intimate that God remembers them, because of his Covenant made to them, his taking the title of their God, their obedience to him, their prayers, and his constancy to them as his ancient friends, when all the world were revolted.

The conceit of Mr. *Rutherfurd* concerning holiness *external federal*, as if it were any cause or reason of re-ingrafting them or their infants, is so frivolous, that I wonder any sober man should once fancy it. For what is it but a state of outward churchpriviledges, right to the seals, *&c* But to imagine so great a work as the re-ingrafting, which infers salvation, should come from *Abrahams, Isaac*, and *Jacobs*, or any other natural believing Fathers visible Churchmembership, Circumcision, Baptism, *&c.* is to derive title to heaven, from at best, an amissible priviledge, which may be interrupted by men. What more is to be seen in Mr. *Cotton, Blake, Cobbet, Baxter*, Mr. *Rutherfurd* may see examined in this *Review*; by reading of which hee may discern, that they have neither

neither closed the dispute; nor managed it so, as that their learning is to be rested on.

SECT. LXXXVII.

The distractions in Germany *and our present distractions, sprung not from Anabaptism as Mr.* Cragge *saith.*

THere having been a dispute at *Abergavenny* between me and Mr. *John Cragge*, *Sept.* 5th. 1653. and a Sermon preached there (when I was gone thence) the next Lords day, in opposition to what I taught, instead of letting mee have a copy manuscript, they were printed with much injury to the truth and my person. Wherefore having had experience in Mr. *Bs.* dealing, what advantage the errour of infant Baptism got by such writings, I being then in *London* and meeting with the Book, made a reply intituled, *A Plea for Antipadobaptists*; to which Mr. *John Cragge* hath returned an answer, and intituled it, *The Arraignment and Conviction of Anabaptism.* He hath prefixed an Epistle to eight eminent Members of the Parliament which sate *anno* 1654. He tels them that *the Cause he defends is and ought to be dearer to them, then any private interests, as whereupon infallibly depends the peace of Church and State.* He might more truly have said, that infallibly the peace of Church and State depends on the reforming of infant Baptism, which hath corrupted the Church and State by bringing into the Christian societies a world of ignorant, loose and prophane persons, who being the *major* part in all Churches, and Commonwealths, where Christianity hath been received, have persecuted the godly, domineered over the consciences and liberties of the Saints, and upheld a proud and sensual Clergy, to the infinite disturbance of the Eastern and Western Churches for many ages. And though I hope better of the men to whom Mr. *Cr.* ascribes such *heroick excellencies*, that they have or will have more wit or more grace, then to account Mr. *Crs.* cause of infant Baptism dearer to them then any private interests. Yet I must confess I cannot but mourn, that not onely Parliament men, but also Ministers should be so ignorant, as to be taken with such silly insipid clamours (I may truly say) rather then arguings, as Mr. *Cr.* Mr. *B.* and others, have mislead them by.

That which he saith, *the former sad disasters of* Germany *and our present distractions, both took their spring and growth, in a great measure, from Anabaptism*, is most false.

The disasters in *Germany* which were in the years 1524, 1525. did spring from the great burthens and oppressions which were put on the Rusticks by their Princes, Bishops, Abbots. *Spondanus* expressly in his *Auct.* of his *Epit.* of *Baron. Annals ad annum* 1524. saith, *That they began in* Suevia, *by rising of the Boors against their Lord Count* Lupius, *and that the beginning thence being risen, after an infinite number of Rusticks being stirred up to seditions upon pretext of Gospel liberty* (which *Spanheimius* him-

himself in his *Diatribe Historica* §. 4. refers to *Luthers* Book of *Christian Liberty* as the occasion taken by them) *committed great outrages.* And *ad annum* 1502. tels us, *That in the Diocess of* Spire, *a conspiracy of Husbandmen against the Bishops and Canons, which was called the* Rustick League, *began from two Rusticks: of which conspiracy the chief article was that they should shake off every yoke, and in imitation of the* Helvetians *should recover their liberty.* And *Lucas Osiander Epit. hist. Eccles. cent.* 16. l. 1. c. 16. p. 34. saith, *These particular seditions in* Germany, *were the* præludia *or sore playes of that great sedition of Rusticks, which was in its vigour in the year* 1525. And *Gnodalius* in his *history of the rustick tumults in Germany* in the year 1525. *lib.* 1. saith, *That in* Suevia, *where they first began, they did openly signifie that they were not Gospellers, nor did flow together for the Gospel sake, but because of exactions.* Bp. *Jewel. Def. of the Apology of the Church of England* part. 4. chap. 4. Divis. 1. to *Harding*, saying, *were the hundred thousand Bores of* Germany *consumed by the sword of the Nobility there for their obedience? answers thus,* "The Bores of *Germany*, of whom ye speak, for the greatest "part, were adversaries unto Doctour *Luther*, and understood no part "of the Gospel: but conspired together, as they said, onely against "the cruelty and tyranny of their Lords: as they had done two and "twenty years before in the same Country, in the Conspiracy called "*Liga sotularia*, fifteen years before Doctour *Luther* began to preach: "the partners of which conspiracy had for their watchword the name "of our Lady, and in the honour of her, were bound to say five *Ave* "*maries* every day. Certainly touching those later Rebels, it is known "that *Luther* sharply and vehemently wrote against them. And they "themselves being demanded thereof, utterly denied both the partaking, and also the knowledge of the Gospel. It is true *Muncer* was a busie man in *Thuringia*, and stirred up the people disposed to tumults by reason of oppressions, and at *Munster* in *Westphalia* in the years 1532, 1533. were stirs and out-rages; but even *Spanheimius* himself sets down the beginning of them to have been upon the Protestant reformation, by the preaching of *Rotmannus* and others, afore the comming of *John Matthias*, and *John Becold* of *Leyden*, the Bishop and Canons of *Munster* being Papists opposing it. How in like manner the Bishop of *Geneva* was expelled when the Protestants grew potent there, and the like was done in other places, is manifest by records extant, which acts have been represented as alike odious with those of *Muncer*, and at *Munster*, and would have been so reputed if there had been the like success, I mean the adverse party had prevailed as they did in these.

Our present distractions cannot with any shew of truth be said to take their spring from Anabaptism, by any that know things from the relation of men imployed in publike negotiations, their being neither in the beginning nor now, either in the Councel of State, or Parliaments, or Armies, or City of *London*, or Universities, or Countries, any such persons or parties, as could sway things any further then to put some stop to the violence of the Clergy against them, to which as the cause of them, though not the onely, the present distractions are to be referred:

as

to whom how much in former ages, and at this present, the great troubles of the Churches of God are to be ascribed, may be seen in part, in Mr. *Baxters* Book intituled, *The Reformed Pastour*, ch. 4. sect. 1, 2. and in many histories.

Mr. *Cr.* adds; *which reason with experience dictates; for by their principles whole nations are unchurched and none received into communion, but by re-baptizing, all former members esteemed as Publicans and Heathens; hence Magistracy and Ministry that dissents, are by them wholly disgusted, if not discarded.*

Answ. 1. Experience hath not proved either the disasters in *Germany* or our present distractions, to have sprung from Anabaptism, but from other causes; chiefly, the oppression of Princes and Prelates. 2. Nor are Mr. *Crs.* reasons sufficient to evince Anabaptism a cause of such troubles. For the first principle, that *whole nations are unchurched*, is as well the Independent as Pædobaptists principle (among whom is Mr. *Cradock* counted a *light in their Goshen* of *Monmouthshire*, by the relatour of the dispute in the Epistle dedicatory) and if so, the present distractions are to be ascribed with as good reason to Indepency, as to Anabaptism, and perhaps with greater; it being considered that they have been and are the more potent party. As the Papists imputed all the troubles to Protestant principles of Christian liberty, the Prelates to non conformists, whom *Whitgift* long since compared with Anabaptists, because they alledged against Prelacy *Matth.* 20 25, 26. so the Presbyterians charge the like on Independency, and perhaps Independents on Anabaptism; yet none of their principles are indeed the spring of the troubles, but the violence of the leading men of each party, who by their mis-reports and clamors, stir up Magistrates and people against their opposites, and will by no means allow liberty to them, nor willingly live: of which spirit Mr. *Cr.* seems by his writing to bee, and I suppose the State will discern all such as will not tolerate others, who dissent in religion, intolerable. 2. It is false *that Magistracy and Ministry that dissents, is by Anabaptists wholly disgusted, if not discarded.* For though I cannot justifie all so called, there being violent spirits among them (who are intolerable) as well as others: yet neither do all nor any great part that I know of, appear to be such. But if they did, yet sure it comes not from those principles fore-named by Mr. *Cr.* there being no such consequence included in those tenents, that they who are not Churchmembers are not to be accounted Magistrates. As Bp. *Andrews* answered, *resp. ad Bellarm. Apol.* c. 1 p. 30. *Bellarmine* alledging the *Puritans did not admit the Kings Supremacy, because they brought a parity into the Church, To the King's Supremacy what is parity among Elders in the Church? Videt ergo lector ludere hic par, impar, Cardinalem*; so may I say to Mr. *Cr.* The Baptists do not count whole nations to be Churches of Christ, and with them agree Independents, as Dr. *Owen of Schism*, ch. 7, *&c* The Baptists receive none into communion but the baptized, esteemed all other as not in the Church visible (though these two last are denied by many of them) what is the non-admission into the Church, to the disgusting or discarding of Magistracy in the

Com-

Common-wealth? The Reader therefore sees Mr. *Cr.* to play here *par impar*, even and odd.

What Mr. *Cr.* *hath suffered for patronage of respect to tender Consciences*, I know not; nor who are *for promiscuous toleration without distinction*. What he adds out of the old Testament of Princes punishing idolatry and blasphemy, was done by special judicial laws of *Moses*, which do not binde Christian Magistrates; if they did, it makes nothing for the punishing of errours of Christians about the Christian doctrine, by civil punishment. It is granted that Ministers are bound to oppose errours by preaching, and Ecclesiastical censures, both singly and in Councils; yet neither have Councils, nor the learnedst Doctours been very happy in determining of errours, and heresies. That which was heresie in one Council was Orthodox in another; under one Emperor that was adjudged truth, which was blasphemy under another. What strange kinds of Heretiques were the *Quartodecimani*, *Aerians*, *Helvidians*, and many more? *Had Vigilantius or Jovinian* (saith Mr. *Baxter* in his *Reformed Pastour* p. 147.) *had Hieromes name, some of their Heresies might possibly have been articles of faith*. Nor was it well done (however Mr. *Cr.* conceives) that well-minded Emperours did rely so much on the advise of Synods and Bishops, as to banish and destroy at the instance of them, such as they judged heretiques and schismatiques. The sad tragedies about the doctrines of the Trinity, Images, Easter, *&c.* are a sufficient document to all wise rulers to bee cautelous how they use their power for suppressing persons deemed erroneous in point of doctrine. There may bee toleration of different opinions in a Commonwealth *without mixture of religion*, and that such toleration doth *not dissolve the bond of obedience*, or *breed any of those evils* Mr. *Cr.* reckons up (except by accident) the peaceable rule of the united Provinces of *Belgia* and elsewhere shews. It is the intemperate zeal of Preachers and others against dissenters, which is the chief cause of such evils as Mr. *Cr.* reckons up. I remember that I have read, that the Bores of *Germany* were not subdued till 100000. of them were slain, but *Sleidan* reports not in his *Com.* l. 7. or any other, that *in Germany the Anabaptist grew so populous, that they could not be vanquished, till almost a hundred thousand of them were slain by the united forces of the Empire*. But the Emperour objected to the Protestants that their Preachers were a great occasion of the Rustical war, wherein an hundred thousand were slain. But whether it were so or not so (what ever Mr. *Crs.* protestations be) the writing this Epistle, with some other passages at the time and to the persons to whom it was directed, shew what we are to expect from him and such as he is, if ever they have power over us. But of these things onely by the way.

Sect. 88.

SECT. LXXXVIII.

Austins saying about Apostolical traditions is not to be rested upon, nor his testimony about the antiquity of Infant Baptism.

AFter his own Epistle, and the Epistle of *I. T. P.* and the reprinting of the conference between me and Mr. *Vaughan*, and the dispute between me and himself, Mr. *Cr.* leaving out the former Epistle of *I. T. P.* begins with a descant on the title of my reply, which he vainly makes to imply *a suit against the universal Church*, though it be onely an action against innovators, who have left the plain way of Christ and his Apostles, and (as they have done in many other things) brought in infant Baptism, to the great corruption of the Church of God: And for Mr. *Halls* inditement, it is such as is fit for boys onely to make sport with; and were Mr. *Hall* or Mr. *Cr.* of such serious and grave spirits as they should be, they would have buried it in silence, or been humbled for handling things of God so lightly, such writings being fitter for light wits in the University, then for Preachers and Pastors over Churches of Christ. My calling Mr. *Baxters* book a cheat and mock titled book, is proved here to be right; and that Mr. *Ms.* is no *impregnable Defence*, is here shewed. The rest of Mr. *Cr.* light Poetry in *sect. 1. &c. par. 1.* I let pass as the scum of his wit, and onely take notice, that he terms from *Stow* Sir *John Oldcastle a traitor, who was hanged on a gibbet and burned in St. Gyles field*, whom Mr. *Fox* in his book of Martyrs in the time of *Henry* the 5th. hath against *Alan Cope* vindicated, and by sundry arguments particularly by the manner of his death mentioned by Mr. *Cr.* made it probable, that he died a Martyr oppressed by popish Prelates. Whose case is a good document how little credence is to be given to the censures of men, when the relations of them are made by their prevailing adversaries. What *I* think of laying on hands, may be seen *part 2.* of this *Review*, *sect. 23.* Dr. *Featly* was a man with whom I had sundry times conference when he was in his greatest esteem, but never found him such as *I durst not look in the face when living*, and sure his book of Baptism is (besides what *Denn* hath done) shewed here and elsewhere not to be unanswerable. With what spirit Mr. *Cr.* and other Pædobaptists, and my self, have written on this subject, must be left to the cognizance of our Judge.

If *Austins* saying, *l. 4. de Bapt. contra Donat. c. 23. That what the universal Church holds, nor was instituted in Councels, but always retained, is most rightly believed to have been delivered by no other then Apostolical authority*, were meant as Mr. *Cr. sect. 5. p. 67.* expounds it, including the Apostles, I should yeeld it. But 1. I do not conceive that to be *Austins* meaning; for 1. then the speech would be an inept tautology to say, that what the whole Church including the Apostles holds, is most rightly believed to have been delivered by no other then Apostolical authority;

rity; it were as if he had ſaid, what the Apoſtles held the Apoſtles held: 2. The very ſpeech ſhews that *Auſtin* meant it of the univerſal Church of his time, the word [*tenet*] being in the preſent tenſe, and the Councels meant being ſuch as were ſince the Apoſtles, and that he counted that to be inſtituted in no Councels, but to have been always held, of which he could not ſhew any beginning or any interruption: 3. Elſewhere his ſpeeches ſhew this was his mind, as *Epiſt.* 118. *ad Joann. Illa quæ non ſcripta ſed tradita cuſtodimus, quæ quidem toto terrarum orbe obſervantur dantur intelligi vel ab ipſis Apoſtolis vel plenariis Conciliis quorum eſt in Eccleſia ſaluberrima autoritas commendata atque ſtatuta retineri*, and he inſtanceth in the anniverſary ſolemnities of Good Friday, Eaſter day, Holy Thurſday, and Whitſunday, and adds; and *if any other thing hath occurred which is kept by the whole Church where ever it ſpreads it ſelf.* And accordingly he makes the neceſſity of the Communion to eternal life as of Baptiſm to the Kingdome to be from Apoſtolical tradition, *tom.* 7. *de pecc. mer. & remiſ. l.* 1. *c.* 24. Mr. *Crs.* conceit is not right, as if the words, *And if any man ſeek for Divine authority in this thing*, did intimate that his following rule was meant of what was held in the Apoſtles time: for in them he means that which he after fetcheth from Circumciſion out of Scripture, beſides that which the whole Church holds, not inſtituted in Councels, yet ſtill held. In this ſenſe it is urged by *Canus, l.* 3. *loc. Theol. c.* 4. as a rule to know genuine unwritten traditions Apoſtolical from ſpurious, and rejected by *Chamier, pauſtr. cath. tom.* 1. *l.* 8. *c.* 14. §. 13. as impoſſible, ſith what hath been in all ages and Churches from the Apoſtles cannot be known; and it is urged by *Bellarm. de bonis oper. in part. l.* 2. *c.* 14 for Lent faſt, and refuted by *Chamier, pauſtr. cath. tom.* 2. *l.* 19. *c.* 7. §. 36.

2. This rule cannot ſtand the Epiſtler in any ſtead for proving infant Baptiſm without the Apoſtles writings, 1. becauſe there is no way without them to know what was univerſally held, there being no man able to know what the Church holds in all places in his own time, much leſs what in former ages was held; and many things have been taken even by *Auſtin* as univerſally obſerved which were not, and many Councels held which are unknown, and many corruptions crept very early into the Church whoſe original cannot be ſet down determinately, of which *uſhers general anſwer to the Jeſuites challenge*, gives reaſons. 2. Infant Baptiſm cannot bee proved to have been univerſally obſerved, but as now it is taught and uſed hath been oppoſed by ſome of the Ancients, and is now rejected by Proteſtant Divines, as it was by the Ancients taught and uſed. Nor is *Auſtins* teſtimony *Serm* 10. *de verb. Apoſtoli* (not *Serm.* 15.) *that the Church always had and held Infant Baptiſm*, valid for Mr. *Crs.* purpoſe; 1. becauſe the term [*hoc, this*] may bee rather referred to the doctrine of infants being born with original ſin, rather then the practiſe of their baptiſm, and to this ſenſe both the ſcope, words precedent, conſequent, and the terms, *had, held, perceives from the faith of Elders, keep to the end* (which are moſt fitly applied to doctrine) make more probable, as I noted in my *Apology* §. 16. *pag.* 83. 2. Were the meaning of *Auſtin* about infant baptiſm, yet there were no

cauſe

cause to rest on this testimony as credible, 1. because it is but a speech in a popular Sermon, in which men speak not exactly as in other writings. 2. The words [*hoc Ecclesia usque in finem perseveranter custodit*] could be known onely by guess and conjectural presage, it being of a contingent matter not by Divine revelation fore-told, and therefore the other speeches (as likewise other speeches, as that *tom. 7. de pecc. mer. & remiss. l. 1. c. 24.* shew was his wont) are to bee conceived as spoken not out of any good records, but from that which he found observed in his time, where he had been. 3. Because *serm. 14. de verbis Apost.* he saith, that *Cyprian Epist. 59. ad Fidum quid semper Ecclesia sensit monstraverit*; though he onely set down what was determined in that Council of *Carthage*, which was in the third Century. 4. There are so many speeches of the ancients false, uncertain, contradicting each other concerning Apostolical traditions, universal observations, that many Protestants have discredited them, of which some testimonies are set down by me in my *Præcursor sect. 3. Salmasius appar. ad libr. de primatu papæ*, mentions some other, as *pag. 134. All the Fathers with one accord make* Paul *and* Peter *founders of the Roman Church, and yet were deceived*; *Hierome* saith, *it was in all the world decreed, that one should be a Bishop over others*: and yet the Preface of *Selden* before *Twisdens* Collection of ancient British Histories, shews it was otherwise in *Scotland* of old. And for *Austin Epist. 118. ad Janu. c. 1, 6.* hee makes the anniversary solemnities of Easter, *&c.* of eating the Lords Supper fasting, as always universally observed, in which he was mistaken. Mr. *Cr.* doth abuse me in making my argument, as if I had said Easter was always held, my words were; If *Austins* rule were true, then Easter should be from the Apostles; not because I thought it true, but because *Austin* thought so, and so by his rule Easter must bee counted to come from the Apostles, and his testimony is as good for it, as for the universal observation of infant Baptism. 5. Not onely Protestants but Papists also do now reject things observed by the Ancients, as amply as infant Baptism. *Jewel Sermon at Pauls Cross, p. 48. Usher answer to the Jesuits challenge, p. 23. It was the use of the ancient Church to minister the Communion to infants: which is yet also practised by the Christians in Egypt and Ethiopia. The Church of Rome, upon better consideration hath thought fit to do otherwise.* The putting milk and honey into the mouth of the Baptized, the standing at prayer on Lords days between Easter and Whitsontide, the baptizing at Easter persons catechised in Lent, with many more are now left; though *Bellarmin. l. 2. de bonis operibus in particulari c. 17.* tels us, *Abolitam esse consuetudinem baptizandi catechumenos & absolvendi pœnitentes in paschate verum est apud Lutheranos: caterum apud Catholicos, ac præsertim in urbe Romana nullus est annus, quo non multi Catichumeni in paschate baptizentur*; which I mention to shew, that there are some foot-steps yet remaining of the old baptizing. *Ep. Jewel Defense of the Apology of the Church of England, part. 2 ch. 16. div. 1.* saith, *there have been errours and great errours from the beginning*: hee mentions there and in the *Sermon at Pauls cross*, baptizing for and of the dead, giving the Communion to the dead body, and therefore there and

in his reply to Dr. *Cole*, he rejects customs of the ancient Church, and condemnes carrying home to the absent the Communion; mixing water with the wine, and many more things; and still requires the Lords Supper and Baptism to bee administred according to the institution of Christ; which if Mr. *Cr.* or any other can ever shew to have been of infant Baptism, I will say as Bp. *Jewel* did concerning the 27. Articles propounded at *Pauls Cross*, I am content to yeild and to subscribe: otherwise Mr. *Cr.* and other Pædobaptists by accusing mee as opposing the universal Church in *Austins* sense (though I deny it to be true) do but condemn themselves, who with Papists do reject things counted by the writers of the first ages Apostolical, and of universal observation near the Apostles times.

Nor is the fifth proposition of Mr. *Cr. p. 67.* true, *That the whole Church since the Apostles in all ages, collectively considered, cannot err either in doctrine or discipline.* For if the whole Church might err so in one age, it may also in all ages collectively considered, the promises being no more to the Church in all ages collectively considered, then in each age distributively considered, nor any means given to them after the Apostles collectively considered, to keep from errour, then to each, distributively; yea the Churches nearer the Apostles, had more meanes to keep them from errour then other ages, yet they erred in doctrine and discipline, as many writers shew, about Easter, the Millenary opinion, and many other. As for the promise *Matth. 16. 18.* it is not true of the whole Church visible, *the gates of hell* have and *do prevail against them*, but of the invisible, and yet the promise is not to the invisible that they shall not err, but that they shall not erre finally to damnation, which if they did, then indeed *the gates of hell* or of death *should prevail against them*, that is (as *Cameron* rightly in his *praelection*) *they should not rise to life eternal.* Nor is there a promise *Joh. 16. 13.* to the whole Church, but to the Apostles, the promise being as well *to shew them things to come*, as *to lead them into all truth*: And yet the promise is not so made to the Apostles, but that they might err as *Peter* did *Gal. 2.* though when they taught the Church by writing or preaching, they were so guided as that they should not err. But of this point of the militant Churches erring, I need say no more, but refer Mr. *Cr.* to his own Author Dr. *Rainold thes. 3.*

6. Were it granted that antiquity did universally practise infant Baptism, yet neither were the present doctrine or practise justified by it, but condemned; and Mr. *Cr.* as truly may be said to plead against the universal Church as my self. For it is manifest from the places where there is mention of it in the Ancients, that they taught it and practised it, onely upon the opinion of the necessity of it to save an infant from perishing, and because the very baptism did give grace, remission of original sin, made believers, heirs of the Kingdome of heaven, and accordingly they practised it, onely in case of danger of death, very seldome, and this they did to unbelievers children, as well as believers, as a work of charity, not of institution or right by their birth to either. But these things Mr. *Cr.* pleads against them in, as well as my self, and both the doctrine

doctrine and practise of Pædobaptists now is against the Ancients as well as mine: Yea more, in that they had a constant course of baptizing the catechized persons upon a solemn profession of faith, and did in all baptisms, except that of the *Clinici*, that is sick persons baptized in their beds, plunge the whole body, or dip it so as to be under water: which are now clean otherwise and things unknown among Pædobaptists. So that as Bp. *Usher* in his *answer to the Jesuites challenge*, in the article about *praying for the dead*, *p.* 245. proves the Romanists to have rejected the ancient prayer for the dead, because they pray not for Martyrs and others in bliss for their resurrection, but for persons in Purgatory to be delivered thence; so I may truly say, the Pædobaptists now have rejected the ancient infant Baptism, sith they deny Baptism necessary to salvation, or that it gives grace, and they do it onely to believers infants, by sprinkling or perfusion, without mersion, scarce to any but infants, without any solemn course of catechising ordinarily in order to future Baptism, and to infants ordinarily out of the case of danger of death, upon pretence of a federal holiness by birth, and ordinance of visible Churchmembership unrepealed, unknown to the Ancients, and therefore their doctrine and practise hath no patronage from them.

Mr. *Cr. p.* 98. saith, that *I cunningly alter the subject of the question*, when I say infant-sprinkling was not held of the whole Church; and tels me, *that he and others do not say so.* Which intimates that hee and others desert the maintainance of sprinkling infants as ancient; which diffidence is some argument that the late *Assembly* have forsaken the ancient way of Baptism by dipping, having in the *Directory* determined *sprinkling as sufficient*, and in the practise of many of them taken away the old Fonts, more agreeble to antiquity, and brought in little stone Basons near the Pulpit or Readers Pew, like Popish holy-water pots, fit onely for the novelty of sprinkling after the Scottish mode. Nor is Mr. *Crs.* way of *powring water on the face, or dipping in part of the head*, any more the baptizing Christ appointed, or antiquity used, except in the case of the *Clinici*. 'Tis true *Gods ordinances are not destructive to nature, who requires mercy and not sacrifice*; But this proves rather that Baptism should be omitted altogether, and not the ordinance altered, and people mocked as they are by the preacher, that saith falsly, he baptizeth the person, when he doth onely sprinkle or powr water on the face, or dip in part of the head.

SECT. LXXXIX.

The teſtimonies of the ancient writers of the Greek Church *concerning Infant Baptiſm are examined, and my exceptions made good againſt Mr.* Cragge, *Dr.* Hammond, *Dr.* Homes, *Mr.* Marſhal.

THe alledging of pſeudo-*Dioniſius the Areopagite*, and *Clements Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, is but to abuſe the world with counterfeit names, diſcovered by many learned Papiſts and Proteſtants to be ſuch, and the like is to be ſaid of *Juſtin Martyrs* forged teſtimony *qu.* 36. *ad orthodoxos*: which are not rejected becauſe queſtioned, as Mr. *Cr.* ſeems to intimate, but becauſe they are by many ſtrong evidences proved not to have been the Authors, whoſe names they bear. As for *the evidence to matter of fact they give, that infants were baptized in that age in which they were written*, I do readily grant it, and before too; yet think it no advantage for the preſent pretended infant Baptiſm, which is e'ean otherwiſe, and upon other reaſons; as particularly, that *the baptized infants obtained good things at the reſurrection by Baptiſm, but the unbaptized obtain not good things.* Nor is there a word in that to confirm the novel doctrine of the childrens right to Baptiſm, as being in Covenant with the parents. For neither are the parents there ſaid to be believers, but *the bringers*; nor by the parents faith are they ſaid to have right to Baptiſm, but *by the faith of the bringers to obtain good things at the reſurrection*: and therefore in vain doth Mr. *Cr.* thus endeavour to hide the deformity of that Authors doctrine, which is no better then that which commonly Proteſtant Divines condem as Popiſh. More honeſtly in this then Mr. *Cr.* doth *Bellarmin tom.* 3. *l.* 2. *de effectu Sacram. c.* 6. ſay, *Juſtin. in his Apology to Antoninus, ſaith, we obtain remiſſion of afore committed ſins in water*, &c. *And before he had ſaid, that no man was brought to Baptiſm, unleſs he before believed. Like things hee hath in his dialogue with* Triphon. *And* ch. 8. *alwayes in the Church the cuſtome was, that thoſe who would be Chriſtians ſhould firſt be made catechized perſons, and long enough inſtructed, and not baptized unleſt inſtructed, and firm, and ſtable in faith*, citing to this end *Juſtin in his Apologye to Antoninus, as ſhewing the manners of the Church.*

As for *Irenæus* his teſtimony, *lib.* 2. *adv. har. c.* 39. it proves not infant Bapsiſm. For though it be true that Mr. *Mede* in his *Diatribe on Tit.* 3. 5. ſay, *None, I trow, will deny that when the Apoſtle ſpeaks of saving us by waſhing of regeneration, and renewing of the holy Ghoſt, hee ſpeaks of Baptiſm*; yet it follows not that that the Apoſtle meant by *regeneration*, Baptiſm; nor is it likely, ſith the word [*regeneration*] is not to be read [by the waſhing which is regeneration] as if it were by apoſition, but [*of regeneration*] as the Genitive poſſeſſive, and the meaning

ning is by the washing which signifies regeneration, which is before the washing; yet if it were so, it proves not *Irenæus* meant by [*renascuntur are born again*] are baptized, sith he saith not are by washing born again, as the Apostles phrase is. Nor though it be granted that in *Justin Martyr* and others of the ancients [*to be regenerated*] is [*to bee baptized*] doth it appear that *Irenæus* meant it so in that place, unless it were proved it is so onely meant by him and the ancients. Nor doth *Irenaus l.* 1. *c.* 18. term Baptism regeneration as Dr. *Homes p.* 118. suggests, but saith thus *to the denying of Baptism of that generation which is into God.* But that indeed the word [*renascuntur are born again*] is not meant of Baptism, is proved from the words and the scope of them. For 1. the words are [*per eum renascuntur, by him, that is Christ, are born again*] and it is clear from the scope of the speech about the fulness of his age as a perfect master, that [*by him*] notes his person according to his humane nature. Now if then [*by him are born again*] be as much as [by him are baptized] this should bee *Irenæus* his assertion, that by Christ himself in his humane body infants and little ones, and boyes and young men, and elder men, are baptized unto God. But this speech is most manifestly false, for neither did Christ baptize any at all in his own person, the Evangelist *John* 4. 1, 2. expressly affirming, that though *the Pharisees heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples then* John, *yet Jesus himself did not baptize, but his Disciples did baptize*, nor did the Disciples baptize any infant at all, as may bee gathered from the whole N. T. 2. The word which *Irenæus* expresseth, whereby persons were born again to God by Christ, is applied to the example of his age, as the words and scope shew. *Omnem ætatem sanctificans per illam quæ ad ipsum erat similitudinem. Ideo per omnem venit ætatem & infantibus infans factus, sanctificans infantes, in parvulis parvulus sanctificans hanc ipsam habentes ætatem, simul & exemplum illis pietatis effectus & justitiæ & subjectionis. Juvenibus juvenis exemplum juvenibus fiens & sanctificans domino. Sic & senior in senioribus, ut sit perfectus Magister in omnibus non solum secundum expositionem veritatis, sed secundum ætatem sanctificans simul & seniores, exemplum ipsis quoque fiens.* But hee was not in his age an example of every age by his Baptism, as if hee did by it sanctifie every age, for then he should have been baptized in every age, but in respect of the holiness of his humane nature which did remain in each age, and so exemplarily sanctifie each age to God, so as that no age but was capable of holiness by conformity to his example. 3. *Irenæus* his words are *omnes enim venit per semetipsum salvare, omnes inquam qui per eum renascuntur in Deum, infantes & parvulos, & pueros & juvenes & seniores*, now if the meaning were that Christ came to save all that were baptized by him, or by his appointment, then he came to save *Simon Magus*, and whoever are or have been baptized rightly, even *Judas Iscariot*, if he were baptized. But in that sense the proposition of *Irenæus* were most palpably false, and therefore that sense is not to be attributed to his words. 4. Christ is by *Irenæus* said *to sanctifie as a perfect Master, not onely according to the exposition of truth, but also as an example to them of piety, justice, and subjection*; but this is to bee

under-

understood not in respect of his Baptism onely, but his whole life, in which he was an example even an infant, for then he did willingly *empty himself, took upon him the form of a servant, was made in the likeness of men, and being in fashion a man humbled himself to death*, Phillip. 2. 7, 8. By all which reasons I presume the Readers, who is willing to see truth, will perceive this passage of *Irenæus* to be wrested by Pædobaptists against its meaning, to prove an use of Pædobaptism in his time. Which I have the more largely insisted on, because indeed it is the onely testimony of credit which Pædobaptists have any colour from for infant baptism in the 2d century: In the 3d. century it is not denied, but that infant baptism and many more corruptions were; yet even then it was very rare, in case onely of danger of death, out of that case disswaded, in that case allowed upon the conceit of giving grace by it, and saving the infant from perishing. But I shall allow Mr. *Cr.* and other Pædobaptists, to say the most they can for this corruption.

Origen is alledged next by Mr. *Cr. in Rom. 6. l. 5. homil.* 8th. *on Levitic.* and 18th. *on Luke.* "The Exceptions against these are 3. 1. "they are translations, *Origens* Greek in the Original is lost. The same "may be said of St. *Matthews* Gospel, which he writ in the Hebrew or "Syriack now lost, the Greek copy onely extant. And of the LXXs. "translations of the Old T. which our Saviour followed more exactly "then the Hebrew Original, translations agreeing with the Original "copy being equally authentick.

Answ. 1. *There is no certainty, nor probability that* Matthew *did write in Hebrew*, saith the *Annotator on Matth. in his argument* of that Gospel *the new Annotations* called by some *the Assemblies at westminster. Pareus* in his *Proeme to his Commentary on* Matthew, *with the leave of antiquity*, Erasmus *and other learned interpreters doubt not a little of that opinion that he wrote in Hebrew, and the reasons of doubting seem not to be light*, which may be seen there, with answer to the objections produced out of antiquity. 2. Whether there were such a translation by LXX. *Jews*, as *Josephus* relates of *Aristeas, l.* 12. *antiq. Judaic. c.* 2. I do not so much question, as the particularities of the relation, but the authority of it is much questioned, of which much may be seen in *Chamier. paustr. cath. tom.* 1. *l.* 13. and it is much doubted whether that we have be it, of which I am told learned *usher* hath written, which I have not seen. But sure our Saviour who spake in *Hebrew* or *Syriack* followed it not, nor do I think it safe or right to say that the Evangelists or other holy writers *followed it more exactly then the Hebrew Original.* But sure the translation of *Ruffinus* of *Origens* Homiles is nothing like to either of these, in which he confesseth he did not exactly follow the Original, and it is likely for this reason *Voss. thes. Theol. de Pædobap. part* 2. *thes.* 8. said, *But we shall the less care for* Origen, *because the things we cited are not extant in Greek.* But Mr. *Cr.* adds.

"But 2*ly.* it is said that the translation is censured by *Erasmus*, and "*Perkins*, as in something contracting, adding, or altering. What is "added is ingeniously confessed by *Ruffinus* the translator himself; nei-

"ther

"ther does acute *Erasmus*, nor judicious *Perkins*, nor any of the Anci-
"ents most critical, impeach him in the forequoted testimonies; there-
"fore this exception is blank.

Answ. This exception is good notwithstanding this answer. For 1. *Perkins* doth not onely censure *Ruffinus* his translation, as *in something contracting, adding, or altering*; but also puts *Origens commentaries on the Epistle to the Romanes, not faithfully translated by* Ruffinus, *among his counterfeit works.* And *Erasmus* in his *censure of the Homilies on Leviticus*, saith, *That a man cannot be certain whether he reads* Ruffinus, *or* Origen. And because Dr. *Homes* saith *I make no exception against the translation of the Homilies on Luke*, he may take notice that *Erasmus* in his *Annotations on Luke* 1.1. speaks much against the Paraphrase of *Origen* on *Luke*, and in his *Annot.* on *Luke* 1.3. *Sic enim visus est sentire quisquis is fuit cujus extant in Lucam commentarii Adamantii titulo*, which shews that *Erasmus* took not those Commentaries for *Origens*, or at least doubted thereof. And I shall add the words of *Scultetus*, in his *medulla Patrum*, l.6. c.2. *Jam Ruffinus plurium librorum Origenis interpres tantam usurpavit licentiam: ut ademerit, adjecerit, mutarit, quæ sibi viderentur adimenda, adjicienda, mutanda: ut sæpe incertus sit lector, utrum Origenem legat an Ruffinum: cum Græca Origenis opera non extent hodie, e quibus Latina versio corrigi possit & emendari.* And I find cited *Erasmus* his *preface on Hillary*, as charging *Ruffinus* with this practise of adding and changing beyond an interpreter in all his translations, as of *Eusebius* his History, but chiefly of *Origens* writings. *Grot. annot. in Matth.25.46. Quid Origenes senserit ex ipsius scriptis difficile est dictu, adeo omnia a Ruffino sunt interpolata. Hieronymus Apol. adv. Ruff. l.2.* speaks thus to *Ruffinus* concerning some of his translations of *Origen*, *Novit conscientia tua quæ addideris, quæ subtraxeris, quæ in utranque partem, ut tibi visum fuerit, immutaris.* Whereas therefore Mr. *Ms. friend, Defence* part 1. p.15. tels me, *You call the Author of them supposed* Origen: *It had been your part before you had so branded them, first to have made it manifest by some undeniable evidence or other that they were not Origens*: I tell him, that being but a respondent, it was enough that I shewed such evidences as I did to prove the passages doubtfull, an uncertain witness being no good proof. And to Dr. *Homes* his saying in his *Animadv.* on my *Exercit. p* 129. *Truly a man can hardly with patience enough look upon Mr. T. his dealing in this: when we urge* Origen, *he is not* Origen *with him; but if he do it, then* Origen *must be received.* I answer, if the Dr. had had patience enough to have considered my words, he might have observed, that I onely named *Origen Hom.* on *Rom.6.* but did neither assign the 3d. century for the time in which those words were written, nor did intimate that they were to be received as his, but added two reasons to prevent this imagination, as if by alledging those words under the title of *Origen homil. on Rom.6.* (by which onely it is known) I did judge they were his, whereof the one was the censure of *Erasmus*, the other, that neither *Austin*, nor *Hierom* mention *Origen* as avouching infant Baptism: which is enough to shew it to be likely, that the passages cited were added by *Ruffinus*, though *Hierom*

and

and others mention not these in particular, sith neither doth he mention all the particulars of his dealings in this kind, but chargeth them upon his conscience. Nor is it true, that *what is added is ingeniously confessed by* Ruffinus *the translator himself*: For though the words cited by Mr. *Ms. friend, Defence, p.16.* shew that *Ruffinus* acknowledged of what sort his additions were to his translation of his Homilies on *Leviticus*, yet they shew not what in particular they were; nor is any thing produced to shew the words cited for infant Baptism were not one. Nor is there any good answer made to my allegation to prove that passage likely to be one, 1. from the bringing of them in (as it seemed to me when I read them) in a patcht manner, not as if they were woven at first with the whole cloth, that is the rest of the writing before and after, but as sewed to it by a botcher, without any handsome coherence; which neither Mr. *Ms.* friend, *p.16.* nor Dr. *Homes* p.130. deny, and therefore I count worth the observing by the judicious Reader, when he shall examine the places, as being of some moment to discern whether they were *Origens* words at first, or *Ruffinus* his assument. 2. Because they are the very words which are frequently used by the refuters of *Pelagians* in the 5th. century, who denied Original sin, whereas *Origen* is taxed as the very Father of Pelagianism, by *Hieron. præfat. ad lib. 4. in Hierem.* and elsewhere, as teaching ἀναμαρτησίαν *perfection or freedome from sin*, contrary to the express words of those cited passages; and when *August. tom.7. l 1. adv. Julian. c.1,2.* alledgeth ancients avouching Original sin, he never mentions *Origen*; and therefore these passages, being so express against *Pelagians*, and in the very words used by the refuters of them in *Augustines* time, are to be judged to be added either by *Ruffinus*, whose words to the same purpose on the 50th. Psalm are cited by *Chamier, paustr. cath. tom.3. l.1. c.6. §.9.* and of whom the same Author, *tom.4. l.7. c.9. §.30.* saith, *Sciunt omnes docti exiguam fuisse Ruffini in vertendis authoribus religionem*, or by some other. Nor are these passages in *Origen* onely *hints against some piece of Pelagianism, which might be conceived by some few in his time*, as Dr. *Homes* minceth the matter, *p.130.* but express arguing against the main point of *Pelagianism*, denying original corruption, and that in the chief arguments used by *Augustine* and others. Nor did *Origen Pelagianize a little onely*, but *is supposed to have first brought in Pelagianism into the Church, Hieron. adv. Ruffin.* saith *Dr. Owen, display of Arminianism, ch.12.* And though it's not denied that *Origen* did deliver contraries, yet I think it's hard to find him so often, and so directly arguing against his own tenet. Nor do I conceive, however Dr. *Homes*, Mr. *Blake*, Mr. *M.* and others imagine contradictions in my words which are not so, that ever Dr. *Homes* hath found in my writings *such clashings against my self*. Nor do I make such an argument as M. *Ms friend Defence, p.17.* answers, that *the passages make against the Pelagians, and therefore necessarily they were written after the Pelagian heresie was broached* (which is a meer shifting fashion in that Author who ever he were, used before in answering my argument from *Irenæus* words and scope, which he answers as if I made it from the scope and not the words) but thus, these passages are plainly and directly against the *Pelagians*

legians chief point of impeccability, which *Origen* is charged to bee the Author of; therefore according to *Rivets* rule *tractat. de patrum autoritate c.* 14. it's not likely they were *Origens*, to which he answers not. I will add only the words of *Voſſius Hiſt. Pelag. l.* 2. *part* 1. *th.* 6. *p.* 153. *Idem Origines T.* 2. *p.* 471. *niſi is potius Rufinus interpres (quis enim, quæ vel Origenis, vel paraphraſtæ adeò liberi fuerint, hodie diſcernit) in cap.* IX. (*rectiùs* VI.) *ad Rom. ubi ait, ab ſorde peccati mundus non eſt quiſquam, etiamſi unius diei fuerit vita ejus ſuper terram. Sed fuſe clareque imprimis hoc de peccato ſcribit lib.* VIII. *&* XII. *in Levit. niſi iſti in Leviticum commentarii Cyrilli potiùs ſint, quando etiam in hujus operibus inveniuntur, ac, ut in Origenianis libri ſexdecim, ita inter Cyrilliana ſexdecim homiliæ appellantur*; which ſhews, that that learned writer for Pædobaptiſm, did diſtruſt thoſe very paſſages cited for infant Baptiſm to have been none of *Origens*.

Mr. *C.* adds. "The third thing objected is, that he calls it a tra-
"dition; ſo does the Apoſtle things contained in Scripture, 2 *Theſ.* 2.
"15. *Epiphanius* calls Baptiſm and other divine truths παράδοσις tra-
"ditions, and yet quotes Scripture for them. *Bellarmin* calls infant
"Baptiſm a tradition, and yet brings ten places of Scripture to prove
"it. *Auſtin* affirms *lib.* 10. *c.* 23. *de Geneſ.* that the cuſtome of our mo-
"ther the Church in baptiſing of little ones is in no wiſe to be deſpiſed,
"nor to be thought ſuperfluous, nor at all to be believed, unleſs it were
"an Apoſtolick tradition, and yet proves the neceſſity of it from *Joh.* 3. 5.
"unleſs one be born again of water and the ſpirit, *&c.*

Anſw. It was granted in my *Examen* that the greateſt points of faith though written, were by the Ancients called Apoſtolical traditions, but in this point that the words aſcribed to *Origen* meant an unwritten tradition, I alledged 1. that the phraſes *pro hoc & eccleſia ab Apoſtolis traditionem ſuſcepit*, and *ſecundum Eccleſiæ obſervantiam*, are ſufficient proof to them who are acquainted with the Ancients writings of thoſe times. To this is nothing replied by Mr. *Ms. friend.* Dr. *Homes*, or M. *Cr.* to ſhew that theſe phraſes are applied to any other then unwritten traditions, when they are uſed of rites, for the uſe or inſtitution of which they alledge no text of Scripture. 2. That there is no text of Scripture cited for the uſe or inſtitution of infant Baptiſm. To this it is replied, that *Origen layes the ground on the Scriptures*, But thoſe Scriptures are brought for the proof of original ſin, and the neceſſity of infant Baptiſm, which were reaſons of the Churches obſervance, not proofs of the uſe and inſtitution of it. And that the Scriptures do not give any proof of the uſe or inſtitution of infant Baptiſm, but onely grounds of the reaſonableneſs, and why the Church took it up, is ſhewed to have been the judgement of many learned Papiſt and Proteſtants of later and elder time, in my *Præcurſor ſect.* 20. which may bee eaſily obſerved, becauſe they alledge nothing out of Scripture about inſtitution or practiſe of it, but of neceſſity to ſave the infant; which being a miſtake, it appears the tradition was not from the Apoſtles. Beſides, as *Auguſtin* alledged *Joh.* 3. 5. for infant Baptiſm, ſo he alſo alledged *Joh.* 6. 53. for infant Communion, which hee and the Ancients obſerved as an Apoſtolick tradition, and

many Churches observe even to this day; yet we conclude it is but an unwritten tradition, and so judged by the Ancients: All the places of the Fathers which cite Scripture for infant Baptism, infant Communion, Easter, Lent-fast, and many other things which the Ancients observed, *shewing rather the reason of their observation, then the institution*, as Mr. *Cawdrey* speaks in another case, *Sabb. rediv. part. 4. chap. 1. §. 24.*

To the 20th. section of my *Præcursor*, Mr. *Baxter* in his *Præfestinantis moratur* saith, *The Ancients took infant Baptism, as you say, for an Apostolical tradition, but not unwritten. The warrant they supposed written, but not the history de facto.*

Answ. The ancients must needs take infant Baptism for an unwritten tradition when they supposed the History neither *de facto* nor of the institution to be written, though they took *the custome of the Church* (as *Austin tom. 3. l. 10. de Genes. ad litteram c 23.* terms it, having such reason from the necessity of it to save them perishing upon the mistake of *Joh. 3. 5.* for their warrant. But how poor a matter was taken by the Church for a reason to continue a custome, may appear even by those words of *Austin* in that place, which shew also it was taken onely for a custome of the Church taken up by them, and not appointed by the Apostles. For having spoken as doubtfull and uncertain what to say about the question before agitated by him, concerning the creation of the souls of the children from the parents, because of the objection from the Baptism of little ones, he then adds; *Yet the custome of our mother the Church in Baptising little ones, is not to be despised, nor by any means to be accounted superfluous, nor at all to be believed unless it were an Apostolical tradition. For that little age hath great weight of testimony, which first merited to shed blood for Christ.* Whereby it may appear, 1. That *Austin* took it for a custome of the Church, without example or institution written. 2. That he took such a frivolous pretence as the death of the children of *Bethlehem* slain by *Herod*, *Matth. 2.* to have great weight of testimony for the believing of infant Baptism to have been an Apostolical tradition. It would be counted arrogance in me to censure the Fathers, yet when I find such silly reasons as *Austin* here and elsewhere, and *Cyprian Epist. 59. ad Fidum*, give as warrant for infant Baptism, so slightly passed over by Mr. *B.* and others, and their testimonies still urged for the credit of infant Baptism, which do with any that is willing to see the weakness of them discredit it, I cannot but for the truths sake say, that as in many other things so in this of infant Baptism the Fathers speeches are so vain, as that there is more need to bewail the errour they have led people into, then to the continuance of the deceiving of people by them, to alledge them for proofs, or to magnifie, justifie or excuse them.

Mr. *B.* adds, "You might have spared all the 86 page where you "prove that Papists take it for an unwritten tradition. We know they "are desirous of any pretence to set tradition above Scripture. Yet you "know *Bellarmin* and others commonly prove it by Scripture. The "words of *Becanus* (not §. 24. as you say, but §. 12.) yeeld, the text "rightly

"rightly interpreted to prove infant Baptiſm, and that's all that I de-
"ſire. I had thought that *Chamiers* anſwer to this might have ſatisfied
"you. If you have forgot it, peruſe it again *tom. 7. lib. 9. c. 10. §. 40,*
"&c. and *tom. 4. l. 5. c. 9. §. 32.*

Anſw. I could not well have ſpared any part of that page. Not onely later Papiſts engaged in the modern controverſies, but alſo elder and diſingaged Papiſts and others, were alledged by me, of whom it is not meet to ſuſpect that they did acknowledge that infant Baptiſm is an unwritten tradition, out of a deſire to ſet tradition above Scripture, but out of cleer evidence of the truth of what they ſay. Nor do I think Mr. *B.* can ſhew one Author until *Luthers* day, who made infant Baptiſm any other then an unwritten tradition, although they produce many of them Scriptures for the neceſſity, reaſonableneſs, and lawfulneſs of the Church to uſe it, to whoſe authority they aſcribed too much in the appointing ſuch rites, and interpreting Scriptures to that end. I do not finde that the engaged Papiſts cited by me, did *ſet tradition above Scripture*, but that *they make it equall* I grant. I know *Bellarmin tom. 3. l. 1. de ſacram. bapt. c. 8.* brings three arguments from Scripture for infant Baptiſm, and *c. 9.* ſaith, *deducitur evidenter ex Scripturis, ut diximus*, but how he means it hee tels us thus in the ſame chapter; that *though the argument of the Anabaptiſts from defect of Command or example have great force againſt* Lutherans, *for as much as they uſe that principle every where, that the rite which is not in Scripture, having no command nor example there, is to be rejected, yet it is of no force againſt Catholicks. For although we find no command expreſly, that we ſhould baptize infants, yet that alſo is openly enough gathered out of Scriptures, as we have ſhewed above: and beſides the tradition of the Apoſtles is of no leſs authority with us, then Scripture, for the Apoſtles ſpake with the ſame ſpirit with which they did write. But that this is an Apoſtolick tradition, wee thence know whence we know the Apoſtolick Scripture to be the Apoſtolick Scripture, to wit, from the teſtimonies of the ancient Church.* The words of *Becanus* were cited rightly by me out of his *manual of Controverſies l. 1. c. 2. §. 24.* (not §. 12. as Mr. *B.* corrects me without cauſe) and they plainly ſhew the meaning of thoſe men to be, that the Scripture onely proves infant Baptiſm by that ſenſe of it, which is not manifeſt but by the tradition, and practiſe of the Church I have peruſed *Chamier pauſtr. Cath.* (not *tom. 7.* as Mr. *B.* directs, I know none ſuch) but *tom 1. l. 9. c. 10. §. 40, &c.* and *tom. 4. l. 5. c. 9. §. 32.* But I am not thereby ſatisfied, that either the Ancients took infant Baptiſm for any other then an unwritten tradition or that it ought to be taken.

Mr. *B.* proceeds. "Mr. *Rogers* hath made you know he is of another
"judgement. Mr *Bedford* tels me he hath corrected his word in a la-
"ter edition. How could you allege Dr. *Field* without conſidering how
"you wrong'd your ſelf? Is nothing written in Scripture but expreſly?
"yea is not that Scripture proof, and plain proof, which ſhews plainly
"from Scripture the grounds reaſons and cauſes of the neceſſity of the
"practiſe? Dr *Prideaux* thought Epiſcopacy provable from Scripture:
"and therefore if hee thought that infant Baptiſm muſt bee proved the

" same way, he is sure against you. For Dr. *Taylour*, if you have read " all his books, I hope you will no more reckon him amongst Prote- " stants, having so much of the body of Popery in them. Mr. *Youngs* " words (if they be his) are against you in the thing you cite them for. " There are *testimonia minùs aperta*: and there are *testimonia aperta pro* " *fundamto & præmissis, quæ sunt minùs aperta directè pro conclusione.* " My audaciousness in asserting plain Scripture proof must bee better " repressed then thus, if you will satisfie men of reason and con- " science.

Answ. I have made known in my *Apology* sect. 13. how Mr. *Rogers* shifts but answers not the allegation I made of his words. And if M. *Bedford have corrected his words*, I wish it have not been for the cause sake, against his conscience. If he and Mr. *Rogers* can so easily say and unsay, who can give credit to men that can thus blow hot and cold with the same breath? I know no wrong to my self done, by alleging Dr. *Field*. Though things be written in Scripture which are not so expressly, yet is not that Scripture proof, nor plain proof for infant Baptism, any more then infant Communion, which shews plainly from Scripture, *Pauls* conclusion of original sin, *Rom* 5.12. and Christs *Joh.* 3.5. which Ancients took falsly for grounds, reasons and causes of the necessity of infant Baptism, as they did *Joh.* 6. 53. of infant Communion, yet took the use to bee a custome of the Church, countenanced from Scripture without institution of Christ, or practise of the Apostles And that this was Dr *Fields* meaning, is plain from his words; and this seems to have been the common opinion of the Prelates of the Church of *England*, by the words by way of Preface used at the solemnity of Baptism, and in sundry places of the *Common Prayer-book*, *Catechism*, *art.* 27. *of the Church of England*. And after this manner thought Dr. *Prideaux* infant Baptism and Episcopacy proveable by Scripture. I have not read all Dr. *Taylors* works, nor do I know but that hee is to bee reckoned among Protestants. Dr. *Youngs* words are much for me, 1. In that he produceth no precept but that of Circumcision for infant Baptism. 2. That hee confesseth the practise Apostolical to be somewhat obscurer, and therefore addes the custome of the Church from the times of the first ages, which is in effect all one as to resolve the proof of infant Baptism finally into the custome of the whole Church, especially when he saith; *we cannot smite the Anabaptists with plain testimonies*. Nor can Mr. *Bs.* distinction of *more or less open testimonies* help him, sith Dr. *Young* denies, that *Pædobaptists can smite with open or plain testimonies, the Anabaptists barking against infant Baptism*. If Mr. *Bs audaciousness in asserting plain Scripture proof for infant Baptism be not yet repressed, nor men of reason and conscience satisfied*, I must leave them to the Lord. Enough I think is said about *Origens* words. I go on.

Dr. *Hammond* in his *Defence of infants Baptism*, *pag.* 98. saith thus; " About the same time (the 3d. Century) or without question soon af- " ter wrote the Author (under the name of *Dionysius Areopagita*) *de* " *Eccl. Hierarch.* For as by *Photius* it appears, *Theodorus Presbyter* about " the year 420. debated the question, whether that writer were *Dionysius* " mentioned

" mentioned in the acts or no. And of this no doubt hath been made,
" but that he was a very ancient and learned Authour. He therefore in
" his 7th. ch. of *Eccles. Hierarch. Edit. Morel.* p. 233. proposeth the
" question, as that which may seem to prophane persons (*i.e.* heathens)
" ridiculous, why children which cannot yet understand divine things,
" are made partakers of the sacred birth from God, *i. e.* evidently of
" Baptism (concerning the baptizing of infants saith *Maximus* his scho-
" liast) adding to the same head also, that others in their stead pronounce
" the abrenunciations and divine confessions. And his answer is, 1. That
" many things which are unknown by us why they are done, have yet
" causes worthy of God. 2. That we affirm of this the same things which
" our divine Officers of the Church being instructed by divine tradition
" have brought down unto us, and again, our Divine guides (*i. e.* the
" Apostles saith *Maximus*) considering this, appointed that infants
" should thus be admitted according to the sacred manner, nothing can
" bee more clear then that the Apostolical tradition is by this ancient
" and elegant writer avouched for the baptizing of infants, as a suffici-
" ent account of that matter, against the reproaches and scoffs of pro-
" phane or heathen men, who deemed it unreasonable. And so there
" is a most convincing testimony for that time, wherein that Author
" wrote, which must needs be in the 4th. Century, before *Theodorus*
" *Presbyters* debating the question concerning him, but most probably
" more ancient, and so to be placed in this 3d. age.

Answ. 1. It is to be noted by the Reader, that Dr. *Hammond* doth not so much as pretend the antiquity of that Author to be afore the 3d. century, and consequently not that *Dionysius* the *Areopagite* mentioned *Act* 17 34. as some Papists would have it, but are by learned men both Papists and Protestants refuted, whereof may be seen *Magdeb. centur.* 1. *l.* 2. *c.* 10. *Scultet. med. Patrum, l.* 11. *c.* 9. *Perkins prepar. to the demonstr of the probleme.* 2. Though Dr. *Hammond* conceive, that that Author *is to be placed in the* 3*d. age* by reason of some words of *Photius*, (which for want of books I cannot examine) yet *Salmasius ad Colvium* saith *p.* 179. *quamvis subditittius ille (Dionysius Areopagita) sit auctor nec antiquior quinto seculo. p.* 441. *quem certa fides est scripsisse circa finem quinti seculi.* And that which *Scultetus ubi supra* observes, that *in his book of Ecclesiastical Hierarchy he writes many things of Temples, of Altars, of Holy places, of a Quire, of consecration of Monks, of the tonsure and shaving of heads*, is me thinks a good argument, that the Author was som idle dreaming Monk no elder then the 5th. century, and is so far from being accounted a Writer of esteem among Divines, that he is rather censured as one who by his curiosities hath corrupted Divinity. 3. Whether those who *deemed infant baptism unreasonable* were infidels who derided it, or Christians who scrupled it, is not cleared by the Dr. Nor is it apparent that by *Divine guides* are meant *the Apostles*. 4. But if it were, that Author makes it no other then an unwritten tradition, if he did he would have alledged some Scripture for it; and the words [*our Divine Officers being instructed*, not as Dr. *Hammond* translates it *by Divine tradition*, but *unto* or *of the old tradition have brought down*

unto

auto us] do shew, that he counted it a tradition unwritten and delivered from one Officer to another until that time. Now it is granted that in the end of the 3d. and following ages, infant baptism, and in like manner infant communion were counted traditions Apostolical to save infants from perishing, and such seems to have been the opinion of that Author. *Pamelius annot.* 89. on *Cyprian de lapsis. Tractat hunc locum D. Augustinus Ep.* 23. *ad Bonifac. Haud obscure autem hic quomodo & suprà indicatur vetus Ecclesiæ consuetudo communionis parvulorum, qualem etiam indicare videtur Dionysius Areopagita sub finem Eccles. Hierarch. & sua adhuc ætate D. Aug. Epist.* 107. *ad vitalem.* All which being considered, this testimony is so far from being a *most convincing testimony* of the derivation of infant baptism from the Apostles, that considering upon what ground they observed it, and how much vanity was in the Ancients in their retaining many fond customes, and fathering them on the Apostles, and when common defending them by Scriptures perverted, it is a convincing testimony that infant baptism was no more from the Apostles then infant communion, both meer corruptions taken up on mistakes and defended by abuse of Scripture.

Mr. *M.* Mr. *Cr.* Dr. *Homes*, Dr. *Hammond* alledge *Gregory Nazianzen* his 40th. *Oration about baptism*, in which he *adviseth the baptizing of infants*, which saith Dr. *Hammond*, *is a plain testimony of the Churches doctrine at that time, the 4th. century, about the year of Christ* 370. *he flourished, and died in the year* 389.

Against this sundry things are objected, 1. that the same Author saith (as I find his words in *Chamier. paustr. cath. tom.* 4 *l.* 5. *c.* 9. §. 66.) where he gives instance in his 40th. Oration *of baptism*, of those who decease without baptism, *Neither can they receive it, either perhaps by reason of infancy, or some altogether involuntary chance, by which it is that even they, who would, obtain not that gift.* From whence it is manifest, that in *Gregory Nazianzens* time infants did decease without baptism, and that they could not receive it by reason of infancy. Nor is this objection salved by making the reason of these childrens not receiving baptism, because *that sometimes it might fall out that Christians might not have the opportunity of bringing their children to baptism, because they dwelt among infidels or Paynims, where they could not enjoy the benefit of the word and sacraments for themselves or their children; therefore they were necessitated to put off the baptising of their children*, which seems to be Mr. *Ms.* friends evasion in his *Defence*, p. 14. in that he applies this passage in *Nazianzen* as well to the hinderance of the baptism of children as of elder persons. For the words of *Nazianzen* shew, that as some deceased without baptism by reason of some ἀκούσιον περιστασιν, *unvoluntary accident*, whether by the hand of God or men; so others he saith deceased ἀπ' ἀπορίαν *barely by reason of infancy*, and that by reason of it οὐκ ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ τε δέξασθαι *they were not in power or capacity to receive it.* Which is a plain testimony, that however in case of apparent danger of death then infants might receive baptism according to his opinion, yet ordinarily they were not in the power or capacity to receive it, and so did sometimes die without it.

2. It is objected, and thereby this observation is confirmed, that when he comes in the same Oration to set down what he would have done about infants baptism, he resolves 1. that they should be baptized *if danger did urge it, that they might not miss of the common grace*, intimating that otherwise they should. 2. He *gives his judgement for others that they should wait longer.* 3. The reason he giveth of this longer waiting is, *that they may hear some mystical or spiritual thing, may be taught to answer somewhat, and if they understand not fully, perfectly, and exactly, yet they are instructed and informed.* 4. That (not as Dr. *Hammond* to give colour to his conceit of sanctifying to be the same with baptizing, 1 *Cor.*7.14. *by this means they may be baptised souls and bodies*; for if this were good reading, 1. they should baptize themselves, 2. they should baptize their souls which were ridiculous;) but, *so as that they sanctifie both souls and bodies by or with the great mystery of initiation.* Which shews he conceived 1. that by baptism benefit did come to infants though they perceived it not; 2. that it sanctifies their bodies; 3. that it is better done, when children are taught to answer; 4. then they sanctifie souls and bodies, 5. that danger of death was a forcible impulsive to move to the baptism of infants, 6. that without baptism infants should miss of the common grace.

To this saith Dr. *Hammond* thus, "1. It is clear that it no way pre-"judges the doctrine and practise of the Church formerly set down, "and approved by him, that infant children, indefinitely considered "might be baptized, and if danger approached, must, how young soever "they were; which is as contrary to the Antipædobaptist, and so to Mr. "*T.* as any thing.

Answ. 1. The phrase [*the doctrine and practise of the Church*] is according to the Prelatical language, I think as much as the doctrine and practise of the Prelates, but according to the Scripture language it non-sense, the Church being the number of persons taught, and on whom baptizing is practised, not the persons teaching or practising, who are stiled *the Elders of the Church* in Scripture. 2. That the Elders of any Church afore *Nazianzen* taught that *infant children, indefinitely considered, might be baptised, and if danger approached, must, how young soever they were*, I find not pretended of any besides the Council mentioned in *Cyprian, Epist.* 59. *ad Fidum*, which it is true determined, in opposition to *Fidus* his scruple, the lawfulness of baptizing any day, but not of any infants who were likely to live without apparent shew of danger of death, but rather the contrary is manifest from their reason, why they would have them baptized any day afore the 8th. because *the son of man came to save mens souls, as much as in us lies, if it may be, no soul is to be lost*, and therefore to be baptized any day afore the 8th. Now this implies, that they meant this onely of those infants who being in apparent danger of death would be lost, if not baptized. Now it is true this is contray to my doctrine, and it is as contrary to the doctrine of Pædobaptists, who deny the position of the Papists, that *baptism confers grace by the work done, that infants dying unbaptised perish*, and *if* Nazianzens *opinion do not prejudice this doctrine and practise of the Church*, yet it

it doth prejudice the doctrine and practise of Protestant Pædobaptists, who, contrary to *Nazianzens* mind, would not have infants baptized in that case onely, or for his reason, but would have infants baptized out of the case of imminent and apparent danger of death, and not deferred, upon a pretence of a Covenant right and visible Churchmembership as their priviledge, not as necessary to avoid the danger of perishing.

"2dly. (*saith Dr.* Hammond) that it is but his private opinion pre-"tending not so much as to any part of the Church of that, or former "ages to authorize it.

Answ. 1. That *Tertullian* did in like manner determine as *Nazianzen* did, that infants were not to be baptized but in case of imminent and apparent danger of death, will appear in the examining of his testimony among the Latine Doctors. 2. I know no reason why the counsel and opinion of these two should not as well be counted the doctrine and practise of the Church, and to be of equal authority as *Cyprians*, and his *Councels*, *Augustines*, and *Hieroms*.

"3dly. (*Saith Dr.* Hammond) that the state of children being so "weak and uncertain, that 'tis hard to affirm of any that they are not (for "the first three years) in any danger, his councel for deferring will "hardly be ever practical to any.

Answ. The counsel of *Nazianzen* to baptize in case of danger was not of infants that are in any danger, but of urgent or pressing danger, as the word ἐπείγον, *press*, *urge*, or *impel*, shews. And thus it is practical, as the use of private baptism in those places where it is used doth sufficiently shew.

Fourthly, saith he, *that the deferring of which* Nazianzen *speaks is most probably to bee understood of those whose parents are newly converted, and themselves doubt whether they shall be yet baptised or no, for to such he speaks in that place from* p. 654. *A.*

Answ. The reasons being general, this restriction appears groundless, nor is the Drs. conceit of any validity, that because four pages before he speaks to them, therefore that counsel of his concerns their children onely.

Lastly, saith he, *that the deferring till three years old, if it were allowed, would no way satisfie the Antipædobaptists pretensions, and so still the former passages ought be of force with all, and no heed given to the whispers of Mr. I. and others, as if that holy Father disswaded Baptism in any age unless in case of danger, when he clearly saith,* ἐν ὁσίοις καὶ ἁγνοῖς σώμασι, *Let him in the tendereſt age be Baptised and consecrated to the spirit.*

Answ 1. Why hee should call my words or writings *whispers* any more then his own, sith they are audible enough were it not that I speak to deaf men who will not hear, I do not deprehend, I imagine they are louder then the Doctour would have them. 2. That men should not give heed to my words as well as the Doctours, if they seek the truth impartially, I know not, sith where truth is sought both sides are to bee heard. 3. It is true the deferring Baptism till three years old, will not satisfie

ſatisfie us as ſufficient to rectifie the abuſe of infant baptiſm is granted, no nor till thirty, except the perſon become a diſciple and believer in Chriſt: But it ſatisfies us in this, that *Nazianzens* judgement was, that little ones ſhould not be baptized till they come to ſome underſtanding of the thing ſignified by baptiſm, unleſs in caſe of imminent and apparent danger of death, though we conceive he allowed too ſhort a time to inſtruct them. 4. If the word *conſecrated* be meant of baptiſm, and *from the nayles* ſignifie tender age, yet it is not likely he meant this tender age of infancy, ſith hee made perſons uncapable of baptiſme by reaſon of infancy, judged it better to have them firſt inſtructed; If he did, he would have it to onely in caſe of danger of death imminent.

But ſaith Dr. *Homes*, p. 142. 1. *If* Greg. Nazianzen *doth give reaſon why infants ſhould bee baptiſed, in caſe they are not likely to live to be of riper years, it is ſo much the better for us.*

Anſw. I ſuppoſe the Doctour doth not think with *Nazianzen*, that the danger of death is a ſufficient reaſon for the baptinzing an infant, for that ariſeth from the Popiſh conceits of regeneration by Baptiſm, *ex opere operato*, and the neceſſity of it to ſave a infant from periſhing. And therefore *Nazianzens* reaſon muſt bee the worſe for him, ſith it thwarteth his opinion of baptizing upon an imagined priviledge of Covenant holineſs, and his practiſe of doing it ordinarily to infants of Churchmembers out of that caſe. And it would bee conſidered, that where the ground of a practiſe is diſclaimed the alleging of the practiſe correſpondent to that ground and no further, is impertinent for confirmation of the practiſe of the ſame thing, in a different manner, and upon a different ground; as the Proteſtant Divines tell the Papiſts, that their alleging the ancients commemoration of the dead, proves not the Popiſh praying for the dead to be ancient, as Dr. *Uſher* at large in his *anſwer to the Jeſuits challenge*, ſith the Popiſh praying is upon the opinion of Purgatory, and for them that are there, the Ancients for the Apoſtles, Martyrs, &c. who are paſt Purgatory, and for their reſurrection; in like manner concerning the allegations of the Ancients Monkery, which either was neceſſary onely by reaſon of the inceſſant perſecutions of thoſe times, or if voluntary, yet with labour of their hands, and ſo different from the Popiſh Monkery which is idle, beſides Gods appointment, voluntary, ſuperſtitious, upon an imagined perfection in that which is indeed ſinful. And ſo for confirmation by laying on of hands, anointing with oyl, uſe of the ſigne of the croſs, ſetting up lights and many more, it is frequently ſhewed that they countenance not the Popiſh confirmation, extream unction, uſe of the ſigne of the croſs, lighting candles at noon day in their Temples, &c. becauſe they were in different manner, and for different reaſons and purpoſes then they are now uſed by them. And indeed the diſcovery of the different reaſons, manner, and end of rites uſed by the Ancients, from that they are now uſed, is of greateſt moment to ſhew the novelty of the Popiſh, Prelatical Pædobaptiſts uſages, who have not onely quite departed from the Scripture but alſo from antiquity, even in thoſe things which the Ancients practiſed indeed, but not as they do.

Secondly, saith Dr. *Homes*, *he doth give another reason, beside that of partaking of common grace, namely*, 1. Κρεῖσσον γὰρ, *For it is better that they should be sanctified without a feeling of it, then to depart without the seal. So he thinks they are sanctified too in infancy as well as at riper years.* 2. Ἡ τέτε λόγ& ἡμῖν, *A reason also of this to us is Circumcision, that was wont to be done on the* 8th. *day*, &c.

Answ. 1 The first of these is no other then the partaking of common grace (for to partake of the common grace is all one as to be sanctified) onely with a little enlargement. 2. The 2d. is indeed rather a preventing of an objection [that they could not be partakers of the common grace without perceiving it] rather then a further reason of baptizing them. And the answer is from two examples, one of circumcision which was given to infants without the use of reason, the other of the anoining or sprinkling the door posts, which were things insensitive, bringing salvation to the first born, which is such a woodden reason as Dr. *Homes* thought fit to let pass in this place.

Thirdly, saith Dr. *Homes*, *wee answer that all three reasons stand in force, as well for all believers infants (God putting them under the promise, Gen. 17.) as for the infants that are in danger of death.*

Answ. Whatever force there is in the reasons (which in my apprehension are frivolous) to prove Dr *Homes* his opinion or practise, yet sure in *Nazianzens* intent they are onely for the colouring over of the practise of infant baptism, of any whether believers or unbelievers children; onely in case of apparent danger of imminent death, and not at all for countenancing baptizing of believers infants onely at all times as federally holy.

Fourthly, saith Dr. *Homes*, *that* Nazianzen *urgeth divers divine reasons (to him evincing) for the baptism of infants in danger of death: but for the delaying of others not in danger of death, he saith*, Διὸ μὴ γνώμην, *I give my opinion; he calls it his opinion. And what is it? That* τετραετίαν, *such children should stay till three or four years old more, or less? And what is to be expected from children of that age? more then from infants toward baptism? For* Nazianzen *himself confesseth, that though they may hear and answer some spiritual things, yet they understand imperfectly. But doth* Nazianzen *give us there any Scripture for this differing? None. Doth he give any reason? Even in effect the same as for baptizing of infants in danger of death, to wit, that they may be sanctified in mind and body.*

Answ. 1. Tis true *Nazianzen* gives one reason for baptizing infants in case of danger of death, which is the sanctifying them by it, not divers reasons. the examples of Circumcision and anointing the door posts, being answers to an objection, as I said before. Now that reason is so far from being Divine, that it is from a meer superstitious conceit, as if the meer outward Baptism did sanctifie: Nor is it the same reason in effect for differing baptism three or four years with that which hee gives for infant baptism in case of danger of death. For though he supposeth in both Baptism sanctifies, yet he takes infant Baptism to sanctifie onely the body, the other to sanctifie body and mind. He supposeth they may learn some spiritual thing, though imperfectly, and so the

baptism

baptiſm may be a ſign to them though obſcure, and there may be ſome memory of what is done, though confuſed, which though it be not as it ſhould be, yet it is better and more agreeable to Scripture then the infant Baptiſm, where there is no ſignification to the baptized, nor remembrance of it. 2. Be it granted that *Nazianzen* expreſſeth but his opinion, and that it betters not the thing much, and his reaſons not ſo right as they ſhould have been, there is in this paſſage this evident, that infant Baptiſm was no tthen common as now, nor upon ſuch reaſons as now, nor approved of as now it is, but out of the caſe of danger of death imminent, apparently diſſwaded, and conſequently the preſent common infant baptiſm an innovation from what was in that age.

Dr. *Hammond* adds, *That* Chryſoſtome *in his Homily to the* Neophyti, *hath theſe words, For this cauſe* (i. e. *becauſe there be ſo many benefits of baptiſm here recited, ten in number*) *we baptiſe children though they have not ſins, and that he flouriſhed in the beginning of the firſt Age.*

Anſw. Though I finde in two Homilies, one in the fifth, the other in the ſixth tome of *Chryſoſtomes* works of *Eton* print, ſome ſpeeches unto the newly inlightned or planted, yet I finde not theſe words there, nor any where elſe in any of his homilies. Yet I deny not them to bee *Chryſoſtomes* finding them in *Auguſtin tom. 7. l. 1.* againſt *Julian* the *Pelagian, ch. 2.* But perhaps if the words before were viewed, it might be diſcerned whether the Baptiſm of little ones then uſed, were onely in caſe of danger of death apparently imminent, or without that caſe. It is likely hee meant that infants or little children were baptized onely in caſe of danger of death imminent, ſith many of his Homilies expreſs, even that where theſe words cited were, exhortations to the newly baptized, and the relation of his life teſtifies, that when hee was perſecuted by the Empreſs, and was about to baptize on the ſolemn feſtival in which Baptiſm was uſed, the perſons men and women that were to be baptized by him fled away naked, being ready to be baptized upon his apprehenſion, which ſhews they then baptized perſons naked. And the occaſion of the ſpeech, as ſet down by *Auſtin*, ſhews it was done upon the conceit of giving them grace, which is manifeſt by the words διὰ τοῦτο *for this cauſe*. And the particle καὶ, *alſo*, in the Greek, ſhews there was mention of baptizing others then little children. And in the ſame place *Auſtin* ſaith, *John Chryſoſtome held, believed, and taught this*, not onely that little children were not onely to be baptized, but alſo to have the Euchariſt or Lords Supper, for *without his fleſh and bloud they could not have life.* As for the other place Dr. *Hammond* cites in *Chryſoſtoms* 40th. *Homily on Geneſis*, that *Baptiſm is lawfull in the firſt age*, I yeeld that *Chryſoſtome* did in that age allow infant Baptiſm, but I think the Dr. cannot ſhew that he held it was to bee done out of the caſe of apparent danger of imminent death, or that the practiſe of baptizing them out of that caſe was ordinary. It is moſt evident by many proofs, that both then and ſome ages after, the ordinary uſual baptizing was of chatechized perſons at the ſolemn feaſts, when moſt in the Empire were by profeſſion Chriſtians.

SECT. LXXXX.

The arguments to prove Infant Baptiſm an innovation Exam. pag. 9. *are made good againſt Mr.* Marſhal, *and Dr.* Homes.

WHereas Mr. *M.* had ſaid in his *Sermon* pag. 3. that *it is manifeſt out of moſt of the Records that wee have of antiquity, both in the Greek and Latin Church, that the Chriſtian Church hath been in poſſeſſion of the priviledge of baptiſing the infants of believers for the ſpace of 1500. years and upwards*; I ſaid in my *Examen* p. 9. But it is wonder to mee that if it were ſo manifeſt as you ſpeak, you ſhould finde nothing in *Euſebius* for it, nor in *Ignatius* nor in *Clemens Alexandrinus*, nor in *Athanaſius*, nor in *Epiphanius*, that I mention not others.

To this Mr. *M.* or *his friend* replies, that I *add three arguments to ſhew that Infant Baptiſm was not known in the Greek Church*, But therein he abuſeth me, for I added them not to that end, but to ſhew that it was not ſo manifeſt as Mr. *M.* ſaid, that it was not univerſally known.

To my mention of the ſilence of *Euſebius*, &c. he ſaith. 1. *The queſtion was not ſtarted then, as the Fathers ſpake not clearly of the traduction of original ſin, before it was denied by the Pelagians.* 2. *That it is enough to him that none of the Authors named by me ſpake againſt it.*

Anſw. 1. The queſtion of the *Hieracites* was raiſed in *Epiphanius* his time, which did lead to ſpeak of infants Baptiſm, and yet *Epiphanius* allegeth not infants Baptiſm againſt them, though it had been for his purpoſe. 2. Sure *Euſebius* that writes the Eccleſiaſtical ſtory, and ſuch as wrote the hiſtory of the Church, had occaſion to mention it as they do the Baptiſm of perſons of age, the uſe of the Lords Supper, the meetings of Chriſtians, the orders of the Church, the ordinations of Biſhops and other things, and would if it were ſo manifeſt as Mr. *M.* ſaid it was. 3. It may be they ſpake not againſt it, becauſe there was no queſtion about it. But it is likely there was no queſtion about it, becauſe there was in the firſt ages no practiſe of it, or very obſcure. For as ſoon as it began, *Tertullian* put in ſome exceptions againſt it and after him *Nazianzen*. 4. If the Fathers afore *Pelagius* aroſe, did not ſpeak clearly of original ſin, then it is likely the paſſages in *Origen* on *Levit. Rom. Luk* were not his, ſith they ſpeak clearly of the traduction of original ſin and that ſpeech of *Voſſius Hiſt. Pel. l. 2. part. 1. th 6. p. 153.* is right; *For who can at this day diſcern what paſſages were the brats of* Origen *or his paraphraſts?*

Hee adds. 1. *If any thing were brought out of* Ignatius, *you would tell mee, that you did not know* Ignatius *when you ſee him.*

Anſw. 1. Though *Ignatius* Epiſtles be very doubtfull, yet I incline to think ſome of them to be his which we have, and that genuine paſſages may be diſcerned from ſpurious. 2. If any paſſage, though ſpurious, were to be found in him for infant Baptiſm, Paedobaptiſts would not ſtick to produce it, who make no conſcience to allege the words falſly

ascribed

aſcribed to *Juſtin Martyr* in the book of *queſtions and anſwers to the Orthodox*, and ſtick not to maintain the allegation of it, as his, though it mention *Origen*, whom Dr. *Homes* imagins *Juſtin Martyr might hear of*, though he died by his confeſſion *anno* 169. and *Origen* was not born till about 186. as the paſſages in his *Animadv.* on *my Exercit.* p 111, 112, 127 compared do ſhew. Beſides the allegation of the Book of *Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy*, as *Dionyſius* the *Areopagites*, the *queſtions ad Antiochum*, as *Athanaſius* his ſhew, that neither this Authour nor other Pædobaptiſts are aſhamed to allege baſtard writings, which ſay any thing for infant Baptiſm.

Concerning *Clemens Alexandrinus* he tels me *Defence* p. 19. *You deſire to know what* Clemens Alexandrinus *ſaith* (which is not true) *why ſure he had none but great infants to be his Schollers* (I conceive he means profeſſed Pagan infidels, But I think this not true, ſith in his writings he directs Chriſtians, and oppoſeth heretiques) *if you* (*who pretend to bee acquainted familiarly* (which is very falſe) *with the ſecrets of antiquity*) *be acquainted with him, you'l know what I mean: He deſired* (*as it is likely more Greek Fathers who were converted from Paganiſm did*) *to ſet forth religion in ſuch a way, as might move other Pagans to come and confeſs the Chriſtian faith, that ſo they might bee added to the Church by Baptiſm, in ſuch a way as was proper to the baptiſing of grown men.* Which is true, and confirms my preſumption that when he ſpeaks of Baptiſm, as he doth *lib.* 1. *pædag. c.* 6. and elſewhere, he would have mentioned infant Baptiſm and its benefit to the ſame end, if it had been in his time in uſe, as Mr. *M.* in his *ſermon* ſaid.

Concerning *Athanaſius* he ſpeaks thus, "What ſay you to that paſ-
"ſage in *Athanaſius*? Where he is ſhewing how wee are buried with
"Chriſt in baptiſm, and riſe again; he ſayes the dipping of the infant
"quite under water thrice, and raiſing of it up again, doth ſignifie the
"death of Chriſt and his reſurrection upon the third day, *Athan. dicta*
"*& interpretatio ſcript. q.* 94. is not that teſtimony plain?

Anſw. It is? But who ſe is it? Is not that Book one of theſe ſuppoſititious writings in the 2d. *tome* of *Athanaſius* works, of which *Scultetus Medul. patrum part.* 2. *l.* 1. *c.* 42. ſaith, *quædam nullo judicio videntur conſcripta, quæ ſe ſatis produnt*? Among which alſo are the *quæſtions to Antiochus*, out of which Mr. *M.* or his friend *pag.* 20, 21. cite two teſtimonies, one out of quæſt. 2. and another quæſt. 114. and ſaith, *the words are ſafe and ſound built on a Goſpel ground, owned by all the reformed Churches*, which *make infants of believers baptiſed to enter into the Kingdome of heaven*, excluding the unbaptized, which hitherto hath been termed Popery. Nor is hee excuſed from abuſing Readers with theſe baſtard writings, by ſaying, *the words following may be erroneous, and yet written by Athanaſius*, when the words following are part of the anſwer, which is erroneous, and they are ſo connex that they muſt bee the ſame Authors. As for the words, *How do you prove what you allege out of* Tertullian *and* Gregory Nazianzen, *and that I make this a plea for my ſelf, that my allegations may gain a favourable conſtruction, that my proofs taken out of antiquity do as ſtrongly prove the point in hand,*

as proofs are usually taken in such matters, no whit excuseth him, sith my proofs are from writings not suspected, his are from treatises judged by many of each side to be supposititious, mine from passages not excepted against, as his are, and therefore my wondering ceaseth not: and the silence of these, together with *Epiphanius* his not urging infant Baptism against *Hieracites*, yeeld a strong presumption of the rarity of infant Baptism then, though from thence the non-usage bee not syllogistically concluded. And for the words hee brings out of *Epiphanius*, hee might call *Baptism the great Circumcision*, yet *reject infant Baptism* (though I said not he did, but that it's likely it was not so manifest as Mr. *M.* said) as he might call Presbyters Priests, and Deacons Levites, and yet not tye Presbytery or Deaconship to a tribe, and the age in which each sort ministred in the Temple of the Jews. I add, that the words cited out of the supposed *Athanasius* prove dipping under water then the usual way of Baptism.

What Dr. *Homes* brings *Animadv.* on my *Exercit. pag.* 143. out of *Clemens Alexandrinus Strom. l.* 3. *pag.* 461. serves not his turn, but is rather against him, for it mentions *onely one Baptism of Believers*. And the same may be said of what he brings out of *Epiphanius* his 2d. Book *tom.* 2. *contra hæres.* 30. *pag.* 52. In which hee makes *the perfect Circumcision, not to be onely of men in the time of their imbecility, but of men and women, all the people of Christians indeed*, which omits if not excludes infants.

"2ly. *saith Mr. M. or his friend, def. pag* 21. you reason from the continuance of the questions put to persons when they were to be baptized, "and answered by them: which I think because we must conceive children were not able to return an answer to them, thereby you would "infer they were not baptized: But I answer, when the Gospel was "first declared into the world, such as being of age were first taught "were then baptized, *Acts* 2. 41. *& Acts* 8. 13,37. After that time such "as were taught are said to be catechized: for κατηχησις εις πιστιν "ἀγει. the Catechism leads men to faith, saith *Clemens Alexandrinus* "*Pædag.* When such were prepared and made fit to bee baptized, certain questions were propounded to them concerning their faith in "Christ, their resolution to forsake the Devil, *&c.* which are related "by many of the Ancients: when those of age afterwards brought their "children to baptism, these questions were likewise put to them (though "of themselves they were not able to make answer to them) but how "warrantably, I will not go about to prove; yet that they were used at "infants Baptism, as well as at the Baptism of such as were at age, it appears by *Balsamon in Can.* 6. *Conc. Neocæsar. Aug. Ep. ad Januarium*, "*&c.* To all which questions at childrens baptism, such as undertook "their education made answer on their behalf. Therefore you cannot "by these questions infer that children were not baptized, seeing these "Authors certifie that questions were put to them, and also tell us who "answered for them.

Answ. 'Tis true I cannot, nor did I ever intend to prove that children were not baptized in the third age, but the putting the questions to

infants

infants to answer, shews that at first none were baptized but such as could answer to them: and sith this was but a ridiculous thing, which this Author will not go about to prove to have been done warrantably, to put questions to infants to answer, doubtless it came not from the Apostles or Apostolical men, who would never have appointed so frivolous a thing but as this Author doth very honestly confess, they baptized such as were taught and catechized, and as he well notes out of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Catechism leads men to faith*, and that to Baptism. And this undeniably proves, as *Ludovicus Vives* truly gathered, *tom. in August de civit. Dei c.* 27. *l.* 1. *tom.* 5. that *at first none was baptized till he could ask for it and answer to the questions, which custome he saith he hath heard continued in some Cities of Italy.* It is likely those of the *Greeks* about *Calabria*, and so far as I can yet by search discern, this continued the first and second Age, to baptize onely persons of age. In the third Age, infant Baptism with many other corruptions began, and then to keep a mimical shew of the old manner of answering the questions, some made answer in the infants name; which being after objected to *Augustin*, he answers *Epist.* 23. that the answerer did not speak falsly, when he said the infant did believe, *because he had the Sacrament of faith*: which was indeed no answer, sith the answer was made afore the Sacrament, and the Sacrament could not make him a believer who was not. Now this answer was not to engage them *to undertake their education*, as this Author seems to imply, but to assert they did believe afore they were baptized, it being originally the right use of that rite, to baptize none but those who were first believers, till the superstitious conceit of an infants perishing without Baptism first brought it in, as necessary in case of apparent danger of imminent death, and no otherwise; as those many reliques of Antiquity in the speeches of *Tertullian*, *Nazianzen*, and others shew; besides the narrations of baptizing the catechized at solemn times, and the not baptizing of children of believers till they came to age, the intent of baptizing *Austin* when in youth he was sick, but putting it off when recovered. But after his time, the necessity of it being so vehemently pressed by him, and urged against *Pelagians*, infant Baptism in process of time quite swallowed up true baptism; and that which this Author here ingenuously confesseth was the primitive use, is now cried down as if it were an innovation and an heresie. So monstrously hath the ignorance and intemperate speeches of Fathers, School men and others, and the violence and mistakes of *Luther*, *Calvin*, and others, perverted the doctrine of Baptism, and oppressed those that have sought to reform it, though if there were no more to be said for them then what here this Author, whether Mr. *Marshal* or Dr. *Young* confesseth, it were enough to satisfie men that were willing to be satisfied, that infant Baptism was not at first *when the Gospel went first abroad into the world*, and yet then doubtless Believers had infants; but that *afterwards men brought their children to Baptism*, when corrupt opinions of its necessity and the giving grace by it were received, and to allay the extream bitter and unreasonable heat of spirit, which is in the clamarous Pædobaptists of our days. But I go on.

Mr.

Mr. *M.* or *his friend* tels mee, *Thirdly, you conceive because many children born of Christian Parents were not baptised when they were young, therefore it was not their custome to Baptise infants. For the making good hereof, you bring forth instances of* Constantine *the Great*, Greg. Nazianzen, *and* Chrysostom. *Afore he speaks of these instances, hee sets down some known reasons, some imagined, why some deferred among the Ancients their own Baptism; and he thinks they might upon the like reasons defer their childrens.*

Answ. 1. That they did defer their children Baptism confirms my opinion, that it was not ordinary in the *Greek* Church to baptize infants. 2. That if they did defer it upon the reasons imagined by him, then they thought it not necessary to be done in infancy, as Pædobaptists do now, chiefly Mr. *Baxter, plain Script. proof part.* 2. *ch* 8. who *will have infants baptised immediately, as soon as ever they are disciples*; which by his grounds is at the first instant of their birth, or afore. 3. That very reason why some deferred Baptism to old age, to wit the doing away sin, was indeed the very reason of their baptizing infants. And *Nazianzens* confutation, telling some *that all times were fit for Baptism, seeing no time was free from death*, shews how ill Mr. *M.* chose that passage to put in the Title page of his Book, unless he would have Readers to baptize upon that opinion, as if thereby they could *work out their salvation.* 4. All this discourse about the various reasons of mens deferring their own Baptism, is quite besides the point about parents deferring their infants Baptism, which not to have been upon any of those imagined reasons, but because they thought it not necessary, nor did practise it but in case of apparent danger of imminent death to the infant, will appear by weighing his answer to my instances. To that of *Constantines* being not baptized in infancy, though *Helena* his mother were a Christian, it is said; 1. *That it appears not that* Constantines *parents were in his infancy become Christians.* 2. *Himself was also an unbeliever many years.* To which I reply; though it be not apparent that *Constantius* or *Helena* were Christians in the infancy of Christians, yet those Historians that do conceive they were, and yet it being agreed he was not then baptized, do tacitely yeeld, that it was not unusual for the children of Believers to be unbaptized till they came to age.

Dr. *Homes* tels me, *That I have ill urged* Constantin *a Latin, for an instance that Baptism of infants was not ordinary in the Greek Church.* But I think otherwise since *Constantin* lived and died in the Greek Church, and therefore fitly mentioned among them.

The next mentioned by me is *Gregory Nazianzen*, the son of a Christian Bishop, and brought up long by him, was not baptized till hee came to be a youth. To this saith Mr. *M* or *his friend How do you prove he was the son of a Christian Bishop? His father was once in the* Hypsistarian *error, whether he were converted before* Gregory *was born it is not exprest. when hee was young he was bred at* Athens *under heathens, to which it is not likely his father would send him if a Christian, and why he was no baptised as soon as he was converted to Christianity I conjecture the reason was that he might the better prepare himself to receive baptism.*

Answ.

Answ. I did little imagin that this Author would have so far gratified the Papists, as to joyn with *Baronius* and other *Romanists*, by shifts to avoid the evidence of this instance, which Protestants urge to prove Bishops to have then married and begot children after marriage. To his question, I prove him to have been a Bishop, by the same words of *Gregory Nazianzen* himself in *the verse of his life*; by which *Chamier paustrat. Cath. tom.* 3. *l.* 16. *c.* 13. §. 41. *Dr. Hall honour of the married Clergy* 2d. *Book Sect.* 8. and others, prove *Gregory Nazianzen* to have been begotten of his Father being a Bishop, where he brings in his Father speaking to perswade him to help him in his charge, in these words, as Dr. *Hall* turns them into English out of Greek, *The years of thy age are not so many as of my Priesthood*. Which how to free from *Baronius* his devices of an *hyperbole*, and the inconsistency with the other passages of his fathers Baptism, and his study at *Athens*, and seeing *Julian* there, the Reader may see in *Chamier ubi suprà* at large. Where and in Dr. *Hall* he may find, that his mother was also a pious Christian when hee was born, and that she begged him of God. And the Century Writers of *Magd.* say *cent.* 4 *c.* 10. *She was born of pious and holy progenitours*. And though he travailed abroad, suppose at 12. years of age, yet was he long brought up by his parents, especially in that time in which he was to have been baptized, if the Baptism of infants had been then ordinary: yet was hee not baptized (as this Author confesseth) till he was of age, after he returned to his Father, who it is not likely did send him to be trained up under infidels, however hee might light on their acquaintance and hear them. As for the reason of deferring his baptism, it is in vain to enquire into another cause, then that which *Gregory Nazianzen* himself in his 40th. *Oration of holy Baptism* gives, when hee adviseth to baptize infants in case of apparent danger of imminent death, but out of that case to defer it. And this appears to have been the genuine reason, and the practise accordingly in that (as *Gregorius Presbyter* relates in *his life*) when sailing to *Athens* a storm arose, so that his life was in apparent danger, he was afraid of dying unbaptised, and resolved to be baptised. The other reason assigned by Mr. *M* or his friend, is frivolous; for though the better to prepare himself to receive baptism, might be the reason of his deferring it so long as he did when he came to age, yet it could not be a reason of his parents deferring it, or of his in infancy. So that notwithstanding these vain shifts of this Author, wherein he joyns with the Papists, who use the like devices to avoin this testimony urged by Protestants to prove the marriage of Bishops then, and is refuted by them; yet this one instance is an evident proof, that in the Greek Church baptism of infants was not ordinary in the fourth Century, but used perhaps extraordinarily in case of apparent danger of imminent death.

There is the less need of insisting on the instance of *Chrysostome* his birth of Christian parents, and educated and baptised at age by *Miletius*, with that of *Nazianzen* is so pregnant. 'Tis true I did allege it as *Grotius* his saying, whom I found counted for a learned man by *Spanheimius* and many others, and I might well make use of him, as Protestants sometimes do of Papists that are corrupt in point of antiquity.

If Dr. *Young* were the Author of the first part of Mr. *Ms. Defence*, and of the Latin Book *of the Lords day*, published in the year 1639. under the name of *Theophilus Philokyriaces Loncardiensis*, hee himself cites *Baronius* for the Lords day in the very title page of his Book. What *Grotius* was in his life and studies, I leave for those who knew him to judge; his books though in many things corrupt, I might be allowed to make use of, as of other learned men with judgement. In this thing I did think I might the more securely take his word, because in the same place *Annot. in Matth. c.* 19. 14. hee declared hee was for infant Baptism; nor do I think it was without some reason which he affirmed, though my time and Library yeeld mee not the advantage of making search into this thing. It is enough that it is supposed by learned men probable, which would not bee if it were not then ordinary, that the children of Christian parents were baptized after they had themselves been believers. Which is plain by the resolution of the *Synod* of *Neocæsarea*, elder then the first *Nicene*, which determined; *That a woman with child might be baptized, because the Baptism reached not to the fruit of her womb, because in the confession made in Baptism, each ones free choise is shewed.* For if in the confession in Baptism each ones free choise is shewed, then infants were not ordinarily baptized, who could shew no free choise in confession.

How this is vindicated from the shifts of Mr. *M* or *his friend*, may be seen in my *Apology sect.* 16. *p.* 87, 88. which I think needless to repeat. And for *Grotius* his saying, that *in every age many of the Greeks unto this day, keep the custome of deferring the Baptism of little ones, till they could themselves make a confession of their faith*, may be true, if either those in *Italy* mentioned by *Ludov. Vives Comment. in Aug. l.* 1. *de civit. Dei, c.* 27. were Greeks, as it is likely in *Calabria*, where are Greek Churches as I remember *Brerewood* shews in his *Enquiries of Religion*, or the *Georgians* children, or the Christians children of *Cholcos* were Greeks; of whom *Heylin* in his *Geography* in the description of *Armenia*, out of *Brerewood*, *Alexand. Rosse* in his *Censure of Religio Medici*, &c. say, they are not baptized till they be 8. years old. Nor need the Anabaptists yet to blush, for all Mr. *Ms.* or *his friends*, or Dr. *Homes*, or Dr. *Hammonds*, or Mr. *Craggs* allegations, in saying that the Ancients, especially the Greek Church, rejected the baptism of infants for many hundred years. For there is no evidence produced for infant Baptism in the Greek Church till *Nazianzens* time, who *flourished* saith *Dr. Hammond about the year of Christ* 370. *and died in the year* 389. which is above 300. years, and hee dissuades it except in case of apparent danger of imminent death, and saith some are kept from Baptism by reason of infancy, and as Mr. *M. p.* 24. of his *Defence* saith, *all times were fit for Baptism, seeing no time was free from death*, intimates Baptism not fit for some time, except in that case, which may be gathered to have been the onely reason of infant Baptism, from what is said before of the story of his own baptism; and therefore I doubt not to conclude, that infant Baptism was not so ancient in the Greek Church as is by Mr. *M.* and others pretended, and as now it is taught by him and others, is a late innovation.

Sect. 91.

SECT. LXXXXI.

The teſtimonies of Tertullian *for Infant Baptiſm, and Dr.* Hammonds *interpretation of* chap. 39. de Anima, *are examined with* 1 Cor. 7. 14.

I Proceed to review the proofs from the *Latin* Fathers for infant Baptiſm. "Mr. *Cr. brings up* Tertullian *in the front*, whom he reckons at "the end of the ſecond Century, *others at the beginning of the third*, a- "bout 70. or leſs years after *John* the Apoſtle, in which ſhort tract of "time, the Apoſtolical practiſe of infant Baptiſm could neither bee "clouded, nor forgotten. Neither would he have commended his pri- "vate opinion as more profitable, that the Baptiſm of ſome infants for "ſome reſpects ſhould be deferred, but have called it down, as an in- "novation, if the practiſe of it had not been as tranſparent to every "mans apprehenſion as if it had been writ with the Sun beams. That "infant Baptiſm was in practiſe in *Tertullians* days, it appears by this "queſtion *lib. de bapt. c.* 18. *Quid feſtinat innocens ætas ad remiſſionem "peccatorum?* Why does innocent age (meaning children in their in- "fancy) make haſt for remiſſion of ſins? meaning Baptiſm; which is "a clear caſe, whatſoever *Semi-Socinian Grotius* ſay to the contrary. "That *Tertullian* was for infant Baptiſm himſelf appears, that in his "Book *de Animâ cap.* 39. he preſſes it, when the child is in danger of "death, and gives his reaſon *lib. de bapt. cap.* 12. *Præſcribitur nemini "ſine Baptiſmo competere ſalutem*, it is preſcribed that ſalvation is to "none without Baptiſm.

Anſw. 1. That *Tertullian* might not be miſtaken, or that the practiſe of infant Baptiſm could not be clouded or forgotten, is ſaid by Mr. *Cragge* inconſiderately; ſith afore *Tertullians* time the great differences about keeping *Eaſter* between *Polycrates* Biſhop of *Epheſus*, where it's ſaid, *John* lived much and died; and *Victor* of *Rome*, who pretended tradition from *Peter*, the miſtake of *Irenæus* about Chriſts age, with ſundry others. 2. That *Tertullian would have called it down as an innovation, if the practiſe of it had not been as tranſparent to every mans apprehenſion as if it had been writ with the Sun beams*, is a confident ſpeech, but of no credit with thoſe who know *Tertullian* hath not called down, the anointing the baptized, giving milk and honey, uſing the ſign of the croſs, *&c.* which yet are undoubted innovations. 3. It is granted that infant Baptiſm was uſed in his time, but it is withal true, that hee diſſwaded it or did call it down as an innovation, except in caſe of danger of death, and that by ſundry reaſons; which if hee had taken ken infant Baptiſm to bee from the Apoſtles, hee would not have done. 4. The allowing of it in that caſe aroſe (as Mr. *Craggs* quotations ſhew) from the errour of the neceſſity of it to ſalvation. But Dr. *Hammond* ſaith further.

" *Tertullian* a man of great learning, and a diligent obſerver and re-
" corder of the cuſtoms and practiſes of the moſt ancient Church, *lib de*
" *animâ c.* 39. affirms it from the Apoſtle, *ex ſanctificato alterutro ſexu*
" *ſanctos procreari*; that when either parent is ſanctified or believer,
" *i. e.* baptized, the children that are born from them are holy, and
" this, *tam ex ſeminis prærogativâ, quàm ex inſtitutionis diſciplinâ*, both
" by prærogative of their ſeed, and by the diſcipline of the inſtitution,
" *i. e.* (as hath been ſhewed) by Baptiſm; adding from the ſame Apo-
" ſtle that delivered thoſe words 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. that his meaning was that
" the children of Believers ſhould be underſtood to be *deſignati ſanctita-*
" *tis ac per hoc ſalutis*, and evidencing what he means thereby, by the
" following words, of Chriſts definition *Joh* 3. unleſs a man be born
" of water and of the ſpirit, he ſhall not enter into the Kingdom of God,
" *i. e. non erit ſanctus*, ſhall not be holy; where Baptiſm is manifeſtly
" the thing by which theſe children are ſaid to attain that ſanctity. *And*
more hee adds in the beginning of the next Chapter to the ſame purpoſe.
" And ſo he is a competent witneſs for the beginning of that third age.
And a little before, " In the middle of the firſt Century St. *Paul* deliver-
" red theſe words; Now are your children holy, *i. e.* your children
" new born (as appears by the context and *Tertullian*) are ſanctified as
" that ſignifies baptized, in the ſtile of the New Teſtament and the An-
" cient Church.

" And *ch.* 3. *ſect.* 1. St. *Paul* 1 Cor. 7. 14. ſpeaking of the Believers
" children, he ſaith, νῦν γὲ ἁγία ἐστι, but now are they holy, *i. e.* it is
" the preſent practiſe of the Church (that Apoſtolical Church in St.
" *Pauls* time) to admit to Baptiſm the infant children of parents, of
" whom one is Chriſtian, though not of others. That this is the mean-
" ing of [holy] is there made evident, as by other arguments, ſo by
" this, that the ancient Fathers who knew the ſacred Dialect call Bap-
" tiſm ſanctification, *Eum qui natus eſt baptizandum & ſanctificandum*,
" in *Cyprian*, and ἀναισθήτως ἁγιασθῆναι, to bee ſanctified when they
" have no feeling of it, and ἐν βρέφει ἁγιασθήτω, let him be ſanctifi-
" ed from the infancy, *i. e.* baptized then in *Gregory Nazianzen*. To
" which teſtimonies, and the reſt which is there produced of the agree-
" ment of the Jewiſh ſtile (קדושין ſanctifications for baptiſms, to which
" agrees *Macarius* ſaying of the Jewiſh Baptiſm, σάρκα ἁγίαν (ὅτι it ſan-
" ctifies the fleſh, *hom.* 47. *p.* 509.) becauſe the main difficulty of the
" interpretation conſiſts herein, I ſhall now add more, one very ancient
" before any of theſe (within leſs then an 100. years after the death of
" St. *John*) *Tertullian de animâ c.* 39. where ſpeaking of infants and
" ſaying, *ex ſanctificato alterutro ſexu ſanctos procreari*; that when ei-
" ther the father or mother is ſanctified (*i. e.* received as a believer by
" Baptiſm in the Church, the children are holy; *&c* (clear evidences
" of the notion of the word) this he there proves by theſe very words of
" this Apoſtle, *cæterum, inquit, immundi naſcuntur*, elſe (ſo *cæterum*
" in *Tertullians* ſtile is known to be put for *alioqui*, or the Greek ἐπεὶ
" ἄρα) were your children unclean; adding inſtead of theſe other words
" [but now are they holy] *quaſi deſignatos tamen ſanctitatis & per hoc*

" *etiam*

"*etiam salutis, intelligi volens fidelium filios*, hereby willing that wee "should understand that the children of Believers are the designed or "the sealed of holiness (in the sense, I conceive wherein they that are "baptized, are by the ancients frequently said σφραγίζεσθαι, to be sea-"led) and thereby of salvation also: And all this, saith he, thus urged "by the Apostle, *ut hujus spei pignora matrimoniis quæ retinenda censue-"rat, patrocinaretentur*, that this hope might be a pledge to engage the "believing wife or husband not to part from the unbeliever. And hee "yet further adds (still to the confirming of this interpretation) *Alio-"qui meminerat Dominicæ definitionis, nisi qui nascatur ex aqua & spi-"ritu, non introibit in regnum Dei*, i. e. *non erit sanctus*. Otherwise (or "if this argument of the Apostle had not been sufficient) he would have "mentioned the definition of Christ, that unless one be born of water "and the spirit (*i. e.* baptized) he shall not enter into the Kingdome of "God, *i. e.* shall not be holy; shewing still of what holiness he under-"stands the Apostles speech, that which the child of the believer is made "partaker of by Baptism; concluding, *Ita omnis anima usque eo in A-"dam censetur donec in Christo recensetur, tamdiu immunda, quamdiu "recensetur*. Every soul is so long inrolled in *Adam*, till it bee anew "in Christ, and is so long unclean till it be thus anew inrolled; which "as it supposeth every child of *Adam* to bee impure, till it bee thus by "Baptism made a child of Gods, a member of Christ, so it gives a full "account of that uncleanness, and that holiness of which the Apostle "speaks; the former the state of a child of *Adam* unbaptized, the later "of him that by Baptism is initiated into Christ. *And p.* 81. *bee saith*, "he found this passage of *Tertullian ch.* 39. *de animâ* perfectly to accord "to his interpretation of 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. For which reason (though I at first intended onely here to examine the passage of *Tertullian c.* 39. *de animâ*) I conceive needfull to examine what Dr. *Hammond* hath said in his *Defence* against me, *ch.* 3, 4. about both places, and I doubt not but that it will be made appear by me, that he hath not avoided by his *Defence* the exceptions I brought against his interpretation of 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. nor interpreted the Apostle right, nor *Tertullian*, nor that they do, as he speaks, *perfectly accord*, to which I now addresse my self.

1. He omits the making good of his paraphrase of the Apostles words 1 *Cor.* 7. 12, 13, 14. except onely those words [*else were your children unclean, but now they are holy*] *supposing it unnecessary if the interpretation of the last words appear to be this* [*but now are infant children partakers of the priviledge of Baptism*] which I acknowledge were true, if he could make good this interpretation without making good the paraphrase of the rest. But there being a manifest coherence of all together, and a plain argumentative consequence implied *v.* 14. of the later part from the former, if the interpretation of the later part will not consist with the words going before, nor a good coherence and consequence in his sense making good the rest of his paraphrase, it is necessary he should make good, at least that which if it be not made good against my exceptions, the interpretation of the last clause will not stand. Now I conceive there are in my exceptions, most if not all those things, which

I urged

I urged againſt his paraphraſe and interpreration, which do overthrow it, ſith there would be either want of ſenſe, coherence, or conſequence in the Apoſtles ſpeech, if Dr. *Hammonds* expoſition were received, which Dr. *Hammond* hath not acquitted it from in his *Defence*.

One main thing on which the hinge of his paraphraſe and interpretation turnes, is, that the ſanctification and holineſs there is derived from the faith of the one party, and not on the conjugal relation; and therefore the term [*believer*] which is not in the text) is put by him in his paraphraſe, and the terms [husband and wife] omitted, which the Apoſtle puts down with emphaſis. I preſume the Reader that reads my exceptions from *p.* 316. to 325. will judge the Doctors excuſe not ſufficient, he gives for not anſwering them more fully, when he *aſſures me it were eaſie fully to anſwer them p.* 65. but does not, eſpecially in this point on which the controverſie between us depends, and therefore not ἀπάρεγον as the Dr. terms it. I think the Dr. hath made a more immoderate excurſion in his heaping up teſtimonies out of the Fathers, in his ſtanding ſo much on the denial of an enallage, and the force of the preposition ἐν. But I reſolve to follow him, and hope to overtake him in long running, though his Pen and Preſs be quicker in diſpatch then mine.

The firſt thing the Dr. attempts is, to prove out of the Fathers, that *the term* [*holy* 1 Cor. 7. 14.] *is as much as* [*partakers of Baptiſm.*] *Firſt* ſaith he, *the ancient Fathers who knew the ſacred Dialect, call Baptiſm ſanctification, and* Cyprian *and* Nazianzen *are cited*.

To which I anſwer, 1. The word of the Apoſtle is [ἅγια] the adjective [*holy*] which notes a ſtate of diſcrimination from the unclean, not [ἡγιασμένα *ſanctified*] a participle connoting the action of the ſanctifier, as well as the ſtate of the ſanctified, and therefore may import Baptiſm, and not the other; now the two Fathers the Dr. cites with *Gregory Nyſſen* after, uſe not the term [*holy*] but *ſanctified*, and therefore were it granted that they uſed [*ſanctified*] for *baptized*, yet this proves not they or the Apoſtle to have uſed [*holy*] for *baptized*.

2. I think the Fathers he cites, did not in thoſe paſſages he cites call Baptiſme ſanctification, though they took the perſon baptized to be ſanctified by it. My reaſons are from their words. For when *Cyprian* ſaith [*him who is born to be baptized and ſanctified*] he ſeems to mee to diſtinguiſh, not to confound baptiſm and ſanctification; and when *Nazianzen* in the place quoted uſeth this phraſe, ἁγιάσῃ καὶ ψυχὴ καὶ σῶμα, I think it is ineptly rendered by the Dr. *p.* 102. *by this means they may be baptized ſouls and bodies*: ſure the Baptiſm of water doth not touch the ſoul: and therefore *Nazianzen* is to be ſo interpreted as though he included baptizing in the phraſe of ſanctifying as the means of it, yet he doth not confound them, or call Baptiſm ſanctification. The like I imagin might be ſaid of *Gregory Nyſſen*, if I had his book, whoſe words it's likely if the Dr. had ſet down more fully, as hee doth in others, the impertinency of his allegation would have appeared. As for *the Jewiſh ſtile of ſanctifications for Baptiſms*, it will be to be conſidered after. *Macarius* his ſaying, *that the Jewiſh Baptiſm ſanctifies the fleſh*, is not a calling

calling Baptiſm ſanctification. But the Dr. ſtands moſt on *Tertullian*, in which he takes 1. that [*holy*] is uſed as he conceives *Paul* to uſe it 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. for [partakers of Baptiſm] ſo he expounds, *deſignatos ſanctitatis, the deſigned or ſealed of holineſs, in the ſenſe he conceives, wherein they that are baptiſed are by the ancients frequently ſaid to be ſealed*, and p. 92. *deſignati ſanctitatis, ſure muſt ſignifie that they are initiated into Chriſt by the Chriſtian right, or ſign, or ceremony of Baptiſm, as thoſe which had the Heatheniſh ceremonies uſed upon them, were* candidati dæmoniorum, *candidates of the Devil in the former, thus early admitted and initiated into their ſacra*. But neither do I conceive the Apoſtle to have uſed [*holy*] for holineſs by baptiſm, nor that *Tertullian* doth mean that which the Dr. would have him, nor do the Apoſtle and *Tertullian perfectly accord*. Twice in that Chapter doth *Tertullian* uſe the term [*holy*] once [*holineſs*] once [*ſanctified.*] The firſt paſſage is thus. *Hinc enim & Apoſtolus ex ſanctificato alterutro ſexu ſanctos procreari ait, tàm ex ſeminis prærogativa, quàm ex inſtitutionis diſciplina. From hence the Apoſtle alſo ſaith, holy ones to be procreated from either ſex, ſanctified as well by prerogative of ſeed, as by diſcipline of inſtitution.* By either father or mother ſanctified the Dr. conceives meant, *when either the father or mother is received as a believer by baptiſm into the Church*, by [*holy*] *baptized*, for he makes the notion of [*holy*] in thoſe words of *Tertullian* to be the ſame with *deſignatos ſanctitatis*, which he interprets *by ſealed, that is baptiſed in the ancients language*. Pag. 61. [*holy*] *appears to bee this* [*but now are your infant children partakers of the priviledge of Baptiſm.*] But that *Tertullian* mean by [*ſanctified, baptiſed*] is not proved by the Dr. and his paraphraſe makes it in 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. to import *being converted to the faith*; and ſo *Tertullian ad uxorem l.* 2. explains what he means by [*ſanctified*] *gained by the wife to the faith*. I deny not that hee made Baptiſm a means of that ſanctification, but he doth not *call* (as the Dr. ſaith) *baptiſm ſanctification*, but the whole fact of Gods grace, as hee ſaith, *Dei gratia illud ſanctificat quod invenit*, by teaching and inlightning the perſon ſanctified. Yet herein *Tertullian* and the Dr. accord not with the Apoſtle, for the Apoſtle ſuppoſeth 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. the perſon ſaid to be ſanctified ſtill an unbeliever, otherwiſe his reaſon had been nothing to confirm the reſolution *v.* 12, 13. which was the believing yoke fellow might live ſtill with the unbeliever, *for the unbelieving husband*, that is the husband continuing an unbeliever *is ſanctified*; but this cannot bee meant either of converſion to the faith or baptiſm, for then he ſhould be a believer when hee is ſaid to bee ſanctified, ſo that it is plain neither *Tertullians* expreſſion concurs with the Doctors notion, nor do the Dr. and *Tertullian* agree with *Paul*. The other words *ſanctos procreari*, ſith he reſtrains to infants, *the ſanctity pag.* 72. hath this ſenſe; the infants are procreated holy, that is baptized, for thus he ſpeaks; the Apoſtle in that place makes the ſanctification or baptiſm of the children a benefit of the believing parents cohabiting with the unbeliever. But herein neither doth *Tertullian* or the Dr. accord with *Paul*, for hee makes not the holineſs of the children to be the benefit of the parents faith, but of their conjugal relation, nor doth the Dr. accord with *Tertullian*. For the

holineſs

holineſs there meant by *Tertullian*, is not meant onely of the time of infancy. 1. Becauſe he ſaith it to be as well, *ex inſtitutionis diſciplinâ*, as *ex ſeminis prærogativâ*. Where *ex ſeminis prerogativa* the *Dr.* agrees p. 92. to be *in that he is not ſo polluted by their idolatrous ceremonies, and ſo is in ſome* degree holy, not federal holineſs, as Mr. *M. pag* 35. would, the whole ſcope ſhewing that to be the meaning, that *they are not ſo polluted as heathens children.* Now *ex inſtitutionis diſciplina*, the *Dr.* would have have p. 91. meant *the doctrine of Baptiſm inſtituted by Chriſt in his Church; for by this it is that baptiſm was allowed to thoſe that were* ex alterutro ſexu ſanctificato procreati, *born of parents of which either of them was Chriſtian. Thus in his book de bapt. c.* 12. *he uſes a like phraſe*, tingi diſciplina religionis, *to be ſprinkled with the diſcipline of religion, meaning evidently being baptiſed.* Where the *Dr.* by the way doth ill render *tingi* by *ſprinkled*, no Grammarian doth ſo render it, nor doth *Tertullian* to mean it, as in the place may be obſerved. But to the thing. This cannot be the meaning of *Tertullian* in that place. 1. The words are theſe, *ut opinor autem aliud eſt aſpergi vel intercipi violentiâ maris aliud tingi diſciplinâ religionis. As I think it is one thing to be ſprinkled or intercepted with the violence of the ſea*, as *Peter* was when againſt his will he was in the ſea, *another thing to be baptiſed with the diſcipline of religion*, that is, out of a willing yeilding to baptiſm by the learning of religion, that is, knowledge and profeſſion of faith which religion prompts to, meaning plainly not the doctrine or command of Chriſt, but the learning or diſcipline of his own heart, in the ſenſe that *Tertullian* uſeth after, *diſciplina verecundiæ & modeſtiæ.* And that ſenſe which I give the Scope leads to, which is to ſhew neither the Apoſtles being daſhed with the waves when the ſhip was almoſt covered, nor *Peters* being almoſt drowned, was Chriſtian baptiſm, becauſe it was not out of a voluntary diſpoſition from that diſcipline of religion which doth diſpoſe to it, but the violence of the ſea. 2. *Tertullian* could not mean as the *Dr.* would, ſith there is no ſuch inſtitution of Chriſt either expreſſed by the Evangeliſts, or by *Tertullian.* The Evangeliſts expreſs no title to baptiſm, but by the perſons own faith or diſcipleſhip who is to be baptiſed, as is proved *Review part.* 2 *ſect.* 5.

And *Tertullian* in his Book *of Baptiſm* a little after the words cited by the *Dr. c.* 12. expreſſeth the inſtitution of Baptiſm thus; *Lex enim tingendi impoſita eſt & forma præſcripta, ite (inquit) docete nationes, tingentes eas in nomen patris & filii & ſpiritus ſancti. Huic legi collata definitio illa: niſi quis renatus fuerit ex aquâ & ſpiritu non intrabit in regnum cœlorum: obſtrinxit fidem ad baptiſmi neceſſitatem. Itaque omnes exinde credentes tingebantur.* And after, *Nam & prius eſt prædicare, poſterius tingere*, and in the 18th. chapter gives his reaſons *againſt the haſtening the baptiſm of infants, as being not neceſſary*, which if he had acknowledged ſuch an inſtitution, as the *Dr.* imagins, he could not have ſaid, and directs according to the inſtitution, *Let them come when they grow up, when they learn, when they are taught whereſoever they come, let them be made Chriſtians when they can know Chriſt*; and after preſcribes, *How they ſhould go to baptiſm, with prayer, faſting, kneeling, confeſſing of ſins;*

and

and in his Book *of Repentance*, cals *Baptiſm the ſealing of repentance*, no where is any ſuch inſtitution of infants Baptiſm from the faith of one parent; and therefore I conclude, *ex inſtitutionis diſciplina*, is not meant as Dr. *Hammond* conceives.

On the other ſide I conceive that he means by [*ſanctos procreari*] real holineſs future, and by *ex inſtitutionis diſciplina*, learning of the doctrine or inſtitution of Chriſt. That the holineſs is real ſaving holineſs, is gathered firſt from the joyning together, *deſignati ſanctitatis ac per hoc etiam ſalutis*, which plainly ſhews, that the holineſs meant is that by which is ſalvation. 2. This is confirmed, in that it is made the effect of being born by water and the ſpirit. 3. Shall enter into the Kingdome of heaven, is expounded by *ſanctus, holy*. 4. It is oppoſed to that uncleanneſs which they had in *Adam*, and it is expreſſed to bee in Chriſt, which muſt needs bee a real ſaving holineſs. 5. If it bee that which is by baptiſm, then it is not baptiſm it ſelf, as the Dr. expounds it, but a conſequent on it, which is no other then ſaving holineſs. 6. This is proved from the expreſſion of *deſignatos ſanctitatis ac per hoc ſalutis*; this is confeſſed by the Dr. to expreſs the ſame with *procreari ſanctos ex inſtitutionis diſciplina*, but *deſignatos ſanctitatis* hath the ſenſe of *deſigned to be holy*, that is, *a believer by education, and ſo ſaved*. I will ſet down the words of a Letter of my learned and much honoured friend and *quondam* ſcholler Dr. *Wilkins*, Warden of *Wadham* Colledge in *Oxford*, who at my requeſt imployed a friend to enquire into the ſenſe of this paſſage of *Tertullian*, and thus wrote to me: *As for that phraſe*, Deſignatos ſanctitatis & ſalutis, *though this reading be approved by* Pamelius, *and* de la Cerda *in their editions, yet 'tis corrected by* Johannes a Wouwer, *by that famous Manuſcript Copy of* Fulvius Urſinus, *now in the* Vatican, *which hath it* Deſignatos ſanctitati. *which reading is now generally received as the moſt genuine, as may appear by* Rigaltius *and* Georgius Ambianus *in his laſt and beſt edition of* Tertullian *at Paris* 1648. *And the moſt proper ſenſe of this phraſe muſt be ſuch as are deſigned by their parents to a religious education, which is likewiſe ſignified by that other expreſſion* ex inſtitutionis diſciplina. So that *deſignatos ſanctitati ac per hoc etiam ſaluti*, plainly expreſſeth, that whereas the Pagan idolaters did dedicate and conſecrate their children to Devils, and thereby made them unclean, the children of the believer were brought into the world holy, both in that they were free from ſuch pollution, and alſo by prayer, vow, or reſolution deſigned or intended to be made holy by the diſciplin of Chriſtian inſtitution, and ſo to be ſaved, or to enter into the Kingdome of heaven, by faith in Chriſt. 7. This ſenſe is confirmed by the words [*hujus ſpei pignora, the pledges of this hope*] which ſhew that the holineſs and ſalvation meant in the words before, was a thing not then exiſtent at the childrens birth, but intended and hoped for at age, upon endeavours uſed by the believing parent. 8. This interpretation of *deſignatos ſanctitatis*, or *ſanctitati*, is confirmed by the expreſſions of *Hierome, Epiſt.* 153. to *Paulinus*, where he ſaith, *Of thy ſecond Problem* Tertullian *hath diſcourſed in his books of Monogamy, affirming the children of believers to be called holy, becauſe they were as it were* candidati fidei,

candidates of faith, and not polluted with any of the filth of Idolatry. Which phrase expresseth the same with *designatos sanctitati*, and alludes to those who in *Rome* stood for Offices in white, and notes that the infants were as it were in expectation of being believers, and baptized, *quod veluti ambiunt & expectant baptismum*, as *Erasmus* in his note on *Hierom, Epist.* 153. to *Paulinus*, or *designed*, that is intended to be holy by the parents, that is to be bred up to profess the faith, and so to be baptized.

To this saith Dr. *Hammond*. "1. This of *Tertullian* is not the place "that S. *Hierom* refers to, but some other in his Books *de Monogamia*, "that one book which we now have under that title affording us no such "discourse on that subject as *S. Hierom* mentions.

Answ. 1. It is more probable that this is the place *Hierom* meant, the expressions so agreeing and the matter, and that *Hierom* writing in hast mistook the the Title of the Book, and the term *candidatos* used in the Chapter before for *designatos*. 2. However, whether it were so or otherwise, the words cited by *Hierom* being to the same purpose will fitly explain the other.

"2dly. (*saith Dr.* Hammond) All that S. *Hierom* cites out of that "(not this) place of *Tertullian* is very reconcilable with what *Tertullian* "saith in this place, and with his opinion that the infants of Christians "were baptized; for, saith he, they were *quasi candidati fidei*, as it were "candidates of faith. Candidates were they that stood for any Office, "*qui candidâ sumpti veste consulatum, praturam*, &c. *postulabant*, who "putting on white garments sued for any Office; and so candidates of "faith, they that sue for this condition in the Church of God, that of "πιστοὶ believers, to which by baptism they are assumed, and accordingly were to be brought to the font, like such candidates, in white "garments as they that were to be sanctified; *i. e.* baptized, among "the Jews *Exod.* 16. 10. were also to wash their cloathes or put on clean "garments.

Answ. 'Tis true both places of *Tertullian* are very reconcilable, but not Dr. *Hammonds* interpretation of *designatos sanctitatis* or *sanctitati* with *candidatos fidei*. For Dr. *Hammonds designatos* is as much *baptized*, but *candidatos* notes onely a future thing in expectation, and *candidatos fidei* answering to *designatos sanctitatis* or *sanctitati* shews *the holiness* to be *faith*, and that tending to salvation, not the bare title of a believer by baptism, but such a faith as saves effectually *ac per hoc etiam salutis*, which puts it out of doubt, that a real holiness though in intention and expectation onely, and a real saving faith though future, is meant by *Tertullian* in both expressions, which is not avoided by the Doctors answer.

"Again (*saith the Dr.*) when he saith of them that they were holy "as the vessels of the Temple were holy, though they had no sense, this is "a clear laying of a ground, whereby children may be deemed capable "of this relative holiness, which is to be had by baptism, though as yet "they are not capable (for want of understanding) of inherent holi-"ness.

Answ.

Answ. 'Tis true *Hierom* expresseth another way of holiness which infants might have without understanding, but that this should be by baptism he doth not intimate. But if he did, yet he doth not make it the meaning of *Tertullians candidatos fidei*, and therefore serves not his turn to prove that by *holiness Tertullian* meant *baptism*. Yea, this very thing is against it, sith it is added as another way of sanctity then that he first mentioned, as the words *simulq; considera* do seem to me to intimate; and therefore *candidatos fidei* and *designatos sanctitatis* or *sanctitati* is not *partakers of Baptism* in *Tertullian*, as the Dr. would have it.

"Lastly (*saith the Dr.*) when he mentions it as an idiom of Scrip-"ture to call them holy, who are clensed, purified, expiated, speaking "of those legal lustrations or purifications, this gives an account of St. "*Pauls* using the word in the Christian Church for the Christian lustra-"tion, purification, expiation, *i. e.* for baptism.

Answ. 1. It gives but a lame account till it be proved St. *Paul* useth *holy* for *baptized*. 2. Though *Hierom* do say *the Scripture names holy for clean, purified, and expiated*; yet this doth not prove he conceived the Scripture puts *holy* for Christian baptism.

Yet again saith the Dr. "And by the way it appears by St. *Hierom*, "that he useth promiscuously *sancti* and *sanctificati*, and so that gives us "authority to interpret [ἁγιάζεται] in the end of the verse, in the same "sense in which [ἡγίασται] is used in the beginning for those that are "brought and received to Baptism. All which are far enough from "serving any of Mr. *T.* his interests, and might have inclined him to "have omitted that testimony of St. *Hieroms*, if he had more maturely "considered of it.

Answ. How this testimony serves my turn upon more mature consideration of it, is shewed. It is true *sancti* and *sanctificati* are used of the same persons, yet they are not the same; as *calidum* and *calefactum* may be said of the same wood, yet are not the same, sith fire may be said to be hot, but not heated; and God may be said to be *holy*, but not *sanctified*. But the Dr. forgets himself when he would have *sanctified and holy*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *to be interpreted in the same sense*. For then when it is said the unbeliever hath been sanctified, that is, brought to the faith by the wives counsel and example, it should be said of the infant children that they are in the same sense *holy*, that is, converted to the faith.

Yet further saith the Dr. "Nay 3. I must add, that Mr. *T.* his ren-"dring of *candidati* and *designati sanctitatis* and *candidati fidei* by being "in designation of being believers and baptized, intended to be holy "by the parents, to be bred up to the faith and so baptized, is a most "groundless inconvenient interpretation. For if by holiness and faith "be meant inherent holiness and faith, then Baptism it self is the cere-"mony of consecrating and designing them to this, and so precedent to "that holiness (nor subsequent to it as Mr. *T.* sets it) and accordingly "in the Church writings the word [*fideles*] believers, is never bestowed "on any, though of mature age and knowledge, till after they be bapti-"zed, [*competentes*] and [*illuminati*] illuminate and believers being all one, "promiscuously used for those that have received baptism, in opposition

"to *catechumeni* those that have not yet attained it: But if holiness and "faith be the relative holiness then infants being as capable of that as "vessels in the Temple, they might be presently designed and conse-"crated to that, and not first bred up in the faith, before they were par-"takers of it.

Answ. That the interpretation I give is neither groundless nor inconvenient, is manifest by the phrase it self, *designatos sanctitatis* or *sanctitati*; the Doctors interpretation is altogether groundless and inconvenient; For he renders p. 59. designed by sealed, but he shews not that ever [*designatos*] signifies [sealed,] the term for that is *obsignatos*, *Tertullian* in his Book *of Repentance* saith, *Lavacrum illud* (meaning baptism) *est obsignatio fidei, quæ fides a pœnitentiæ fide incipitur & commenditur*: The term [*designed*] notes plainly the intention of the parent, and this is also plain from the next words [*of this hope*] which shews it is not baptism in infancy they were designed to, for that they need not hope for, they might presently have; but real holiness of saving faith, and therefore expressed by *candidatos fidei*, and that this holiness was such a real holiness, appears by the addition *ac per hoc etiam salutis*, there being no other holiness that could bring salvation, and the term *candidatos* imports a suing or seeking for it, as *Erasmus* expresseth it *veluti ambiunt & expectant*; and Dr. *Hammond* p. 92. himself expresseth *candidatos dæmoniorum, candidates of the Devils, ambitious to be admitted thus early into his service.* So that all these reasons shew, that *designatos sanctitatis* notes the intention of the parents with endeavours to produce faith, and so to bring them to Baptism. Which is the more evident if it be read [*designatos sanctitati*] for that case plainly intimates a tendency to it. As for *designatos sanctitatis*, which the Dr. that he may σκλεύειν ἑαυτῷ *serve his own purpose* (which he elsewhere causlesly imputes to me) turns [*sealed of holiness*] I crave leave to tell the Dr. that in my apprehension it makes *Tertullian* speak non-sense; and that it cannot be the meaning that it should note the consecrating by baptism, it appears in that it should have been then *sanctitate*, or *per sanctitatem*. Besides, they are said to be *designatos salutis* as well as *sanctitatis* and I hope the Dr. will not render it *sealed of salvation* as if it noted *the ceremony of consecrating*. Salvation in no Writer being put for for Baptism: And however, here it's a distinct thing from *sanctity*, which the Dr. makes *Baptism*. So that I think I may safely infer, that *Tertullian* means by [*designatos sanctitatis* or *sanctitati* rather] not Baptism, but the intention of the parents (for of their act he speaks in opposition to the Gentile parents designing their children to Devils; or as the terms are *vowing, deputing* to them, making them *candidatos*) to breed them up in the faith, and so to bring them to Baptism and Salvation, which his words in his Book *de Baptismo*, c. 18. shew he approved as best, except necessity through danger of death imminent and apparent urged the hastening of it in little ones; regularly he would have faith first, and baptism after, as the words in his Book *of Baptism*, and *Repentance* forecited shew. And whereas the Dr. saith, *in the Church writings the word believers is never bestowed on any though of mature age and knowledge till after they be baptized;*

tized, and so faith must be subsequent not antecedent to baptism as I set it, the *Dr.* may perceive his mistake by the words of *Tertullian* before quoted, *Itaq; omnes credentes tingibantur, Lavatrum illud est obsignatio fidei;* and this is agreeable to Christs speech, *Mar.16.16. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,* to which perhaps *Tertullian* alluded when he said *designatos sanctitati* which *Grotius* follows, *Annot. ad 1 Cor.7.14.* or *condidatos fidei ac per hoc etiam saluti,* or *salutis.* The relative holiness which vessels in the Temple were capable of, is far from *Tertullians* meaning: Certainly *Tertullians* phrase of *designed to holiness* is so far from proving infant baptism, that it proves the contrary, sith he is not said to be *designatus* or *candidatus* who hath an Office or thing in possession, but he who is chosen to it or seeks for it, and so hath it onely in intention or expectation. As *designatus saluti* is not actually saved, so neither *designatus sanctitati* actually baptized.

He adds. *The children of believers, I willingly grant, are presumed to be by them intended to be bred up to the faith; but if that intention of theirs bring forth no present effect, if they do not bring them thus early and enter them into the Church by Baptism, why should that bare intention of the parents give them the stile of holy or sanctified, or how should these infant children, which may die before they come to those years, receive any present priviledge or benefit by that which is thus far removed from them?*

Answ. The Drs. words answer this, *p.92.* when he saith, *whosoever is born from either parent Christian, hath one priviledge by nature, by his very seed, that he is not so polluted as the Idolatrous heathens children by their Idolatrous ceremonies, and so is in some degree holy in that respect,* which is a present effect, opposite to the present evil effect which the heathen Idolatrous devotions brought on their children.

He goes on. *Now for the 2d. part of this suggestion, that what I say from* Tertullian, *that they were holy,* i. e. *baptized* in seminis prærogativâ *is a mistake, I must answer by viewing of the proofs of his assertion: First, saith he, the holiness was not onely by prerogative of birth, but* ex institutionis disciplinâ. *This is sure a strange proof, It is not so, because it is not onely so. 'Tis certain that* Tertullian *saith they are holy* ex institutionis disciplinâ, *and as certain that they are as much so by prerogative of their birth; the words are most clear,* tam ex seminis prærogativâ quam ex institutionis disciplinâ, *and that I never denied the second could not be mistaken in affirming the first.*

Answ. The words of the Dr. in his 4th. quære gave occasion to think he conceived the children of believers to be termed *holy* by *Tertullian,* that is baptized either onely or chiefly by prerogative of birth as that which gave them title to baptism. But it seems he means that they had title to it, also by the discipline of institution. But *p.92.* he expounds the prerogative of birth onely by their freedome from Idolatrous pollution; Now sure that gave not title to baptism: An Idolaters child if born without those pollutions had not title to baptism, he must be born according to his own exposition of the Apostles and *Tertullians* words of one believer, & therfore he must needs be mistaken in affirming the first, and he must needs miss *Tertullians* meaning if by *holy* be meant *baptized,*

and

and ſays they are baptized *tàm ex ſeminis prærogativâ* if that give no title to it. The Dr. expounds *ex inſtitutionis diſciplinâ* thus, *by the Doctrine of Baptiſm inſtituted by Chriſt, by which Baptiſm is allowed to children born of either parent Chriſtian.* I have ſhewed before how ſhort his proof is of this ſenſe. For preſent, *Tertullians* words, according to this expoſition have an inept tautology; For it is all one as to ſay, they are baptized as well by prerogative of birth as by prerogative of birth, the prerogative of birth by which they are baptized being all one with their priviledge of being born of a believer, which is according to the Dr. the diſcipline of inſtitution. If *Tertullian* had meant as the Dr. would have it, he had not uſed *tàm* and *quàm*, but ſaid, holy by prerogative of birth according to the diſcipline of inſtitution; whence it may appear, that the diſcipline of inſtitution and holineſs is another thing then the Dr. interprets it, nor by his interpretation of the place will the place be clear. For not two priviledges (as he Dr. makes it) but one priviledge, to wit, holineſs, which the Dr. makes to be baptiſm, is aſcribed to them by a double means, freedome from heatheniſh pollutions, and the doctrine of Chriſt about infants Baptiſm: Whereas freedome from ſuch pollutions gives no title to Baptiſm; and if prerogative of birth be meant of federal holineſs (of which is not a word there) and the diſcipline of inſtitution be the doctrine allowing baptiſm to the child born of a believer, it is either an inept tautology, both being the ſame, or incongruous ſpeech, which ſhould be thus mended, by prerogative of birth according to the doctrine of baptiſm by Chriſt in his Church, imagined by the Dr. but not extant in Scripture, nor *Tertullian*.

Nor do *Tertullians* words following, *de Anima, c.* 40. *Every ſoul is ſo long enrolled in* Adam *till it be inrolled in Chriſt, and is ſo long unclean till it be thus anew enrolled*, prove that by [*holy*] *Tertullian* meant baptized. For in the words before (to which [*ita ſo*] refer) he makes *holy* to be the ſame with entring into the Kingdome of Heaven, and *the enrolling in Chriſt* he makes the ſame with *being born of water and the ſpirit.*

Of the words aſcribed to *Origen* and *Athanaſius*, enough hath been ſaid already. Neither *Cyprians* nor *Chryſoſtomes* words prove, that [holy] is as much as [*partaker of baptiſm*] in the Ancients language, much leſs in the Apoſtles 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. to the further conſideration of which I proceed after Dr. *Hammond.*

I excepted againſt Dr. *Hammonds* paraphraſe of 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. that the term [*young children of Chriſtians*] is more then is in the text, which hath onely [*your children*] which is not reſtrained to infancy. But the Dr. proves it is, 1. *By the authority of* Tertullian, *who ſaith of infant children, that they are procreated holy*; and *Nazianzen, who uſing this phraſe* ἁγιασθῆναι ἐκ βρέφους, *in all probability refers to this place of the Apoſtle, and ſo renders* τέκνα by βρέφη, *their children, by their infant children.*

Anſw. 1. *Tertullian* doth not ſay that the infant children are holy in infancy onely. 2. Nor is there any thing ſaid to make it in any ſort probable, that *Nazianzen* referred to that place of the Apoſtle, in which is neither

neither ἁγιασθῆναι nor βρέφος, nor that hee ſhould render τέκνον by βρέφος, when he uſeth not the ſame caſe nor number the Apoſtle doth, but onely uſeth a deſcription of young age, which is not to my remembrance expreſſed by the other word τέκνον any where.

2. The other reaſons are farther from the thing. For neither doth it appear to be the general doctrine of the Fathers, that the parents faith profits onely their infant children, ſome of them do reaſon from the faith of the woman of *Canaan*, the faith of the ruler of the Synagogue, that faith of parents profits children who were not infants. The other reaſon runs upon this miſtake, which ſhould be proved to be the Apoſtles meaning (but is denied by me) that *he makes 1 Cor. 7. 14. ſanctification or baptiſm of the children, a benefit of the believing parents cohabiting with the unbeliever.*

I ſaid [*holy*] for [*admitted to baptiſm*] is a ſenſe of the word no where elſe found. But this the Dr. *hopes he hath cleared, both from the uſage of the word among the firſt Chriſtian writers*, which is anſwered, *and the Jewiſh*, of which in that which follows, and ſaith.

"I might further do it even by this Apoſtles dialect, who in his in-
"ſcriptions of moſt of his Epiſtles to the Churches, calls all thoſe to
"whom he writes, *i. e.* the baptized Chriſtians of thoſe Churches holy,
"*Rom.* 1. 7. and ſanctified and holy, 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. 2 *Cor.* 1. 1. *Eph.* 1. 1.
"*Phil.* 1. 1. *Col.* 1. 1. among whom no doubt there were many, who
"were no otherwiſe holy or ſanctified, then as all baptized Chriſtians
"are capable of that ſtile.

Anſw. True: But doth hee term any infant ſo in thoſe places? or give them thoſe titles barely from Baptiſm? doth he not expreſly term them Saints by their calling not by their Baptiſm? The Drs. allegations have not yet altered my minde, but I think as I did his interpretation new, ſtrange, and abſurd.

I alleged *Aug. l. 2. de pecc. mer. & remiſſ. c. 26.* (and the like is ſaid *l. 3. c. 12.*) "Saying the ſanctification of what ſort ſoever it be, which
"the Apoſtle ſaid to be in the children of believers, yet it belongs not
"to that queſtion of Baptiſm, and the beginning or remiſſion of ſins.

To this the Dr. anſwers, "Tis true he ſaith it belongs not to that
"queſtion, whether the ſanctifying of the *catechumeni* after a ſort by the
"ſign of Chriſt, and prayer of impoſition of hands without Baptiſm, pro-
"fits him not to the entring the Kingdome of Heaven. And the mean-
"ing is ſuch ſanctification, except it be that of baptiſm, cannot avail to
"remiſſion of ſins.

Anſw. The Dr. miſtakes in making the queſtion to be of the Catechumeni, mentioned *c. 26.* it is of the children of believers, who being termed holy, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. ſhould ſeem not to need Baptiſm, which *Auguſtin* anſwers, 1. By mentioning divers ſorts of ſanctification, but not determining which is there meant. 2. By reſolving *that what ever the ſanctification be which the Apoſtle ſaid to be in the children of believers* (not as the Dr. makes it of the *Catechumeni*) *it belongs not to that queſtion of Baptiſm* (not as the Dr. doth palpably pervert the words p. 64. *whatſoever ſanctification it can be imagined to be that the Apoſtle ſpeaks of, except it be*

that

that of Baptiſm, it cannot avail to the remiſſion of ſins, &c.) to wit mentioned *ch.* 25. whether it exclude neceſſity of Baptiſm, original ſin and the remiſſion of it in the children of believers termed holy. Which is plainly againſt the Dr. who will have it meant onely of baptiſm of infants of believers, by vertue of the believing parents faith. As for my other objections againſt his paraphraſe not anſwered, I am ſo far from aſſurance that the Dr. can eaſily anſwer them, that by this anſwer I judge he can anſwer none of them.

SECT. LXXXXII.

Dr. Hammond's *imagined evidence from* [*hath been ſanctified*] *for his ſenſe of the fore part of* 1 Cor. 7. 14. *is nullified, and my opinion of enallage of tenſe vindicated.*

CH. 3. Sect. 2 the Dr. ſaith thus. *Firſt then to my firſt evidence taken from the word* [ἡγίασται *hath been ſanctified*] *referring to ſome paſt known examples and experiences, of this kinde* (*of a wives converting the husband,* &c.) *he hath a double anſwer.* 1. That as my paraphraſe expreſſeth it, it ſhould ſignifie not onely that an unbelieving husband hath been ſanctified, but alſo that there is hope they will, and ſo it ſhould note not onely ſome example paſt, but alſo ſome to come, of which there can be a leſs reaſonable account given, then of putting it in the preſent tenſe in Engliſh. 2. That the *enallage* or change of tenſe is frequent *ch.* 11. 24. κλώμενον in the preſent tenſe for the future, and here ἀκάθαρτά ἐστι for ἦν or ἦν, and in the next *v.* δεδέλωται in the preter for the preſent, and ſo ἡγίασται here, not, hath been, but is ſanctified, or if in the preter tenſe, yet that to be underſtood of a paſt thing, yet continued, as κέκριται *John* 3. 18. notes an act ſtill continued in force. *To theſe two I reply briefly, and firſt to the former* (*the ſame which hee had mentioned before, and excepted againſt as an exceſt in my paraphraſe, but both there and here without the leaſt cauſe*;) *For in my paraphraſe I look upon* ἡγίασται *as a verb of the preter tenſe, and as ſuch onely adapt the ſenſe to it, referring it not to future hopes, but to paſt experiments or examples; onely becauſe examples are rhetorical ſyllogiſmes, and what hath been frequently experimented may alſo reaſonably be hoped, I ſuppoſe that the Apoſtle ſo meant theſe examples, as grounds of hoping the like for the future, not making this of the future any part of the ſenſe of* ἡγίασται *in the preter, but explicating the* τὸ λογικὸν, *or rational importance* (*which is ſomewhat more then the* τὸ ῥητὸν *of the Apoſtles ſpeech*) *and ſuppoſing this concluſion to lye hid under this premiſe, as it is ordinary in all diſcourſe to ſet down the premiſes, diſtinctly leaving the concluſion by every ones reaſon to be drawn from thence, without ſetting it down explicitly.*

Anſw. That the Dr. in his paraphraſe qu. 4. §. 31. of his letter, put ſo much as I have noted *Review part.* 2. *ſect.* 26. of which there is nothing in the text expreſſed, is not juſtified by this plea. For what ever addi-

tion

tion a paraphraſt be allowed, yet ſure no paraphraſt is allowed to expreſs that which he conceives is deducible from the ſenſe of the words in thirteen lines, and the ſenſe it ſelf onely in three, and eſpecially when he layes that in his paraphraſe as the ground of his argument for his poſition, which hath not a word in the text to leade to that inference. Sure I had great cauſe to except againſt his paraphraſe, which was ſo monſtrous as to be defective in ſetting down what was the chief thing to be heeded in the Apoſtles ſpeech, to wit, the relation of husband and wife, and ſo extremely exuberant, as to expreſs that as done often, which is mentioned in the ſingular number onely, and aſcribe the ſanctifying to the converſation not at all expreſſed, and put in a long inference that hath no intimation in the text, and mention an act of the Church, of which there is no inkling there or near it, or any where elſe in Scripture, and ſo many wayes corrupting the ſenſe, as I ſhew *ubi ſuprà*, eſpecially in the main ſuppoſing a mention made of a husband converted by the wife, and yet the husband expreſſed by the Apoſtle as continuing an unbeliever, and a husbands being ſanctified by the wife which is ever aſcribed to Gods ſpirit, never to any Apoſtle, to make that which is uſed as a reaſon of lawfulneſs, as if it were a motive from an advantage, to make that as a Rhetorical motive, which is a Logical proof, to make that which was a rare contingent event, which might and it's likely did as often fail as a convincing argument to ſettle the conſcience in the lawfulneſs of cohabitation, with other faults, as being ſo audacious an attempt, as I think no approved writer can bee ſhewed to have made, nor any conſiderate Reader will allow of. Nor would it ever have come into my thoughts, that ſo learned a man as Dr *Hammond* is, ſhould have vented ſuch a conceit as this is in his *Letter* and *Annotations*, did I not finde him ſet to maintain what the Church of *England*, that is the Prelates, held or appointed, as others what the *Scotiſh* or *New-Engliſh* Churches approve of.

As for his excuſe of his dealing in his paraphraſe, it is too narrow a plaiſter for ſuch a ſore. For neither is any thing 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. ſet down as an example to move the will the judgement being before ſetled, nor any Rhetorical ſyllogiſm, uſed, but a Logical; as the termes γὰρ ἐπεὶ ἄρα, uſed *Rom.* 11. 6. 1 *Cor.* 15. 14, 18, 29, *&c.* ſhew, nor doth the Dr. prove, but ſuppoſe the Apoſtle ſo meant; nor doth he anſwer the allegations I bring to the contrary, *Review par.* 2. §. 26. And his words here do imply as if this were the concluſion, that *it is probable and a ground of hope, that the unbelieving yoke fellow will be converted by the believer cohabiting*, and this the premiſe, *for it hath often ſo come to paſs*, whereas there is not the leaſt intimation of that concluſion in the text, and it is manifeſt by the term [γὰρ *for*] that *v.* 14. is a proof of the determination or concluſion *v.* 12, 13 concerning the lawfulneſs of married perſons living together in diſparity of religion, not of Dr. *Hammonds* imagined as tacitely implied concluſion.

But hee ſaith. "Wherein that I was not miſtaken, I had all aſſu-
"rance from *v.* 16. where the argument is preſt, and the concluſion
"inferred more explicitely. For what knoweſt thou O wife, whether

"thou ſhalt ſave thy husband" and the like mentioned in the para-
"phraſe from 1 *Pet.* 3. 1.

Anſw. Dr. *Hammond* had no aſſurance from *v.* 16. that the unbeliev-ing husband is oft converted by the wife; the thing being expreſſed ſo doubtfully as an uncertain contingent though poſſible, and ſo with ſome hope ſperable, [*Hierom. com. in* 1 Cor. 7. 14. *In dubium quidem poſuit ſed ſemper ambiguam melius evenire credenda ſunt.*] much leſs that there is a concluſion of the probability of the converting of the infidel yoke-fellow, *v.* 14. deducible from the example and experiment of what was done in time paſt, *v.* 16. being neither explication nor proof of what is ſaid *v.* 14. but a motive to make the thing determined as lawfull, *v.* 12, 13. more ſwaſible, or a motive to what is ſaid *v.* 15. *that God hath called us in peace.* In my apprehenſion if *v.* 14. were as the Dr. meanes, the unbelieving husband hath been ſanctified, that is converted by the wife often, and therefore it is probable, or there is a ground of hope, or it is to be preſumed, it will be ſo for the future, the Apoſtle had ſaid the ſame *v.* 14. which is ſaid *v.* 16. and ſo there would have been a meer tautology in the Apoſtles ſpeeches, which is not to bee conceived. As for 1 *Pet.* 3 1. though it ſhew ſuch an event poſſible, yet not frequent, nor is there in *Peters* words the leaſt hint that *Pauls* words 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. are to be underſtood as the Dr. would have them. But the Dr. hath another ſtring to his bow, which he thus urgeth.

"And herein I have the authority of St. *Hierom*; as for my ren-
"dring ἐν γυναικὶ by the woman (ſo I find it *per mulierem* in his 7. *Epiſt.*
"*ad Lætam*, and ſo *Marianus Victorius* in his *ſcholia* aſſures us, all the
"copies ancient and printed read it) ſo alſo for this part of my para-
"phraſe. He produceth an example, becauſe (ſaith he on the place) it
"hath often happened that the husband hath been gained by the wife,
"according to that of St. *Peter*, that if any man believe not the word,
"he ſhould without the word be gained by the converſation of the wife,
"that is, that when they ſhall ſee them changed to the better, all may
"know that the law of God might have been taken in exchange for ſo
"inveterate a cuſtome. *And ſo again Ep.* 7. *ad Lætam*, ſpeaking of the
"like example, we have well (ſaith he) and happily expected (*i. e.* not
"miſt of our expectation) an holy and faithfull houſe ſanctifies an un-
"believer, adding his conceipt, that *Jupiter* himſelf if he had had ſuch a
"kinred, might have been brought to the faith of Chriſt.

Anſw. 'Tis true that *Hierom comment. in* 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. reads *per mu-lierem*, but in *Ep.* 7. *ad Lætam* he reads *in uxore*, and *Auguſt. tom* 7. *l.* 2. *de peccat. merit. & remiſ. c.* 26. and that in *Hierom* in both places the terms *fidelem* and *fideli* are, but not in *Auguſt.* though he render the la-ter part thus, *& ſanctificatur mulier infidelis in fratre.* And I find in the *ſcholies* of *Eraſmus* of *Roterdam*, on *Hieroms Epiſtle to Læta* this the firſt note. *For he is ſanctified*] *The place is with S.* Paul *in the former Epiſtle to the* Corinthians *cap.* 7. *In the antient copies we find written in the husband, not by the husband, and in the wife, not by the woman. For the Greek hath it, For the unbelieving husband is ſanctified in the wife, and the unbelieving wife in the husband. Moreover what the interpreter adds*

[believer

[*believer and believer*] *he hath done for explication.* By which it may appear, that *Erasmus* saith otherwise then the Dr. saith *Marianus Victorius* doth, and for my part I imagine *Erasmus* is the more credible scholiast of the two. 'Tis true that *Hierom com. in* 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. hath the words the Dr. allegeth, but then he addeth, which the Dr. leaves out. *Item ideo vir & uxor invicem sanctificantur: quia ex traditione Dei sanctæ sunt nuptiæ.* That is, *Likewise therefore the husband and wife are to each other or for each other, or in course sanctified, because by the tradition of God mariages are holy, which expresseth* Hieromes *second and better thoughts.* By which it may appear that *Hierom* took *of ἁγιάζεται* as if it were in the present tense. And for the other place of *Hierom* it is true, *Hierom* hath the words the Dr. cites, if the word [*Jovem*] be not put for [*proavum*] or some such word as *Erasmus* thinks. But then it is plain from the words left out by the Dr. *Jam candidatus est fidei quem filiorum & nepotum credens turba circumdat.* That is, *He is as one that would be baptized, who hath a company of believing children & grandchildren about him.* That the sanctifying is not made the priviledge of the husband in respect of his wife, or of the children by the parent, but also the grandfather is conceived likely to be sanctified by the children and grandchildren, and all is ascribed to example and instruction, with this express speech, *Fiunt non nascuntur Christiani; Christians are made, not born such.* And though *Hierome* saith of *Læta's* daughter *Paula*, that she was *prius Christo consecrata quàm genita*, and *she had conceived her, antè votis quam utero*, yet the words *cui imperatori, cui exercitui nutriatur, cui promissa sit, regis amplexibus parat, de spiritualibus nuptiis sciscitantem*, do seem to me to imitate that young *Paula* was not then baptized, which if right it is manifest, that children of believers were not baptized ordinarily then in infancy. And me thinks the words of *Hierom* in his *commentary* on 1 *Cor.* 7.14. on the words, *Else should your children be unclean, but now are they holy; If it were not so as I say your children would yet remain infidels: for it would often happen that the children would follow those parents, who had believed. upon which hope he would have it believed, that the other might bee saved as well by the example of the children as by the marriage*; shew that *Hierom* understood not *the holiness of the children*, of their baptism in infancy, but of their embracing the faith, by following the example of the believing parent, and in like manner the unbelieving parent was sanctified according to him, as well by the example of the children as the marriage. So that however Dr. *Hammonds* paraphrase in the forepart seems to have some countenance from these passages of *Hierome*, yet the latter part is expounded clean besides the Drs. minde, and the passages yeeld us such hints of the not baptizing of infants of believers, as do overthrow his conceit; as if the infants of believers were then ordinarily baptized.

Dr. *Hammond* adds. *As for his* 2d. *answer, I acknowledge such Enallages to be ordinary in the Hebrew, and sometimes, but more rarely, found in the Hebraizing Greeks or Hellenists, and consequently, that where the context will not bear the sense of the tense which is used, there may be place for this Grammatical figure, which yet is not to be made use of unnecessarily.*

Accordingly if there were any convincing reason offered, that [ἡγίασται *in the preter tense*] *could not be born, I should not then doubt to interpret it by this figure, either in the present or some other tense: But when* (*as here it is evident*) *there is no such necessity, then* 1. *I cannot think fit to do so,* (*'tis dangerous to forsake the literal sense, when it may be commodiously retained, and fly to either a Rhetorical or Grammatical figure;*) *and having no motive to do so, I am next to consider, what is the propereſt importance of that phraſe in that tenſe wherein it is uſed, and then I could not* (*I believe*) *have fallen upon any thing more natural, then that the preter form of ſpeech referred to the paſt experiences, &c. This is a full ſatisfaction to his anſwer.*

Anſw. 1. The Drs. acknowledging that ſuch *Enallages* may be, and ſometimes are, ſhews that his interpretation is not neceſſary, and therefore his inference thereupon not certain, which is enough to make good my anſwer. 2. It is to me a convincing reaſon, that there is an *Enallage* of the preter tenſe for the preſent, not onely becauſe *Camerarius* and other learned men conceive ſo, and our Tranſlators ſo render it; but alſo becauſe by the making it to import an experience paſt onely, a ſenſe is brought in (as I have ſhewed in my *Examen*, *par.* 3. *ſect.* 8. in the firſt part of the *Review*, *ſect.* 19, *&c.* in the ſecond part of the *Review*, *ſect.* 26.) which is neither agreeing with the words, nor pertinent or accommodate to the matter of the Apoſtles ſpeech. 3. However the Dr. believe, yet it is ſhewed here, and *Review par.* 2. *ſect.* 26. that to refer the ſanctifying 1 *Cor.* 7. 14 to paſt experiences, is not natural. For the Apoſtles ſpeech being a reaſon, not of the commodiouſneſs of living together in diſparity of Religion, (for if it had been of it, they could have better reſolved themſelves then the Apoſtle, yea, they could have refuted the Apoſtle, and retorted his reaſon againſt him, we find it not ſo by experience,) but of the lawfulneſs, the reaſon muſt be conceived to import right, not event; and ſo the ſpeech is not of what hath been, which onely mentions experience, but of what is *de jure*, or is lawfull; and as *Piſcator* rightly *Schol.* in 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Sanctificatus eſt*] *id eſt, uſus illius ut ſanctus, & conſcientiam uxoris non lædens conceſſus eſt.* And in this manner it is uſual to expreſs ſuch ſentences in the preter tenſe, yet to be expounded by an *Enallage*, as in the ſame Chapter the next *v.* δεδούλωται is in the preter tenſe, yet rightly rendred [*is not under bondage,*] *v.* 34. μεμέρισται *there is difference*, *v.* 29. συνεσταλμένος *is ſhort*, 1 *Cor.* 8. 3. ἔγνωσται *is known*, 1 *Cor.* 4. 4. δεδικαίωμαι *am juſtified*, 1 *Cor.* 15. 1. ἑστήκατε *ye do ſtand*, *v.* 18. ἀπώλοντο *are periſhed*, 1 *Cor.* 16. 9. ἀνέωγε *is opened*, *Tit.* 1. 15 μεμίανται *are defiled*, γέγραπται uſually *is written*, *Matth* 13. 11. δέδοται *is given.*

Yet (ſaith the Dr.) *I may in the* 2*d. place* ex abundanti *add that much more, that the utmoſt he can pretend to by the enallage* (*whether of the preter for the preſent, or of the preter underſtood of a paſt thing yet continued*) *is as commodious for my interpretation as the preter is: For if it be in the preſent, then the importance will be, that it is a matter of preſent daily experience; if in the paſt continued, then that it is matter both of paſt and preſent experience, that the unbeliever is thus wrought upon by the be-*

liever,

liever, and brought into the Church by Baptiſm, and this a juſt ground of hope, that ſo it may be again in any particular inſtance, and ſo a competent motive that the believing wife ſhould abide with the infidel husband, and not depart as long as he will live peaceably with her: And this ſure was S. Hieroms *underſtanding in the words newly cited, the Apoſtle makes inſtance, produceth example that this hath (and doth) ordinarily come to paſs; And to that alſo agrees the* 16th. *verſe, For how knoweſt thou,* &c.

Anſw. 1. If it be in the preſent tenſe, the importance will not be, that it is a matter of preſent daily experience, unleſs it be proved the term [*ſanctified*] notes an iterated event, which I conceive and think I have proved to import right or lawfulneſs, ſo as that the ſenſe is, the unbelieving husband is ſanctified to or in reſpect of his wife (as *Beza, Piſcator, Grotius,* &c. do conceive) that is, lawfully uſed, which is the onely ſenſe that fits the determination of the Apoſtle, which is not of the conveniency or commodiouſneſs or advantage in living together, but of the lawfulneſs, *v.*12,13. Nor if it be in the paſt continued, will it fit the Drs. ſenſe. For the Drs. ſenſe is as if ſanctification were the ſame with converſion, but that is an act tranſeunt, paſt, and not continued; and if it include baptiſm, as the Dr. would have it, the ſenſe ſhould be, The unbelieving husband hath been converted, and brought to baptiſm, and continues to be converted and brought to baptiſm by the converſation of the wife; which cannot be ſaid of the perſon ſaid to be ſanctified: Yea, there is no leſs then an implicite contradiction in the words ſo expounded; for then it ſhould be thus meant, The unbelieving husband (remaining an unbeliever, as the Apoſtles ſpeech ſuppoſeth, elſe it were not appoſite to the caſe *v.*12,13.) is and continues to be wrought upon by the believer, and brought into the Church by baptiſm. Yet were this expoſition allowed, it would no whit avail to the Drs. purpoſe, unleſs the futurity of the ſame act were implied in that imagined ſenſe of the Dr. For it is not the event paſt that is the motive of cohabitation, but the hope of that which may be: And yet the Dr. tels us *in his paraphraſe, he looks upon* ἡγίασται *as a verb of the preter tenſe, and as ſuch onely adapts the ſenſe to it, referring it not to future hopes but to paſt experiences or examples.* Yet he ſaith, *the Apoſtle produceth example, and to that alſo exactly agrees the* 16th. *v. For how knoweſt thou,* &c. which doth not at all mention an example or paſt experience, which could not be not done being once done, but onely an uncertain and doubtfull futurity. So that in this again the Drs. ſpeeches do enterfere, and his ſpeech is moſt falſe, *that the words* v.16. *do exactly agree with the meaning of the forepart of the* 14th. *v.* as the Dr. expounds it. I omit that there is not a word that intimates the bringing into the Church by baptiſm; and if there were, it would import a ſtrange experience of a wives bringing her husband into the Church by baptiſm, which cannot be avoided by ſaying through her perſwaſion it is done by another; For the Text expreſly aſſigns the ſanctification, what or however it be, to the wives individual perſon, if then, to her as an agent it is done by her. But I have ſaid ſo much here, and *Review* 2d. *par. ſect.* 26. of this expoſition,

ſition, as me thinks ſhould make this expoſition of the Dr. to be exploded by the learned.

Yet he writes further thus. "As for Mr. *T.* his inſtances of Enallage, "though now I may ſafely yeeld them all, and rather gain then loſe by "them, I ſhall yet in the laſt place add my ſenſe, that no one of them is "any way convincing; that of κλαύμενον is not, *c.*11.24. for his paſſi- "on was now ſo near approaching, that it might very fitly be repreſen- "ted as preſent, and ſo that be the force of the preſent tenſe.

Anſw. This inſtance is convincing, that *enallage* of tenſe is ſometimes uſed, it being uſed in this place, as *Piſcat. ſcholie in locum, Enallage temporis & metaphora.* And the Drs. reaſon doth no whit weaken the allegation of it; for that which notes *Paulo poſt futurum, a future near approaching*, is not without an *enallage* expreſſed by the preſent tenſe. And for the *enallage* in ἀκάθαρτά ἐστιν, I conceive with the Drs. good leave, that uſually the *Greeks* expreſs by ἦν or ἔσῃ what the Apoſtle doth by ἐστί, and ſo there is an *enallage* of tenſe or mood; and for ἀπόλωλα, *v.*15. if an *enallage* be not conceived, then it muſt not import the preſent tenſe at all, whereas the Dr. grants it notes *the preter tenſe yet continued*, which is all one as to ſay it notes the preſent tenſe, which without an *enallage* it could not do. As for κέκτησαι, *Job.*3.18. I wonder the Dr. would intimate as if it were *produced by me to the prejudice of the preter tenſe*, when my very words ſay expreſly it notes *a paſt thing yet continued*, and bring it to that purpoſe: But how this is far from being *ſtill perfectly agreeable to his notion of* ἁγιάσαι, *the unbeliever oft hath been, and daily is converted, and brought to baptiſm by the believer*, is apparent, in that the continuation of the condemnation, *Job.*3.18. is onely in reſpect of legal force and vertue; but *the ſanctification* 1 *Cor.*7.14. is as he expounds it, a meer tranſeunt *act* that imports no legal right, force, and vertue, and therefore cannot be ſaid to be continued as the other can. And how vain the Drs. ſenſe is, and how juſtifiable my interpretation is by an enallage, is ſhewed before.

SECT. XCIII.

Dr. Hammonds *rendring* [by] 1 Cor.7.14. *is reſelled, and my rendring* ἐν [to] *juſtified.*

*Sect.*3. The Dr. omitting what I ſaid, that if ἐν be rendred [*in*] it ſerves my turn, not his unleſs it be proved it muſt be rendred [*by,*] and his ſupplement [*by the company and converſation of the believer*] proved, ſaith ſomewhat to my reaſon of adhering to the reading of ἐν 1 *Cor.*7,14. by [*to*] 1. becauſe this ſeems to me the faireſt, eaſieſt, and moſt congruous ſenſe. But 1. he tels me *this is the begging of the queſtion, that it is ſuch muſt not be here ſuppoſed when it ſhould be proved.* To which I reply, 1. if it be the faireſt, eaſieſt, and moſt congruous ſenſe, it is ſome proof. 2. That it is the onely ſenſe which can ſtand with the words

words and scope of the Apostle, and is avouched so by learned men, ancient and later Protestants and Papists, is shewed at large in my *Exercit. sect.* 5. *Examen, par.* 3. *sect.* 8 *Review, par.* 1. *sect.* 11, *&c.* here *sect.* 76, *&c. Refutat. of Dr.* Savage *his position in Latine, sect.* 9. *Antidote, sect.* 7. besides what occurs in my *Apology, Postscript, Plea,* which is abundantly sufficient for acquitting me from begging the question, which he doth so importunely urge. 3. That the Dr. rather begs the question then proves his interpretation, hath and will appear in this and the former view taken of it.

But the Dr. sullies the beauty of my sense of the Apostles words thus. "The fairness of the sense (simply taken) is not attempted to bee proved, which yet doth stand in great need of it; For beside the redundance, or unusual sense of ἐὰν, some other parts of the rendering are none of the fairest. As 1. *the believer may abide*] as if it were simply free to abide or not abide, whereas in the present case (when the unbeliever is willing to abide with the believer) the believer is by the Apostle counselled at least, if not commanded (and that is more then a liberty that he may.) To him the Apostle saith (and his sayings have sure authority with them) μὴ ἀφιέτω let him not put away. Nay the interdict of Christ belonging to all but that one case of fornication, *Mat.* 5. and *Mat.* 19. it is evident that by force thereof the believing man must not put away the unbeliever, that is, guilty of no more but unbelief. And accordingly the preface τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς — But for the rest (or for the other questions *v.* 1, 6, 8, 10. say I, not the Lord) must be applied not to the immediate consequents of the believers not putting away the unbeliever, that will stay with him (for that had been determined by Christ in the negative) but to *v.* 15. If the unbelieving depart, *i. e.* if the unbeliever will not dwell with the believer, except the believer forsake his or her religion, what shall be done then? And to that the Apostles counsel is, that marriage inslaves not the believer so far. All which is a competent prejudice to that part or *Mr. T.* his sense, The believer may abide; For if that bee it even when the unbeliever is willing to abide, then she may also depart, if shee rather chuse, which will be found contrary to Christs precept.

Answ. Nil tam rectè dictum quod non possit malè interpretando depravarier, as the Dr. doth here. 'Tis true I did in the second part of this *Review Sect.* 26. *p.* 319, 320. say (and gave reasons of it) that the Apostle 1 *Cor.* 7. 12, 13. did not forbid leaving each other, but resolve onely the lawfulness of living together, but this did not intimate as *if the believer were simply free to abide or not abide with the unbelieving yokefellow willing to live with her, that when the unbeliever is willing to abide the believing wife may also depart if she rather chuse,* but this, that notwithstanding the continuance of the unbelief of the husband, the wife might live with him, it was not unlawfull. So that I asserted not a liberty of leaving him upon any cause, but a liberty of continuing with him, notwithstanding that reason; and therefore the Dr. did ill to paraphrase *v.* 12. *he ought not to put her away,* v. 13. *let her by no meanes separate from him.* And I gave some reason from *v.* 15. where the permitting to de-

part.

part is a matter of liberty, as the word [*is not in bondage*) ſhews, and yet the word is as much imperative as *v.* 1 , 13. And I might have added, that *v.* 18. *let him not be uncircumciſed, let him not be circumciſed*, are there expreſſions of liberty, not of duty (as the reaſon *v.* 19. ſhews) and yet are as imperative as the forms uſed *v.* 12, 13. [*See before of this, p.* 624, 625, 626.] 'Tis true, to be circumciſed might be forbidden elſewhere, as *Gal.* 5. 2, 3. and might be then unlawfull, and ſo it might be forbidden in other texts for the beliver to leave husband except in caſe of fornication, but in theſe texts liberty onely is expreſſed, in the one of living together notwithſtanding the unbelief of the one party, in the other continuing in that ſtate of circumciſion or uncircumciſion, as they were in when they were firſt called to the faith of Chriſt. And this I think the Dr. ſhould prefer as the moſt ſuitable to his own expoſition, ſith the frequent converſion of the infidel by the believer, *v.* 14. is no ſit reaſon to make it an unlawfull thing for her to depart, but onely it may be ſome motive of her will to continue, as the Dr. makes it. And I conceive *v.* 17, 20, 24. are to be ſo expounded, ſith it is clear that to be a ſervant, or unmarried are ſome of the callings there mentioned, as *v.* 21, 27, 28. ſhew, but if it were a command of duty meant, *v.* 17, 20, 24. the ſervant muſt remain a ſervant contrary to *v.* 21. and the unmarried not marry, contrary to *v.* 28. And *v.* 27. μὴ ζήτει γυναῖκα *ſeek not a wife*, being as prohibitive a form as μὴ ἀφιέτω *v.* 12, 13. an unmarried man ſhould be forbidden to woe a woman, contrary to *v.* 28. which exempts marriage from ſin. So that indeed all theſe imperative ſpeeches *v.* 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 24, 27. are to be expounded as reſolutions of liberty, and ſo precepts of indulgence, not abſolute prohibitions or injunctions of what may in no caſe be done, or muſt be done as precepts of empire. And it is as when a perſon ſcrupling whether ſhee may be married to a Prieſt woing her is reſolved thus, let her not forſake him, ſhe is not commanded to marry him, but reſolved ſhe may; ſo it is in this caſe. Which being rightly underſtood, there is nothing oppoſite in my ſpeech to Chriſts ſpeeches *Matth* 5. or 19. about not putting away except in caſe of fornication, nor the Apoſtles 1 *Cor.* 7. 10. Nor need I trouble my ſelf whether τοῖς λοιποῖς be the other queſtions, *v.* 1, 6, 8, 10. though I think it ſhould have been then περὶ λοιπῶν, nor whether it be to be applied to *v.* 15. as the Dr. would, though it bee in my apprehenſion very unlikely.

Secondly, ſaith the Dr. *In this rendring*, ἡγίασται *is engliſhed (not by is or hath been ſanctified, but) by [is as if he were ſanctified] which indeed acknowledgeth that he is not, truely (in any reſpect) ſanctified, and then ſure this will be a ſtrange conſtruction,* ὁ ἄπιστος ἡγίασται *the unbeliever (is not ſanctified but) is as if he were ſanctified, when yet litterally it muſt be rendered the unbeliever hath been, or (to gratifie Mr. T.) is or continues to be ſanctified: For what is this but to interpret an affirmative by interpoſing a negation, he is ſanctified, by he is not? For ſo aſſuredly he is not, if he onely be as if he were.*

Anſw. According to me, ἡγίασται is rendered or engliſhed [*is or hath been ſanctified*], but is expounded [is as if hee were ſanctified]

as 1 *Cor.* 10. ἐβαπτίσαντο is rendered or englished [*were baptized*] yet by *Grotius* expounded *annot.* 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. *baptizati sunt, id est, quasi baptizati sunt.* Which me thinks should be no strange construction to Dr. *Hammond*, who by his answer to Dr. *Owen ch.* 5. §. 1, 2. seems to be acquainted with *Grotius* his annotations and other writings, and to account of him as a very pious, learned judicious man. In this exposition of *Grotius* there is as much an interpretation of an affirmative by interpreting a negation as in mine; the like I may say of other passages in the New Testament, as when it is said *Heb.* 11. 12. *were dead* or *killed* of *Abraham* then alive, *Matth.* 12. 49. *he that doth the will of his father in heaven is Christs mother*, who never bare him in the womb, *Matth.* 12. 5. *they prophane*, who did holy service, *Matth.* 19. 12. *they made themselves Eunuchs*, who were not gelded.

The Dr. adds. *with this let any man compare the interpretation I have given, the unbeliever hath been sanctified by the believer*, i. e. *examples there are of such as have been thus converted from their unbelief, and this sense inforced by the interrogation, v.* 16. *For what knowest thou, O woman, whether thou shalt save the man*, &c. *And by S.* Peters *aphorism of daily observation* 1 Pet. 3. 1. *the husband that obeyes not the word*, i. e. *the unbeliever, may probably bee gained by the conversation of the wife, and then let him impartially pass judgement, which is the faireſt and easiest rendering.*

Answ. Content: If he will but take notice of this one thing (besides many more) that *the unbelieving husband*, mentioned 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. is said to *be sanctified* even then when he was an unbeliever. Which is proved from the text. 1. *The unbelieving husband, and wife, v.* 14. are the same with *the unbelieving husband and wife* mentioned *v.* 12, 13. for the expression *v.* 14. is relative to *v.* 12, 13. otherwise it were impertinent to resolve the question, and the particle [*for* v. 14.] shewing it to be a reason of the determination *v.* 12, 13. plainly proves it to bee meant of the same persons who continued unbelievers. 2. From *v.* 15. where the resolution of the doubt is continued, *But if the unbeliever depart, let him depart*; which is not to bee expounded of him that was an unbeliever but is not, but of him who is when he departs, which is confirmed in that he is opposed to *a brother* or *sister*, who if he were converted should be a brother. 3. From *v.* 16. where still the unbeliever mentioned *v.* 12, 13, 14, 15. is supposed to remain an unbeliever, else why should his saving be made doubtfull and contingent? And if the Dr. stand to his own conceit, as if *v.* 16. *exactly agreed with v.* 14. it must be so construed by himself. 4. His own *Tertullian* who saith *ex sanctificato alterutro sexu*, not *utraque*, and *Hierome*, and all other that add *fidelem*, v. 14. and all the interpreters I know, that do make the sanctifying to be *v.* 14. in disparity of religion, do agree in this, that the unbeliever *v.* 14. is meant of one that continues an unbeliever, otherwise he should not be distinguished from the believer, who was also an unbeliever formerly. Which if but observed, I dare put it to any Reader of ordinary capacity to judge between us, whether the Doctors sense be not so far from being the faireſt and easiest, that it is indeed a foul one,

ſuch as doth imply a contradiction to the Apoſtles words, the [Dr. ſuppoſing *the unbeliever v.* 14, once ſuch but not ſo then, the Apoſtle ſuppoſing him to continue ſo, the Dr. expounding it thus; He that was once an unbeliever, another then the unbeliever meant *v.* 12, 13. hath been ſanctified by the believing wife, that is converted; and the Apoſtle, He that is ſtill an unbeliever, the ſame mentioned *v.* 12, 13. is ſanctified; and whether mine [The believer may abide with the unbelieving yoke-fellow: For though he be an unbeliever, yet in or to his wife, he is as if he were ſanctified; it's all one in reſpect of lawfull [omitted by the Dr.) conjugal uſe as if he were ſanctified] be not the faireſt, eaſieſt, and moſt congruous ſenſe, that is to be given of thoſe words 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.

The *Dr.* goes on thus; "His 2d. reaſon is, becauſe, though the Dr. "deny it, yet I aver that the notion of ἐν for *to* as a ſign of the Dative "caſe, is found more then once in the *N. T.* The truth of this I muſt "now examine, by the proofs offered for the affirmation. And his firſt "proof is, from *Matth.* 17. 12. ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ, This, ſaith he, can. "not be eluded, becauſe the ſame ſpeech is *Mark.* 9. 13. ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ "and rendred by *Beza* in the former place *fecerunt ei*, they did to him. "2. Whereas the Dr. ſaith, ἐν is uſed for εἰς, upon him or againſt "him, it had been meet the Dr. ſhould have given one inſtance at leaſt, "of ſuch conſtruction, which, ſaith he, I do not believe he can do. To "this I anſwer, 1. By two ready inſtances in one verſe, *Luk.* 23. 31; εἰ "ἐν τῷ ὑγρῷ ξύλῳ ταῦτα ποιοῦσιν, ἐν τῷ ξηρῷ τί γένηται; if they do theſe "things (our ordinary Engliſh reads, in a green tree, but the ſenſe and "propriety directs us to) on the green tree, what ſhall be done on the "dry? here is the very phraſe that is uſed in that place of *Matthew*, "ποιοῦσιν ἐν ὑγρῷ, as ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ.

Anſw. I did aver more then the Dr. ſets down, that the notion of ἐν for [*to*] may with good congruity and Grammatical analogy be affixt to it, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. and I uſed theſe words left out by the Dr. whereas he ſaith (meaning the Dr.) ἐν is uſed for εἰς *on him* or *againſt him*, and that *this is an ordinary acceptation*, of ἐν for εἰς; I grant that it is an ordinary acception to uſe ἐν for εἰς, but not in the ſenſe hee here conceives, to wit, as εἰς notes *on* or *againſt a perſon*. Now the Doctors inſtance is but in one verſe, and therefore ſhewes not the ordinary acception, and then whereas I expected an inſtance of ἐν for εἰς, as it notes *on* or *againſt a perſon*, hee brings an inſtance of ἐν ξύλῳ *on a tree*, and this is not of ἐν for εἰς *againſt*, which had been more for his purpoſe, but for εἰς *on*, though in the ſenſe of [*on him*] ἐν rather anſwers to ἐπ' αὐτῷ, then εἰς αὐτὸν. Yet the Dr. brings no authority but his own for this his conceit of ἐν for *on Luk.* 23. 31. I add, that though the Latin and Engliſh tranſlators I have yet looked into, do render ἐν *Luk.* 23. 31. by *in* not *on*, *ſuper* or *contrà* (which are the Drs. notions) yet I find *Diodati* in his Italian tranſlation reading, *al legno verde al legno ſecco*, which I take to be as much [*to*] as if it were expreſſed by *ligno viridi*, and *ligno ſicco* or *arido*, without a prepoſition, and if ſo, the Dr. hath brought a text which further confirms my conceit a-

gainſt

gainst himself. In which I am the more confident, because when an object patient, or a subject suffering is expressed with the verb ποιῆσαι or γένηται, it is either never or very rarely said, ποιεῖν εἰς αὐτὸν, or γίνεται εἰς αὐτὸν, but ποιῆσαι αὐτῷ or γένεταί μοι, as in *Luk.* 1. 25, 49, 68. & 2. 48. & 6. 11, 23, 26, 27, 31. & 8. 39. & 18. 41. & 20. 15. *Acts* 4. 16. & 9. 13. *Luk.* 1. 38. & 14. 12. & 19. 9. *Acts* 2. 43. & 7. 40. & 20. 3. & 22. 6, 17. omitting other writers. Which is an argument to me, that *Luk.* 23. 31. ἐν is redundant, and that it is best translated, *to the dry, to the green*, and so the Dr. hath given an instance for my notion, not for his own.

He saith further. *And then for S.* Marks *using* (*in the parallel place*) αὐτῷ for ἐν αὐτῷ] *that proves not that* ἐν *was redundant in S.* Matthew, *or that it was a bare signe of the Dative case, it being free to S.* Mark *to use any other expression, different from S.* Matthew *so he retained the sense, as it is clear in this place he doth, doing injuries to him, being all one in effect with upon or against him, though the phrases are not the same, which no way inferrs that when the change of the phrase changes the sense, it were lawfull so to vary it, as in the place we have in hand* (ἐν γυναικὶ) *'tis on both sides supposed to do.*

Answ. The *Dr.* omits these words of mine [However if he could, yet me thinks it should satisfie, that ἐν αὐτῷ notes no more than αὐτῷ, and is a sign of the Dative case, because *Mark* who seems to have abbreviated *Matthew*, so expresseth it, and the common use of ποιεῖν when it notes dealings of man to man whether good or bad, is usually expressed by the Dative case, as *Matth.* 7. 12. & 18. 12. & 20. 32. & 21. 36, 40. & 25. 40, 45.] to which the Dr. makes no answer, and that which he saith here, doth confirm my notion. For if it were free to *Mark* to use any other expression different from *Matthew*, so he retained the sense, and yet he doth not use εἰς but put onely the Dative case to express the same; that *Matthew* did it appears that ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ and ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ are to the same sense and phrase, to express injuries done to *John Baptist*, and that ἐν in *Matthew* is redundant, and nothing expressed by it but what is expressed in *Mark* in the Dative case without it. What the Dr. means when he saith ['tis on both sides supposed (ἐν γυναικὶ) changes the sense, and so it is unlawful to vary it] I do not understand, our present question is not whether it bee lawfull to change a phrase when the sense is not changed, and unlawful when it is; but whether ἐν *Matth.* 17. 12. bee redundant and a signe of the Dative case: this is yet unanswerably proved to bee by this, that *Mark.* 9. 13. the same phrase and matter is expressed without it, and there it notes onely the Dative case, and that is the usual manner of expression without ἐν, and therefore ἐν must be taken as redundant, and a sign of the Dative case onely, *Matth.* 17. 12.

The Dr. goes on, *A second instance which he conceivs cannot bee eluded, is* Col. 1. 23. τὸ κηρυχθὲν ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει, *which was preached to every creature, and this he proves to be the onely rendering; 1. Because* κηρύσσω *to preach, is commonly with a Dative case of the object, and*

though 1 Tim. 3. 16. it is ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν, yet our translators and the Vulgar, and Beza read it, unto the Gentiles, as if there it noted onely a dative case; and if it were among the Gentiles there, yet here Col. 1. 23. it cannot be so, because the object is in the singular number, but ἐν when it is for among, is joyned still with a noun of the plural. And 2. that which, saith he, puts this out of all doubt, is, that the phrase Col. 1. answers Mark 16. 15. κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει. But to all this the answer is ready, by observing the exact notation of πᾶσα κτίσις the whole creation. (as we render it Rom. 8. 22.) as that signifies the whole, but especially the Gentile world, and accordingly is exprest by πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, Matth. 28. and farther explained by ὅλῳ κόσμῳ the whole world, to which in S. Mark they are appointed to go, when they were thus to preach the Gospel πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει to this whole creation. Now of κτίσις in this notion it is clear, that though it be in the singular number, yet that hath the power of the plural, as the word [world] and the like, which every body knowes is a noun of multitude, and so is creation, when it is thus taken for the whole created world, meaning the world of men, the nations or people of the world. And then there can be no doubt but κηρυχθὲν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει] is most exactly thus to be rendred, preached in, or among the whole creation, as Gal. 1. 16. κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν preach in the nations, or among the Gentiles, and so 1 Tim. 3. 16. also, though the sense being no way altered by rendering it unto the whole creation, or every creature, and the Gentiles, it matters little though it be promiscuously thus rendred, which yet must not prescribe for other places where the sense is so much changed by the divers rendring as in this case, ὤφθη ἐν σαρκὶ] is observable, wherefore the litteral rendering being retained, we are not reasonably to conclude any more from it, then that litteral reading will afford us. As for the parallel phrase Mark. 16. that doutless can prove nothing; 1. Because the places are not nor can be thought parallel. 2. Because if they were (as of Matth. 28. and Mark 16. hath been granted.) yet the parallel lying onely in the sense, and that being all one whether they preacht to or among the Gentiles, this no way concludes that the phrases are the same, or the ἐν in one redundant, which is the onely thing, for the proving of which this parallel is produced, but of that I have formerly spoken.

Answ. Had the Dr. shewed any one interpreter that ever rendred ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει Col. 1. 23. by *in ... omnem creaturam*, among every creature, or that ἐν as it signifies *inter* or *among* or either of these prepositions, is put in Latin or English before a noun of multitude in the singular number, he had said more then I yet deem hee can, or I think any other Grammarian, nor do I take the word κτίσις to be a noun of multitude, there may bee κτίσις though there were but one individual, though I grant πάσῃ κτίσει notes many creatures, nor do I conceive it good sense to render it *in every creature*, sith the term [*creature*] doth note persons not place, and to *be preached in every creature*, would imply such a sense as will not suit with the matter, which is conceived by many interpreters, to note the accomplishment of what Christ appointed *Mark* 16. 15. which leaving out the preposition ἐν, and the common use of κηρύσσω to preach

predeh being with a Dative case of the object, I did infer that ἐν is redundant and a note of the Dative case, as *Pasor* before me in his *Lexicon* of the word ἐν of which he saith, *Sæpe ex Hebraismo redundat* Col. 1.23. τῷ κηρυχθέντι ἐν πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει pro τῇ πάσῃ κτίσει, *prædicati omni creaturæ*. Sure if it *were most exactly rendered*, as the *Dr.* saith, *preached in or among the whole creation*, it is marvail none hit on this afore the Dr. as they have done *Gal.* 3. 16. 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. Whether *Col.* 1. 23. and *Mar.* 16. 15. be parallel in the manner I make them, is to be referred to the Readers judgement, when he shall compare them together. Sure I finde all these, *Beza*, *Camerarius*, *Piscator*, *Zanchius*, *Grotius*, *Davenant*, *Trapp*, the *new Annotations*, *Elton*, referring to and explaining one by the other, and the *Dr.* confessing the sense the same, every Grammarian that understands *Greek* may plainly see the phrase to be the same save that ἐν is added *Col.* 1. 23. and therefore from all these I infer as most probable, and to me certain, that ἐν is redundant, that it's onely the sign of the dative case of the object, that it is most truely rendered as our Translators and many more rendered, *to every creature*, that is, as *Gerram* expounds it, *universis hominibus*, *to all*, or *all sorts of men*. As for the Drs. cautions about *prescribing* and *concluding*, they are impertinent to the present thing concerning *Col.* 1. 23. *whether* ἐν *be redundant the sign of the Dative case there*. Whether ἐν γυναικὶ 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. be to be rendered [*to*] whether the sense will bear it, whether it make any other change in the sense then is fit, or any more be concluded, then is deducible is before and after to be discussed. Hitherto it appears not but that I said right, *Matth.* 17. 12. *Col.* 1. 23. cannot be eluded.

The Dr. goes on, "His third instance is δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις "*Acts* 4. 12. which he cannot yet conceive, but that it is better rendred, *to men*, then *among men*. And his reasons are; First, because "δίδωμι hath most regularly and consequently (*it should be constantly*) "a dative case of the person after it. Secondly, because if it had been a-"mong men, it had been to be placed after ἕτερον *other*, there is no o-"ther name among men, given, but being placed after given, it is to "be expounded as *referred* to *given* not to *other*, and so must bee read, "*to men*, not *among men*. Thirdly, It seems no good sense, nor true, "that Christ was a name given among men, for though he were among "men, yet he was given from above, To all which, he adds the judge-"ment of *Irenæus l.* 3. *c.* 12. cited by *Beza*, and a parallel phrase "ἐν παρθένοις for παρθένων *Acts* 7. 44. To this I answer. First, That "'tis true when δίδωμι hath any case of the person following and go-"verned by it, that is constantly the dative, but that is no way applica-"ble to this phrase, δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις, for there the persons ἀν-"θρώποις are governed by the preposition ἐν not by δεδομένον. To the "second, that the construction by among, is very good, placing it af-"ter given, there is no other name given among men, *i. e.* no means "of salvation afforded by God, and continued among men. To the "third, That Christs being given from above, no way prejudges his "being given among men, both because the benefit of this gift is a com-

mon.

" mon donative, distributed among men, and also because this gift is " dispene'd in form of humane flesh, Christ is become man, and to be " found and seen among men.

Answ. 1. That *the persons* ἀνθρώπους *men, are governed by the preposition* ἐν, *and not by* δεδομένον, is not rightly said by the Dr. First, Because the placing of it next after δεδομένον shews it is governed of δεδομένον *given*. Secondly, Because if [*men*] were not governed of [*given*] the participle [given] were superfluous. For the sense would be the same, and the speech were as good language if it were left out, and the reading onely thus; *neither is there another name under heaven among men, whereby we must be saved.* 2. That *name whereby we must be saved*] should be put for [*meanes of salvation*] and not a person distinctly is both besides the usual acception of the term [*name*] and the drift of the words, which shew that by [*name*] is meant [*person*] and makes the speech false; For the preaching of the Gospel by Prophets, and Apostles, were means of salvation afforded by God, and continued among men, besides Christ and his preaching. 3. That *this gift was dispenc'd in form of humane flesh, that Christ was become man, and to bee found and seen among men*, shews not that he was given among men, but to be among men, his giving was from above, as he often saith, *that he came down from heaven, Joh. 6.* 38, 41, 50, 51, 58. 33. *given from heaven, v.* 32. *Joh.* 8. 23. *ye are from beneath, I am from above. Joh.* 3. 31. *He that cometh from above is above all, he that cometh from heaven is above all*; which is contrary to what *Peter* (as the Dr. expounds him) speaks here, that *he was a name under heaven given among men.* And the other reason, *because the benefit of this gift is a common donative, and distributed among men*, though it perverts the sense, putting for [*the name*] which signifies the person [*the benefit*] and confounding the person whereby we must be saved with the benefit, which is no other then salvation, yet it makes for my sense. For what is it to be *a common donative, distributed among men*, but to be given to men. So that in the issue, the Dr. notwithstanding his strugling is not able to avoid it, but that it serves my purpose of proving ἐν redundant, and a signe of the Dative case. What the Dr. saith to what I add out of *Beza annot.* on *Acts* 4. 12. the Dr. might have remembred (if he ever read it) that in my *Examen, part.* 1. §. 4. I did take notice that *Irenæus* was a *Greek* and wrote in *Greek*, but now onely we have his works in *Latin* except some few fragments, and *Beza* so great a learned man, as had few equals, especially in the *Greek* language, it is likely knew so too; and therefore the Dr, might have omitted that intimation, as if wee were forgetfull thereof. And it had been fair if the Dr. had taken notice, that *Beza* alledged first the old interpreter, as reading [*datum hominibus, given to men*] and *Irenæus* (meaning his translator, who is commonly cited as *Irenæus*] after him, and that I added *Camerarius*, which the Dr. saith nothing to, but hath a snatch at *Beza's* alleging *Acts* 7. 44. which I rest not on, sith it may be read [*with* or *among*] as well as [*to*] which is agreeable with our last translation, *Our Fathers had the Tabernacle of witness.* But I follow

the

the Dr. in his debates, which it is indeed pitty the Reader or the Dr. should be exercised with, being fit for better undertakings then these, which he is detained with upon his own motion, as one that is *cedere nescius* to a plain truth, not in obedience to me who never injoyned him this exercise.

He saith, "For a 4th. instance, he again resumes that of *Gal.* 1. 16. "2 *Pet.* 1. 5. That *Gal.* 1. where of God the Apostle saith, that he was "pleased to reveall his own son ἐν ἐμοὶ, and when I had rendred that "by or through me to others, This exposition, saith he, makes the A- "postle tautologize ineptly. This strange undecent expression, I wish "had been spared, for certainly there was little temptation for it: why, "I pray, might not the Apostle without incurring either part of that cen- "sure, say, God was pleased through me to reveal his son, and by way "of explication (and withall to denote the designation of that Apostle "to his peculiar province, as the Apostle of the uncircumcision) add, "that I might preach the Gospel to the Gentiles. Certainly every ex- "plication of an obscurer or narrower, by a clearer or larger phrase, is "not inept tautology, but that which all writers which have desired to "speak intelligibly, have always been full of. And yet 2dly, the la- "ter part here, of his preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles (he being "peculiarly the Apostle of the Gentiles, as *Peter* and *John* were of the "Jews whersoever dispersed) is more then was pretended to be said by "my rendring and paraphrasing the former part of it; for in that those "others had not been defined, who they were, or limited to the Gen- "tiles. This Mr. *T.* adverted not in his objection, I desire he will now "take notice of it.

Answ. I could not well have spared the expression, having tempta- tion for it from Dr. *Hammonds* mis-interpreting the Apostles speech, so as to make it according to the Drs. sense, though not according to the Apostles, an inept tautology; which however strange, yet was no unde- cent expression, there being nothing that reflects on the Apostle but on the Dr. tending to shew the absurdity of his interpretation, not of the Apostles words. From which the Dr. doth not relieve himself by his answer here. For the later phrase doth not express the same more clearly, there is neither a copulative conjunction nor dis-junctive, ex- pressed or implied, nor any other particle which may shew the later phrase to be exegitical of the former, but the particle ἵνα doth plainly shew *that*, σὺν δεσμὸς τελικὸς, the Evangelizing or preaching the Go- spel, to be mentioned as the end or consequent of the revelation, and therefore not the same act. Besides the preaching the Gospel by a man is no where termed the revealing of Christ by him to others, being known to him before, but the making known to the person, and revelation is still made Gods, Christs, or his spirits act, and hath a Dative case of the person who is the object to whom the thing is revealed added to it, as *Matth.* 11. 25, 27. & 16. 17. *Luk.* 10. 21, 22. *John* 12. 38. 1 *Cor.* 2. 10. & 14. 30. *Eph.* 3. 5. *Phil.* 3. 15. 1 *Pet.* 1. 12. and this must needs be the meaning, the words before being, whereas before he was zealous

of

of the Law against the Christian profession, *when it pleased God who separated me from my mothers womb, and called me by his grace to reveal his son in him*; or as *Beza annot. in locum* ἐν ἐμοὶ *id est mihi, to me*, which plainly shews that this revelation was to him when he was called, which is called the revelation of Jesus Christ to him, *v.* 12. and made the proof of his calling to bee an Apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by *Jesus Christ*, *v.* 1. and the reason why he preached without conferring with the Apostles And thus doth *Perkins com.* on *Gal.* 1. 16. rightly explain it, *to reveal his son in me or to me, and to expresse the manner or form of his calling or conversion*, and expounds it thus, *to teach me the doctrine of the redemption of mankinde by Jesus Christ, and the words to preach Christ among the Gentiles the end of his vocation.* As for that which the Dr. desires me now to take notice of, I do, though I think it needless, sith the tautology I conceived to follow on the Drs. exposition, is not in the object but in the act, revealing his son by the Apostle, being no other then his preaching, which makes the speech nugatory, *it pleased God to preach his son by me, that I might preach.* As for the place of 2 *Pet.* 1. 5. sith the Dr. makes no more answer I need make no more reply, and I still aver that all the places which I brought out of the *N. T.* have the notion of ἐν for *to*, as a signe of the Da ive case.

To the places out of the Greek of the old Testament, he tels me, *that three onely places in the whole Old T. would never infer that so it must bee in the New* (which I grant) *and there being no pretense of necessity that thus it must be here* (which is also granted, except a necessity of a more fair, easie, and congruous sense then any other rendering) *these three will be of no avail to me.* But this is not yeelded. For the two first, *Deut.* 28. 60. & 2 *Kings* 5. 25. κολληθήσεται σοὶ ἐν ᾗ ἐν τῷ σπέρματι, *vulg. adhærebit tibi & semini tuo*, being used constantly in the *N. T.* with a Dative *Luk.* 10. 11. and 15. 15. *Acts* 5. 13. & 8. 29. & 9. 26. & 10. 28. & 17. 34. *Rom.* 12. 9. 1 *Cor.* 6. 16, 17, *&c.* it is a strong presumption that ἐν is redundant, and onely the signe of the Dative case. And the other place *Psal.* 68. 18. compared with *Eph.* 4. 8. hath some force, it being probable that the Apostle expressed what the LXX meant by ἔλαβες. But it was not of this last onely, but of all together, I said I took them to be more then enough to refute the Drs. speech, that *the notion, wherein* ἐν *signifies to, which is a signe of the Dative case, is never found once to belong to it in the* N. T. *nor can with any tollerable congruity or Grammatical analogy be affixt to it.*

Sect. 3.

SECT. XCIV.

It is shewed that Dr. Hammond *hath no proof from* 1 Cor. 7. 16. *for his sense of the fore-part of* v. 14. *Nor with his sense of* Holy *for* Baptized, *agree with the Apostles argument, though his sense of the fore-part of the v. were granted.*

THe Dr. adds, "My third proof produced for my interpretation of "the first part of *v.*14. which to me put it out of all doubt, by com- "paring it with the reason subjoyned; For what knowest thou O wife, "whether thou shalt save thy husband; or how knowest thou, O man, "whether thou shalt thy wife?] He comes next to examine, and hath "many exceptions against it, all which (without losing time in repea- "ting and viewing them severally) will be soon dispelled by a right "understanding of the force of the Apostles argument, as there I con- "ceive it to lie, Thus *v.* 14. It is matter of ordinary observation, that "unbelieving husbands have been brought to the faith and Baptism by "the believing wife, therefore I now exhort and counsel the believer "not to depart from the unbeliever, in case the unbeliever be willing "to stay, *v.* 13. for this reason, *v.* 16. Because what hath been so oft, "may very probably be hoped again, and consequently upon the premi- "mises the believer hath ground to hope, that she may in time gain "the husband to the faith, and that being so fair a reward in her view, "(the saving or rescuing him from infidelity to Christ) may well in- "force the counsel of the Apostle, not to depart from him, as long as, "without sin, she is permitted to stay. By which it appears that this *v.* "16. is not a bare evplanation of ἡγίασται *v.* 14. (on which Mr. *T.* his "exceptions principally depend) but an application of the argument "formerly proposed, but now more signally brought home to them, "under the form of [τί γὰρ *for what*] by this meanes to re-inforce his "conclusion of their not departing for the cause of infidelity: If the "Reader will but observe what is thus visible, he will want no more help, "to get out of the intricacies and toils, which Mr. *T.* hath here spread "for him in this matter, which is in it self so manifest, as nothing can "be added to it, if either the text or my paraphrase may be permitted to "speak for it self.

Ans. The Dr. seems to be much crest-faln, who having said *his exposition appeared most irrefragably* by *v.*16. wherin he said *the fore-part of* v.14. *was further explained.* When four plain reasons were urged against this, he replies to none, but onely calls them *intricacies, and toils*, and saith, *my exceptions depend on this*, that *v.* 16. *is not a bare explanation of* ἡγιάσται *v.* 14. whereas my reasons prove it to be neither an explanation nor an application of the argument formerly proposed *v.*14. but another argument, not to prove the lawfulness of the believers continuance with the believer, as *v.* 14. but either as a motive to bring them to what he had

concluded lawfull, or to inforce what he had said *v.* 15. And for what the Dr. saith, that *v.* 16. *the argument formerly proposed*, v. 14. *is more signally brought home to them*, it is not true even according to the Drs. own paraphrase. For the Drs. paraphrase of *v.* 14. as if therein a frequency of the conversion of unbelievers yoke-fellows by the believer, were well known as matter of ordinary observation, and so hopefull in the case of the present doubters, brings home the argument more signally then a mention of it as possible, doubtfully expressed as a contingent that might be or not be. But I am willing the Reader should hear us both and then judge. I for my part do still conceive the Drs paraphrase of the fore-part of 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. to be far from the meaning of the text, the reason of the Apostle being by it made a Rhetorical argument to inforce the cohabitation as an advantage, which is used to make it lawfull, and urged from a contingent thing which no whit cleered the doubt, but the reason might be retorted against him, and all ascribed to the yoke-fellow as a believer, when the term believer is quite omitted, and that ascribed to the believer which is stil elswhere ascribed to the spirit of God, and that expressed as done often and as of ordinary observation, which is expressed in the singular number, and made by the Apostle as doubtfull and uncertain. And if these be intricacies and toils the Dr. hath had little compassion on me and his reader, who when he might so easily, would not spend a little more time to help me out of them, though spread by himself.

The Dr. proceeds *Sect.* 4. "His exceptions to the former part of "my paraphrase being now ended, I must attend what hee hath to say "against the latter part of it, that which concernes our matter in hand "more neerly; The words ἐπεὶ ἄρα, for else were your children un- "clean, but now are they holy, *i. e.* upon that score it is that Christians "children are admitted to Baptism, *viz.* because by their living in the "family with the Christian parent, they probably will (and ought to) "be brought up in the faith — and the Church (requiring and receiving "promise from the parents) reasonably presumes they will, and so ad- "mits them to Baptism. The argument of the Apostle thus explained "in my paraphrase (or if he yet will have it more plainly thus, The "Church upon confidence that the believers children will be brought "up in the faith, receives them to Baptism when they are infants; And "upon the same grounds of hope, that your abiding with the unbelie- "ving husband may in time convert him (as by experience it hath oft "been found) I advise you not to depart from him, if he will live with "you, For what knowest thou whether thou shalt save thy husband? "&c.) M. T. hath made a shift not to understand, and substituted another "way of arguing in my name, in stead of it, *p.* 331. And having done "so I must leave him to combate with the shadow of his own creating, "no part of his impression lighting upon that which alone I pro- "fess to bee my meaning in it, which I leave him or the Rea- "der to see, in the particulars proposed by him, but must not "now bee so impertinent, as to lose time in the persuit of them,

Answ.

Answ. Sith the Dr. hath disclaimed my good words, and approbation of his ingenuity, *ch.*1. *sect.*1. of this his *defence*, I shall forbear to commend his ingenuity, but cannot choose but take notice of his shift he makes to avoid the force of my reasons, by bearing the Reader in hand that I made a shift not to understand him, that I substitute another way of arguing in his name in stead of it, that I combate with a shadow of my own creating, no part of my impression lighting upon that which alone he professeth to be his meaning in it, and therefore must not now be so impertinent as to lose time in the pursuit of the particulars proposed by me. This is a pretty art to pretend a reason why he need not answer what he cannot; like his, who when he could not make a good account, devised how he might make none at all. The Dr. saith *I have substituted another way of arguing in his name in stead of that he hath set down.* Now sure this intimates that this he sets down was a way of arguing, and calls his explications he sets down *the argument of the Apostle thus explained in his paraphrase in the later way more plainly.* But in neither do I find any arguing ascribed to the Apostle in the later part of his words 1 *Cor.*7.14. but in the former a meer declaration upon what reason Christians children are (as the Dr. conceives the Apostle means) admitted to baptism; in the later, an addition of a paraphrase on the first part of 1 *Cor.*7.14. with his advise according to *v.*12,13. and his paraphrase confirmed by *v.*16. Nor doth the Dr. at all explain those words, *Else were your children unclean*, though those were the words I chiefly insisted on to shew the absurdity his framing the Apostles reasoning brought his words to, as the Reader may plainly perceive by my words in the 2d part of my *Review*, *sect.*26. *p.*330,331. But to shew the Drs. collusion in this thing, the Reader may observe 1. that neither in his paraphrase in his 4th. *qu.* §.31. (though he make it §.32. *the importance of the Apostles words, and force of his arguing*) nor here doth the Dr. set down the true force of the particle ἐπεὶ ἄρα *else*, which in his *Letter*, *qu.*4. §.33. (to which my answer was made, *p.*330,331,332. with which the Dr. here cavils) he terms *an argumentative stile.* For the expressions [*upon this score, on this one consideration, upon this ground*] are not exclusive terms, as ἐπεὶ ἄρα *else* is, which implies not onely that the thing is so upon that one consideration, but also that without it it should be otherwise; nor doth the Dr. seem to put them as answering to ἐπεὶ ἄρα *else were*, but to νῦν δὲ *but now.* 2. That (as I said before) the Dr. doth in neither of these paraphrases set down any thing as answering to [*else were your children unclean*] nor in his *Letter*, *qu.*4 §.31. except these words are put to answer them [*yet the children of heathens are not admitted to baptism,*] which me thinks hee should not do, sith [*your children*] is in all his paraphrases [*Christians children, believers children*] and therefore I am loth to think him so much overseen, as that he should put [*the children of heathens are not admitted to baptism*] for [*your children were unclean,*] 3. If he should, he should in that paraphrase much pervert the Apostles meaning, by putting that which answers to [*else were your children unclean*] contrary to the Apostles order, after that which answers to [*but now are they holy;*]

holy;] of which diſorder, tending to pervert the Apoſtles meaning, his plainer later paraphraſe here is guilty, putting firſt that which hee conceives anſwerable to [*but now are they holy*,] and then that which anſwers to [*the unbelieving husband is ſanctified by the wife*,] and then that which anſwers to [*v.* 13. *let her not leave him*,] and then the 16th *v.* which ſure is ſuch a diſorder as is very faulty, ſo deforming the Apoſtles argument, as that its like the leaving out of an arm or eye, the placing of the hand where the eye ſhonld be in the painting of a man, whereby he is made a monſter. 4. Whereas the Dr. *Defence of Baptiſm*, *p.* 66. *denies that he made the future hopes any part of the ſenſe of* [*hath been ſanctified*,] in all theſe paraphraſes he ſets down nothing but the future hopes, which are no part of the ſenſe by his own confeſſion, but as he imagines, *the rational importance, the ſcope, ground, or conſideration of admitting children to Baptiſm.* And not onely ſo, but adds more then he makes the rational importance of the term [*hath been ſanctified*] in his paraphraſe, as *that by their living in the family with Chriſtian parents, they probably will (and ought) to be brought up in the faith, and the Church requiring and receiving promiſe from the parents, reaſonably preſumes they will.* None of which he doth ſo much as pretend to be the rational importance of [*hath been ſanctified*,] but adds them of his own; and with like fancying might have added, the Church doth reaſonably preſume they will be Teachers, Officers in the Church, Martyrs, and what elſe they could wiſh them to be. I refer it to any ſober ingenious Scholler to judge, whether ſuch kind of paraphraſing, eſpecially when an argument is drawn from it, as the chief, if not onely pillar of the cauſe, be tollerable.

On the other ſide, that the Dr. did make the Apoſtles arguing otherwiſe, when he refuted the anſwer to his argument hence, in his *Letter*, *qu.* 4. §. 82. appears by his words there, *p.* 257. (which I cited *Review par.* 2. *pag.* 322. and were thoſe whence I gathered the Drs. framing the Apoſtles argument) when he ſaid, The invalidity of this anſwer will be diſcerned First by the method of the Apoſtles arguing in that place, for the co habiting of the believing wife with the unbelieving husband, &c. becauſe the unbelieving husband hath been ſanctified by the believing wife, or elſe were your children unclean, but now are they holy: that muſt needs be this, unleſs there were ſome hope that the co-habiting of a believer, ſhould be a means to bring an unbeliever to the faith, 'twould certainly follow, that their children were unclean; now putting to it that which he in his paraphraſes § 31. of his 4*th qu.* in his *Letter*, where he expreſſeth [hath been ſanctified] thus, *The unbelieving party hath been brought to the faith by the company and converſation of the believer*, and [unclean] by [not admitted to Baptiſm,] and [holy] by [admitted to Baptiſm,] and [your children by [the young children of Chriſtians whereof was an unbeliever;] and I appeale to any that ſhall compare my words in the 2d. part of this *Review*, *ſect.* 26. *p.* 331. where I make this the Apoſtles arguing as the Dr. expounds it, [*If ſome other unbelieving yoke fellow had not been converted by the faith, diligence, and converſation of the believing party that then was, then the children*

dren of you who are believers, but begotten or brought forth by one that yet is an unbeliever, had not been admitted to Christian Baptism in infancy: but now, that is, upon this score, that some former unbelieving yoke-fellows have been brought to the faith of Christ by the faith, conversation, and diligence of the believer, they have been admitted to Baptism,] with the Drs. premised arguings and paraphrase in his *Letter, qu.* 4. §. 31, 82. and here, whether I have not rightly set down the Apostles argument as the Dr. expounds him, and the Dr. hath not changed here his frame of the Apostles argument to hide the deformity of it, and whether there be any truth in it that *I have not understood his paraphrase, that I have substituted another way of arguing in his name in stead of it, or have combated with the shadow of my own creating*; and whether these propositions [*the children of a believing yoke fellow who is joyned to an unbeliever had not been admitted to Christian Baptism, if some other unbelieving yoke-fellow had not been brought to the faith. The children of a believer by an unbelieving yoke fellow have been admitted to Christian Baptism, by reason that it hath been usual that other believers have brought the unbeliever to the faith*] are not included in the Apostles argument according to the tenour of his reasoning conceived by the Dr. and whether there be any shew of connexion in the consequence of the Apostle as the Dr. expounds it, and whether he hath not shifted in stead of answering, and imputed fiction to me that he might hide his own collusion.

SECT. XCV.

Dr. Hammonds *reasons from the terms* holy *and* unclean *for his sense of* baptized *or* not baptized *are refelled.*

THe Dr. next pretends to vindicate his reasons for his interpretation from my exceptions.

" My first reason (*saith he*) is, Because ἁγιος, *holy*, noting a rela-
" tive holiness, a setting apart to God, and the lowest degree of that ima-
" ginable, being the initiating into the Church by Baptism, this must in
" reason be here noted by ἁγια *holy*, as all visible professors, *Exr.* 9. 2.
" are the holy seed, and in the Epistles of the Apostles, ἁγιοι *holy*.
" To this he answers, that it being all granted, confirms not the Drs.
" exposition, because 'tis no good argument *a genere ad speciem affirma-*
" *tivè*, and because infants are not visible professors. But sure when
" the *species* is such, that he that hath not that, hath not any part of the
" *genus*, the argument will thus hold very irrefragably: Suppose that
" of the Deacon to be the lowest order of Officers in the Church, and
" that without which there is no ascending to any higher degree in the
" Ministery, will not then the argument hold, He hath some degree Ec-
" clesiastical upon him, therefore sure he is a Deacon? Thus sure it is
" in this matter, the relative holiness belongs to no person, that is not
" baptized, Baptism is the lowest degree of it, and all superiour degrees

" of

" of Apoſtle, Prophet, &c. in the Chriſtian Church are founded in " that, therefore if the infant children be holy, the infant children are " baptized. So again, Baptiſm is the loweſt degree of viſible Profeſſi- " on, therefore if theſe that are ſaid to be holy are viſible Profeſſors, " then ſure they are baptized; And ſo there is no force in that whether " anſwer or exception to my firſt reaſon.

Anſw. That there is no force to avoid my exception in this reply, may appear. 1. That he ſaith nothing to what I ſaid *p.*333. of the 2d. part of the *Review*, that the term [*holy ſeed*] *Ezr.*9.2. hath a far dif. ferent notion, as I ſhew in this *Review Antipæd. par.* 1. *ſect.* 13, 25. from what the Dr. imagines. 2. Nor doth he here, or any where elſe prove infants to be viſible profeſſors. 3. Nor doth he prove Baptiſm to be the loweſt degree of viſible profeſſion. 4. Nor doth the Dr. prove or can prove, that *the holineſs* 1 *Cor.*7.14. muſt be meant of a relative holineſs, of ſetting apart to God in the Chriſtian viſible Church, ſhort of real ſaving holineſs. The opinion of matrimonial holineſs I aſſert, with many more, is not yet refuted. They who after *Tertullian* interpret it of real ſaving holineſs intentional, as *Rom.*11.26. the Jews uncalled are *holy*, *deſignati ſanctitati ac per hoc etiam ſaluti*, conceive they have as good proof for it as the Dr. for his. 5. Baptiſm is not proved to be the loweſt degree imaginable of relative holineſs in the Chriſtian Church, nor the loweſt degree of viſible profeſſion. For 1. there is a lower degree by freedome from Idol pollutions, ſuch as *Tertullian* mentions *c.* 39. *de anima*. 2. There is a degree of holineſs by vow or prayer, ſuch as *Hannah* devoted *Samuel* by, 1 *Sam.*1.11. which *Joſephus Antiq. l.*5. *c.*11. terms *conſecrating* or *ſanctifying to God*, as the Greek verſion terms *Numb.*6.2,3. the ſeparating of the *Nazarite* by vow *a ſanctifying*, and the Apoſtle prayer in the uſe of food *a ſanctifying* it, 1 *Tim.*4.5. 3. There is a lower degree of viſible profeſſion in the *catechumeni* not yet baptized then Baptiſm is. 4. There is a lower degree of ſanctification of them, according to *Auguſtine*, *l.*2. *de pecc. mer. & remiſ. c.*26. cited before by the Dr. here, *p.*63,64. when he ſaid, *Catechumenos ſecundum quendam modum ſuum per ſignum Chriſti & orationem impoſitionis manuum puto ſanctificari*, whence the Dr. himſelf ſaith *there*, *that ſome kind of ſanctification which the unbaptized might have by prayer and impoſition of hands*, *of which we ſometimes read in the Ancients*, *as hath elſewhere been ſhewed*. 6. Nor is it proved that a perſon may not have the higher degree of holineſs in the Church without Baptiſm. Sure a perſon may be converted, regenerated afore Baptiſm, and ſo holy. And it is yet a queſtion, whether all the Apoſtles and Prophets in the Church were baptized, though I doubt not they were, and that regularly they ſhould be; yet the very queſtioning it ſhews the argument not to hold irrefragably, that he that is not baptized hath no part of relative holineſs in the Church of God, or that all ſuperiour degrees of Apoſtle, Propher, &c. in the Chriſtian Church are founded in that. Laſtly, it is apparent that the holineſs 1 *Cor.*7.14. is not Baptiſm, in that it is from the birth, and ſo afore Baptiſm, and from the parent not from the Miniſter, may be though the child be never baptized, is derived from

the

the lawfulneſs of marriage ſociety, not from the belief of one or both parents, and therefore not Baptiſm, as the Dr. (ſo far as I know) without any example ancient or modern makes it.

He adds, *My ſecond followes from the notation of ἀκάθαρτα Acts* 10. 14. *for thoſe that muſt not be received into the Church, as on the other ſide Gods cleanſing is Gods reputing him fit to bee partaker of this priviledge, whereby it appears now fitly receiving and not receiving to baptiſm*] *are expreſt by* [*holy and unclean*] *To this he anſwers by acknowledging the concluſion,* viz. *the fitneſs of the expreſſion, All his exception is againſt my premiſe, the notion of unclean,* Act. 10 *which, ſaith hee, ſignifies there not onely one out of the Church, but alſo one that a Jew might not go into or eat with. To this I reply that my concluſion being granted, I may ſafely part with that, which inferred it, as when I am arrived at my journeys end I have no further need or uſe of my horſe or guide that brought me thither: Let it be remembred, that* [*holy and unclean*] *fitly expreſs thoſe that are received or not received to baptiſm, and then I am ſure I have not offended againſt the propriety of the words, by concluding from this text, that in the Apoſtles time the believers children were received to Baptiſm; And if I have as little offended againſt the rational importance of the words in that place (as I hope hath formerly appeared that I have) then I hope I am perfectly innocent in inducing my concluſion. As for the uſe of the phraſe* Act. 10. *though now I need not contend, yet I may add that the notion of not entring to and eating with containing under it this other of not baptizing (for ſure he might not baptize thoſe to whom he might not enter) and the baptizing* Cornelius *(and not onely the entring to him) being the end for which Peter received that viſion) I ſtill adhere that ἀκάθαρτα in that place, ſignifies one peculiarly that muſt not be received into the Church by Baptiſm, and the holineſs on the contrary reception to that priviledge.*

Anſw. 1. I granted the fitneſs of the expreſſion onely conditionally, if the holy Ghoſt had ſo thought good, but denied the holy Ghoſt did ſo, and therefore he may offend againſt the propriety of the words, notwithſtanding my conceſſion, and hath as much need of his horſe to get to his journeys end, as if I had not yeelded ſo much. 2. How much he hath offended againſt the rational importance of the Apoſtles words 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. is ſhewed before. 3. Were the fitneſs of the expreſſion abſolutely granted, yet with the Drs. leave, I conceive he needs to contend about the uſe of the phraſe in his ſenſe, or elſe he will not be able to infer any thing for his purpoſe, ſith it is not the fitneſs of an expreſſion, but the uſe of words which muſt direct us in our expoſitions, as being *vis & norma loquendi.* 4. That the uſe of it *Acts* 10. 14. is not for the Drs. purpoſe is manifeſt. For 1. the Dr. thus expounds *common* or *unclean* by not *received to Baptiſm*, now if this were the notion of *unclean Acts* 10. 14. then when *Peter* ſaith [*I have never eaten any thing common or unclean*] hee meanes hee never eat any thing not received into the Church by Baptiſm; and when *v.* 15. it is ſaid [*what God hath cleanſed that call thou not common*] the meaning is, what God hath baptized reject thou not from Baptiſm, which is too ridiculous an expoſition to be urged. 2. If it be ſaid that the ὑπόνοια, or covered ſenſe doth import

it,

it, neither is that true. For 1. it is certain that in the latent meaning, the Apoſtle diſcerned by the viſion that *which is common or unclean* to be meant *v.* 28. of *one of another nation*, and the eating, *keeping company*, or *going to*, which is alſo gathered from *Acts* 11. 3. where the thing objected was, *that he went in to the uncircumciſed, and did eat with them*. So that from hence it is manifeſt, that the proper notion of *unclean* is (in that place according to the ſubſenſe which the viſion aimed at) one that being uncircumciſed might not be gone into to talk with familiarly, and and eat with, though he were one that feared God. Which cannot bee meant of want of baptiſm, for ſo the clean, to wit, the unbelieving Jews were unclean, they were not baptized with Chriſtian baptiſm, but of excluſion from familiar ſociety and converſe. 2. On the other ſide, by *Acts* 10. 15. *what God hath cleanſed that call thou not common*, Peter *v.* 28. ſhews he underſtood allowance to go to him, preach to him, eat with him, as one *accepted of God*, *v.* 35. So that the cleanſing is the taking away of that reſtraint which was upon the Jewes, of converſe with the Gentiles. Which being conſidered, if *unclean Acts* 10. 14. were to be expounded in the ſame notion which the Dr. imagines to be 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *not admitted to the Church by Baptiſm*, then when God bid *Peter count nothing common or unclean*, he bid him count no Gentile unbaptized, and when he ſaid *what God hath cleanſed*, it ſhould be whom God hath baptized, or admitted by Baptiſm into the Church. And when the Apoſtle according to the Dr. uſeth *unclean* 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. in the notion in which it is uſed *Acts* 10. 14. he ſhould mean, your young children were ſuch as a man might not go into, converſe with, talke with familiarly, eat with, which certainly being meant of infants as the Dr. conceives, is ſo ridiculus an expoſition, as a ſober man would not put upon any profane Author, much leſs on the ſacred writers.

As for that which the Dr. ſaith, *that the notion of not entring to, and eating with, contained under it this other of not baptizing, for ſure hee might not baptize thoſe to whom he might not enter*; it is ſo frivolous, as that it is unfit for a man that takes on him to make Annotations on the New Teſtament. For if this were good reaſoning, it would follow on the contrary, every ones going in to, and eating with one, were baptizing; and ſith others then Apoſtles or preachers were to go into or not, they were to baptize or not to baptize, and all that men might not go into or eat with, as excommunicate perſons they muſt bee unbaptized, and by the ſame reaſon, ſith ſure a Miniſter may not admit to the Lords Supper, nor a Biſhop ordain him for a Prieſt, to whom he might not enter; the notion of not entring to and eating with, contained under it this other of not communicating and not ordaining, and conſequently *holy* contains under it communicating, and ordaining, and ſo *your young children are not unclean but holy*, ſhould bee by this very reaſoning expounded, they are admitted to the Lords Supper, and ordained Prieſts.

And what he adds; *And the baptizing* Cornelius *(and not onely entring to him) being the end for which* Peter *received that viſion, I ſtill adhere that* ἀκάθαρτα *in that place, ſignifies one peculiarly that muſt not*

be

be received into the Church by Baptiſm, and the holineſs on the contrary reception to that priviledge, may as well ſerve to prove *unclean* hath the notion of one excluded from the Lords Supper, or heaven, and *holy* on the contrary the reception to theſe, ſith theſe were the ends of *Peters* going in, as well as baptizing, and ſo to ſay *your young children are holy*, ſhall be as much as your young children are admitted to the Lords Supper and to Heaven. Theſe conceits of the Dr. go upon two groſs miſtakes. 1. As if *unclean* were uſed in a ſenſe ſuitable to the Eccleſiaſtical practiſe in the Chriſtian Church, whereas it is uſed according to the uſe and conceipt of the Jews peculiarly. 2. As if the notion of a word did extend to the Concomitants and ends of the act expreſſed by it; which if true, then election, regeneration, ſhould have the notion of juſtifying and glorifying, preaching the notion of adoption and ſanctification. But enough of this raw conceit of the Doctor, he goes on thus.

"My third reaſon, *ſaith hee*, being taken from the uſe of the He-
"brew קדש to ſanctifie, for waſhing any part of the body, and on oc-
"caſion of that, mentioning a conjecture that the uſe of holineſs for
"baptiſm, might perhaps intimate that the primitive baptiſms were not
"always immerſions, but that ſprinkling of ſome part might be ſuffici-
"cient; he hath a reply to each of theſe: To the former, that if this
"reaſon were good, then the husbands being ſanctified by the wife, muſt
"ſignifie his being baptized or waſhed by her; to the latter, that I have
"in my writings ſo oft acknowledged the Baptiſm of the Jews and Chri-
"ſtians to be immerſion of the whole body, that I ought to be aſhamed
"to ſay the contrary, and that I can hardly believe my ſelf in it. To
"theſe I anſwer, firſt to the former. 1. That I that affirm ſanctifi-
"cations among the Jews to ſignifie waſhings, do alſo know that it hath
"other ſignifications, and that that ſignification is in each text to bee
"choſen, which ſeems moſt agreeable in all thoſe reſpects which are
"to be conſiderable in the pitching on any interpretation; conſequent-
"ly that the wives baptizing the husband being a thing abſurd and ut-
"terly unheard of in the Church of God, whether in the Apoſtles or
"ſucceeding ages, this ſenſe may not reaſonably be affixt to it; where-
"as the baptizing of infants being by the ancients affirmed to be recei-
"ved from the Apoſtles, it is moſt reaſonable to underſtand the words
"of this, though not of the other (and ſo to apply the obſervation
"(as it is viſible I did) to the latter, not former part of the
"verſe.

Anſw. This is no anſwer, but a grant that *the ſanctifying* 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. cannot be meant of Baptizing, ſith it is abſurd ſo to expound it; and conſequently, a yeelding the argument from the calling the Jewes waſhings *ſanctifications*, to have no force. Nor doth he at all help himſelf by ſaying, *it is moſt reaſonable to apply it to the latter part of the v.* For there is no reaſon in it, that becauſe the Jewes uſe the word *ſanctification* for *Baptiſm*, therefore *holy* (which is another word, and in another predicament then ſanctified, which is in Paſſion, and the other in quality or relation) and not *ſanctified* 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. is as much as Bap-

tiſm, and becauſe the word *ſanctifications hath other ſignifications then waſhings, and may not be underſtood of Baptiſm in the fore-part of* 1 Cor. 7. 14. therefore *holy*, no where proved to be as much as baptized, it is as much as *admitted to the Church by Baptiſm*, and becauſe *the Ancients mention infant Baptiſm to be received from the Apoſtles*, as they do other unwritten traditions of obſerving Eaſter, Lent, giving infants the Communion, *&c.* therefore *holy* 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. muſt be without any example in Scripture or Father of that uſe of the word, bee expounded thus [*admitted in the Church by Baptiſm.*]

But yet the Dr. is loth to confeſs his errour, but adds. *And yet* 2. *if we ſhall diſtinguiſh of the notion of* [*by*] *and expound* [ὑπὸ γυναικὸς, *by the woman*] *of the perſwaſion, that the woman hath uſed to bring her husband to baptiſm, and not of her miniſtry in baptizing wee may very conveniently ſo interpret the former part of the verſe alſo that by the woman,* ὁ ἀνὴρ ἁγιάζεται, *the unbelieving husband hath been brought to baptiſm*, viz. *by being brought to faith, to which this priviledge belongs.*

Anſw. 1. The Dr. brings no example of ſuch a notion of [*by*] or of ſuch a uſe of the term [*ſanctified*] any where elſe, and how ill it ſuits with the Apoſtles argument, is ſhewed fully before. 2. But were it yeelded him, 1. it would ſhew that the alledging of the Jews calling their waſhings ſanctifications, to expound 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. by was impertinent, the Jews ſanctifications being not by perſwaſion of another, but of themſelves according to Gods appointment, nor do they note firſt bringing to the faith, and then admiſſion by another to baptiſm, but waſhing themſelves; and that is one reaſon why neither the uſe of *ſanctified* nor *holy*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. can be conceived to be alluſive to the Jewiſh ſanctifications mentioned by the Dr. ſith in them the high Priest waſhed himſelf, and but his hands and his feet ten times, but Chriſtian baptiſm was by the miniſtry of another, by immerſion of the whole body, and therefore this third reaſon of the Dr. is altogether improbable. 2. If [*ſanctified* 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.] be to be expunded [*brought to the faith and ſo to Baptiſm*] [*holy* is in like ſort ſo be expounded, and then we might allow the Drs. expoſition of [*holy* 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.] without any detriment to our cauſe, it being granted the children of believers were brought to the faith, and ſo to baptiſm.

Again ſaith the Dr. *As for his ſecond exceptions to my conjecture, founded in the uſe of* טָהֵר *ſanctifications for partial, not total waſhings.* 1. *I anſwer, that I mention it onely as a conjecture, with a perhaps and lay no more weight upon it.* 2. *That for Chriſtian baptiſm I no where affirm that it was onely by immerſion, nor on the other ſide that it was always by ſprinkling, but diſjunctively, either by one or the other (as by the words cited by him from* pract. cat. l. 6. c. 2. *is clear) ſuppoſing indeed that Chriſts appointment was not terminated to either, and ſo ſatisfied by either.*

Anſw. 1. The Dr. by putting in his conjecture, ſhewed his willingneſs to have maintained by ſome colour, the abuſe of ſprinkling in ſtead of baptiſm, which his own words cited by me, made me fear hee did againſt his own light, and the contrary is not cleered by this ſlight excuſe. 2. The Drs. own words alledged by me, plainly ſhewed that he knew

knew the primitive baptisms were alwayes immersions of the whole body, nor was any other use of water for baptism, till the corrupt use of the circumfusion of the *Clinici* in the third Century began. Nor do his words *practic cat. l. 6. sect. 2.* cleer the contrary to be conceived by him; *For when he saith, By Christ appointment whosoever should bee thus received into his family, should be received with this ceremony of water, therein to be dipt*, i. e. *according to the primitive ancient custome, to be put under water three times*; and then adds, *or instead of that to bee sprinkled with it*; though he make Christs appointment disjunctively the one or the other, yet he makes *the primitive ancient custome, onely to bee by putting under water*; as in like manner *p. 35.* and this was indeed the ancient primitive custome, *Rom. 6. 3, 4. Col. 2. 12.* shew, and the known saying of *Tertullian ter mergitamur*. And of any one, Dr. *Hammond* should acknowledge it, who *distinguisheth the sanctifications of a part from* טְבִילָה, that is Baptism, and saith, *the Jewish solemnity of Baptism*, which he would have the original and pattern of our Baptism, *to be the washing of the whole body*. As for his propounding Christs appointmen disjunctively, it discovers more of his audacious and corrupt dealing by making that appointment, which is but one way disjunctive, either that way which is acknowledged to be Christs, or another way instead of it, which cannot b shewn to have been practised by the Apostles, or any Apostolical men in the primitive times. And in this thing it is necessary that the evil dealing of Dr. *Hammond*, Mr. *Baxter*, and others, be shewed, who do most presumptuously add to the ordinance of Baptism; when Christ hath appointed one dipping, they add sprinkling; when Christ appoints onely Disciples made by preaching the Gospel to be baptized, they add infants who are not such, and by a fictitious title make them Disciples by their parents faith, who learn and profess nothing themselves; (which he that read considerately Mr. *Baxters* arguments in his 2. *disputation of the right to Sacraments*, may see sufficiently refuted, and may think he could not write that Book without regret of conscience for what hee had written in his Book of *Baptism*) and when the New Testament makes none members of the visible Church Christian, but professors of faith, they add infants of their own head; and when the Scripture and Fathers in setting down the institution and practise of Baptism, plainly expres both so, as that they confess them to bee onely meant of the aged, yet would have them to include also infants, contrary to the plain words and their own confessions, and in their expositions so expound the texts, as expressing onely what agrees to the aged, and yet in their arguments urge the same for baptizing of infants, which they could not do if they did not plead for infant Baptism against their own light, or were not extremely heedless at one time of what they say at another: How ever it be with them, sure I am, no conscientious Christian hath reason to be satisfied by sprinkling, when Christ hath appointed no other then dipping, nor with infant Baptism when, as Mr. *Baxter* hath fully proved in his 2d. *disput.* that *there is a necessity of profession of repentance and faith before, and none are to bee baptized but those that are first professed Disciples of Christ*, and though

he ſuppoſeth believers children Diſciples, and the parents profeſſion to be inſtead of their own, yet no where proves it, nor offers any proof, but what is meerly conjectural, nor can any Paſtours or teachers of Churches, without moſt arrogant preſumption baptize or take for viſible Churchmembers infants, whom neither Chriſt, nor his Apoſtles did baptize or take for ſuch. But I return to the Dr.

" My laſt reaſon, *ſaith he*, is taken from the effect of the legal un-
" cleanneſs contrary to thoſe their ſanctifications, *viz.* removing men
" from the congregation; agreeable to which it is that thoſe ſhould bee
" called holy, who in the account of God ſtood ſo, that they might be
" received into the Church. To this he anſwers, that it is ſaid without
" proof that the uncleanneſs excluding from, and ſanctification reſtoring
" to the tabernacle, are proportionable to the notion here given, of the
" childrens being excluded or included in the Church, asking why *Cor-*
" *nelius* ſhould be counted out of the Church being a devout man? But
" to this I reply, that that which is ſo manifeſt needed no further proof,
" for what two things can be more proportionable, or anſwerable the
" one to the other, then the Jews calling thoſe unclean and holy, who
" were excluded from and reſtored to the tabernacle, and the Chriſti-
" ans calling them unclean, and holy that were excluded from and re-
" ceived into the Church, the excluſion and reception being the ſame
" on both ſides, as alſo the uncleanneſs and holineſs, and the propor-
" tion lying onely betwixt the Jewiſh tabernacle, and the Chriſtian
" Church, which ſurely are very fit parallels as could have been
" thought on.

Anſw. Were it ſo, yet it had been neceſſary to have proved the holy Ghoſt made them parallels, that from the anſwerableneſs a reaſon might be taken to prove thence the ſenſe of *holy* and *unclean* 1 *Cor.* 7.14. after the Drs. minde: For it is not the fitneſs of an expreſſion, that muſt prove the ſenſe we would, but the uſe and the matter of the ſpeech, in which the Drs. expoſitions are defective. But the holy Ghoſt no where that I know reſembles the meer viſible Church by the tabernacle, but the inviſible, in which the ſpirit of God dwels, or rather every believing Saint, 1 *Cor.* 3. 16, 17. *&* 6. 19. *Heb.* 3. 6. 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. or the body of Chriſt, *Joh.* 2. 19. *Heb.* 8. 2 or heaven, *Heb.* 9. 24. and the uncleanneſs reſembled by the legal uncleanneſs, is ſuch as excludes, and the holineſs ſuch as admits into communion with God, union with Chriſt, entrance into heaven, 2 *Cor.* 6. 16, 17. *Revel.* 21. 27. and the ſanctification reſembled by the Jewiſh waſhings, is that which is inviſible by the ſpirit, 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. not meer outward baptiſm, and therefore if proportion or agreeableneſs could prove a ſenſe of thoſe terms the ſenſe would be fairer for the expounding of holineſs rather of real then relative holineſs.

The Dr. adds, *As for his queſtion of* Cornelius, *it is moſt vain, the whole diſcourſe being not of real but relative ſanctification, and the difference moſt viſible betwixt that ſanctity which was truly in him in reſpect of his devotion, fearing, praying, &c. and that outward privilege of admiſſion into the congregation of the Jews, which alone was the thing which*

in

in the account of God or ſober men was denied Cornelius. *Theſe be pitifull ſophiſms, and in no reaſon farther to be inſiſted on.*

Anſw. All the diſcourſe is not about meere relative ſanctification, ſure Dr. *Hammond* when he expounds *ſanctified* 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. by *being converted to the faith*, and the ſame with *ſaved v* 16. means it of real ſanctification. But were *all the diſcourſe about relative ſanctification*, yet the queſtion was not vain, but attains the end for which propounded, ſith *Cornelius* accounted unclean by *Peter*, *Acts* 10. 14. was not out of the Church of God, no nor out of the Church viſible, *being of good report among all the nation of the Jews*, *Acts* 10. 22. though he were not in the policy of Iſrael, and therefore *uncleanneſs* hath another notion then the non-admiſſion into the viſible Church Chriſtian by Baptiſm, of which is enough ſaid before. Nor are any of theſe things I alledge *ſophiſms*, but plain anſwers, nor any otherwiſe *pitifull*, then that they meet with ſuch a ſuch a ſuperficial and ſlight reply from the Dr. Of the different interpretations from the Drs. of 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. in *Tertullian c.* 39. *de anima*, and *Auguſtin l.* 2. *de pecc. mer. & remiſ. c.* 26. and *l.* 3. *c.* 12. enough before. And *Hieromes* different interpretation, is that which is in the *comment.* on 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. in theſe words left out by the Dr. *Item ideò vir & uxor invicem ſanctificantur; quia ex traditione Dei ſanctæ ſunt nuptiæ*, mentioned here before *ſect.* 92. And *Ambroſe* or who ever was the Author of that Commentary under his name *in locum operum tom.* 4. *ſancti ſunt*] *quia de conjugiis legitimis natis*, both which agree with my expoſition. The two teſtimonies the Dr. brings out of *Cyprian* and *Nazianzen* are impertinent, the former makes a diſtinction between *baptizandum* and *ſanctificandum*, the latter if it call Baptiſm *ſanctification*, yet it doth not call *Baptiſm ſanctity*, the word aſcribed to *children* 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. and therefore rather the firſt part of the *v.* is to be expounded if any thus, *ſanctified* id eſt *Baptized*, which yeelds ſuch a ſenſe as the Dr. will not own, and is ſhewed before not at all to be ſatisfied by him. Neither the antiquity of *Cyprian*, nor *Gregory Nazianzen's* skill in *Greek* aſſures us they underſtood the ſacred Dialect. How much *Tertullian*, whom *Cyprian* counted his maſter, and how much *Origen* of whom *Gregory Nazianzen* learned, miſtook the meaning of Scripture, and generally the Fathers, may be diſcerned by their writings remaining, or if any liſt to take a ſhort cut to ſatisfie himſelf, he may ſee much in *Sixt. ſenenſ. Biblioth. l.* 5. and 6.

In the *4th. ch. ſect.* 1. of Dr. *Hammonds Defence* there is little or nothing which at preſent I need reply to much of it being ſpoken to before. Onely I have thought it neceſſary to go back beſides my firſt purpoſe to *Review* the two firſt Chapters of his *Defence*, becauſe he doth ſo often tell me, that I do inartificially deny his concluſion without anſwering to his premiſes.

SECT. XCVI.

The Jewish custome of Baptism for initiation, was not the pattern of Christian Baptism; as Dr. Hammond *would have it.*

CH. 1. Sect. 1. of his *Defence* Dr. *Hammond* having excepted against my words about waving (though it were his own term *qu.* 4. §. 21.) the more imperfect ways of probation tels us; though infant Circumcision prove not infant Baptism a duty, *Yet it evidences the lawfulneſs and fitneſs of it among Chriſtians by analogy with Gods inſtitution of circumciſion among the Jews, and ſo certainly invalidates all the arguments of the Antipædobaptiſt (i.e. of Mr. T.) drawn from the incapacity of infants, from the pretended neceſſity that preaching ſhould go before baptizing from the qualifications required of thoſe that are baptized,* &c. *For all theſe objections lying and being equally in force againſt circumciſing of infants,* &c. *And this the rather, becauſe the Apoſtle compares Baptiſm of Chriſtians with Circumciſion,* Col. 2. 11, 12. and then adds ſome ſayings of Fathers, which are of no validity for his purpoſe, of the other there is nothing true. For the arguments drawn from incapacity, fore going neceſſity of preaching, qualifications, have their force from the inſtitution of Baptiſm by Chriſt, which lye not at all againſt the circumciſing infants, which hath another inſtitution, and hath no analogy with Baptiſm to acquit infant Baptiſm for unlawfulneſs or unfitneſs, except the Dr. can prove (which I am ſure he can never do) that the Church (as in the prelatical language he uſeth to ſpeak) hath power to make that lawfull and fit to be done in the Sacraments of Chriſt, which is otherwiſe than Chriſt hath appointed. The Apoſtle doth not at all compare baptiſm of Chriſtians with Circumciſion, *Col.* 2. 11, 12. But theſe things are ſo fully argued *Review part.* 2 *ſect.* 5, &c. here *ſect.* 8. that till theſe ſections are better anſwered then Dr. *Hammond* doth here, the arguments will be valid againſt infant Baptiſm.

The force of the Drs. urging Chriſts actions to little ones, *Mark* 10. 16. *Matth.* 19. 14. is ſo little as that in his *Letter qu.* 4. §. 12. he confeſſeth *they come not home diſtinctly to the baptizing* of infants, nor do they prove any *unreaſonableneſs or uncharitableneſs in our objections againſt their baptizing of them*, whom the Dr. affirms not either Chriſt or his Apoſtles to have baptized, who had reaſon and charity enough to have done it, if they had judged it fit to have been done.

That *Matth.* 18. 6. is ridiculouſly applied to little children in age, is demonſtrated *Review part.* 2. *ſect.* 17. *Auguſtins* saying *credit in altero qui peccavit in altero*, and his reckoning infants baptized among believers, is beſides the Book, I mean the Scripture, and to be judged as no better then a fond conceit. The lawfull baptizing of ſome profeſſors of faith who prove hypocrites, is no colour to baptize non profeſſors of faith. 'Tis rightly done, that that *which contains no relation of*

Chriſts

Christs or his Apostles baptising infants, is *put by him among the more imperfect probations*, and such his alleging 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. is already shewed to be.

That which the Dr. saith Sect. 2. that *the Fathers with one consent testifie the receiving our infants to Baptism, to bee received from the Apostles as the will of Christ himself*, is so manifestly false, that, the very first of the Fathers who makes mention of it *Tertullian* in his *book of Baptism ch.* 18. diswades it and useth arguments against it, and those arguments as well are against the believers infants Baptism as the unbelievers, whereby it is evident he opposed the Baptism of any infants; whereto might be added the case of *Nazianzen*, together with his judgement forementioned, as evidences that infant Baptism was not the judgement and practice of the universal Church for 1600. years. The Dr. himself confesseth that *Peter de Bruis and Henry his Schoster, and the Petrobuciani and Henriciani that sprung from them were opposers of it*: and therefore the Dr. doth very much exceed truth in making it *the judgment and practice of the universal Church for* 1600 *years*. The term [*son of the Church*] used by the Dr. is indeed used by Canonists, and others, and it is usual to term the Church a Christians mother, and by the Church the prelates are usually meant, and much advantage made of it to keep Christians under the yoke of Bishops canons. But it is no Scripture term: in it the Elders, Apostles, are termed *Fathers*, 1 *Cor.* 4 15. all Christians *Brethren* and *Sisters* 1 *Cor* 7. 15. and the Church being no other then a company of Brethren and Sisters, it is very unfit to call the Church a Christians Mother, and therefore I am willing not to be accounted *a son of the Church*, nor do I acknowledge that *the judgement and practise* (if there were any such) *of the universal Church for* 1600 *years* (setting aside the Apostles of Christ) *hath any force or authority over me*, nor do I *fear the incurring of Gods displeasure by oppugning or contemning it*, but rather considering how the Apostle 2 *Thes.* 2. 7. tels me, that in his time *the mystery of iniquity did begin to work*, and the vain altercations about Easter in the 2d. Century, and many other mistakes and blemishes even in the Apostles times and much more after, together with the prediction *of the falling away* 1 *Tim* 4. 1. the exceptions against the seven Churches of *Asia* by our Lord Christ himself, the imperfections that are in the writings of the first Fathers after the Apostles, the exceptions against the histories of the Church, the imposing on the Church supposititious Treatises, the corrupting of authors, I think it the safest way to avoid Gods displeasure, not to rest on the practise or judgement of the universal Church (if there were any such) after the Apostles, but onely on the writings of the New Testament, *it being highly unreasonable*, as the Dr. saith, *that an institution of Christs, such as each Sacrament is, should bee judged of by any other rule (whether the phancies or reasons of men) but either the word wherein the institution is set down, or the records of the practise of Christ or his Apostles* in Scripture, which comes nome to the deciding all controversie of faith and manners, and rites necessary to be observed, and needs no *other records* besides scripture, *however conserved or made known to us*, whether by unwritten tradition, or in the writings-

writings of Fathers, in which there is very much uncertainty, but do deter men from adhering to this way as the inlet to many Popish, and Prelatical abuses and errours; yet deny not good use may be made of the ancient writers for clearing of many truths, if they be read with judgement, and do resolve to review what hath been brought for infant baptism by the Dr. out of other writers besides holy Scripture.

Sect. 3. the Dr. complains of mee, "as doing some injury to his "Book in leaving out one considerable, if not principal part, *viz.* that "which concerned the native Jewish children, who were baptized as so- "lemnly, as the Proselytes and their children.

Anſ. But by the Drs. leave, in this no injury is done him: For however he mentioned *Letter of Resol. qu. 4. sect. 5, 6. Baptism as a known rite solemnly used among the Jews in the initiating of Jews and Proselytes into the Covenant*, yet both the words I allege *Review part. 2. sect. 24.* Out of his *Letter q. 4. §. 24.* and all other passages I yet finde in his writings, make the Christian baptism of believers and their infants, to bee from the *Jewish custome of Baptising Proselytes, and children as the pattern, basis or foundation of it*, no where the Baptism of native Jewes, is made the pattern of Christian baptism, though he say §. 24. *the baptism of the native Jews was the pattern by which the baptism of the Proselytes was regulated, and wherein it was founded.* Yea the Dr. in his *practical Catechism l. 6. sect. 2.* saith, *that as among the Jews when any Proselyte was received in among them and entred, or initiated into their Church, they were wont to use washings to denote their forsaking or washing off from them all their former prophane heathen practises* (which did not agree to the native Jews) *so by Christs appointment, whosoever should be thus received into his family, should bee received with this ceremony of water, therein to be dipt, i. e. according to the primitive ancient custome, to be put under water threetimes*: And in his *Letter qu. 4. §. 37. so it is directly the thing that the Jewish practise, in which Christ founded his institution, hath laid the foundation of in baptising Proselytes and their children, and to which the primitive Church conformed.* To which I may add, that the proof which the Dr. brings for baptising of infants from Christs appointment, is thus expressed *qu. 4. §. 22. receiving of Disciples was the receiving of Proselytes to the Covenant and faith of Christ, a Disciple and a Proselyte being perfectly all one, save onely that the latter denotes a coming from other nation*, &c. which shews, that he made the baptising of Proselytes and their children onely, the pattern of Christian baptism.

Next the Dr. sets down his proofs out of the *Talmud, Gemara*, and *Maimonides*, and then concludes; "And now I may, I hope assume, "that not onely there is perfect truth in what I now affirm, that Bap- "tism among the Jews belonged to their natives as well as to Proselytes "(even to all that entred into Covenant, and those evidently were the "Jewish children as well as men) but also that this had before been evi- "denced in that resolution of the fourth Quære, which here Mr. T. hath "been pleased to examine, and consequently that it was no small injus- "stice, and unkindness in him both to the Reader and to me, that hee "would omit to take notice of it, but assume and build on it as a thing

"yeilded

"yeilded and granted him by mydiſcourſe, that the Proſelytes only and "not the native Jews were partakers of that Jewiſh baptiſm. This ſure "was a ſtrange infirmity in an anſwer.

Anſw. It is a ſtranger infirmity in a Reply, that whereas I had expreſly in the 2d. Part of my *Review ſect.* 24. *p.* 307. ſaid, after the baptiſm *Exod.* 19. 10. the Jews did not baptize Jews but onely Proſelytes, the Dr. ſhould not take notice, that I limited my denial of the baptizing the native Jews, to the time after the baptiſm *Exod.* 19. 10. Now I think there is not one of his allegations prove, that the Jews baptized native Jews after the giving of the Law. I confeſs I was unwilling to relye on mine own judgement in this, or Mr. *Seldens*, becauſe the Dr. excepts againſt it (though I thought and think ſtill Mr. *Selden* was in the right in this, and of any man living I imagined his knowledge in things of this kind, to be moſt accurate and ample) and therefore did write a Letter to my ancient acquaintance Mr. *Edward Pocock* Profeſſor of the Oriental Languages in *Oxford*, to inform mee if I were miſtaken: But whether by reaſon of his bodily infirmity, or miſcariage of Letters, or other cauſe, I have received as yet no anſwer. At preſent having not the Books cited by Dr. *Hammond*, I return this anſwer, that none of the words as he cites them, ſhew that Baptiſm was to the poſteri y of native Jewes, after the giving of the Law for entring the Covenant, not the words *Talmud. tr. de repud. Iſrael do not enter into Covenant but by theſe three things, by Circumciſion, by baptizing, and by Peace offering.* Nor thoſe in *Gemara ad tit. Cheritboth. c.* 2. *Your fathers did not enter into the Covenant but by circumciſion and Baptiſm*, and in *Jabimoth c.* 4. *Rabbi Joſhua ſaid, we find of our mothers that they were baptized and not circumciſed.* Nor thoſe of *Maimonides tit. Iſurei bia. c.* 13. *By three things the Iſraelites entred into the Covenant, by Circumciſion, Baptiſm and Sacrifice, and ſoon after, what was done to you, yee were initiated into the Covenant by Circumciſion, and Baptiſm, and Sacrifice.* For that out of *Gemara*, the very words (as the Doctor himſelf obſerves) ſpeak of what *the Jews did of old time*, not what was a cuſtome continued among the Jews in after times, and ſo I make no queſtion but the words of the *Talmud* are to be underſtood, ſpecially when the words of *Maimonides* counted the exacteſt of the Rabbins in the Jewiſh cuſtomes, ſet down thus out of *Maimon. in miſ. tom.* 2. *in Iſſurei biah ch.* 13. §. 1, — 6, 11, 14, 15. do plainly ſhew this to have been the meaning of the Hebrew Drs. as I find them in *Ainſworth Annot.* on *Gen.* 17. 12. *By three things* (*ſay the Hebrew Drs.*) *did Iſrael enter into the Covenant, by Circumciſion, and Baptiſm, and Sacrifice. Circumciſion was in Ægypt, as it is written, no uncircumciſed perſon ſhall eat thereof,* [Exod. 12. 48.] *Baptiſm was in the wilderneſs before the giving of the Law: as it is written, ſanctifie them to day and to morrow, and let them waſh their clothes* [Exod. 19. 10.] *And Sacrifice, as it is ſaid, And hee ſent young men of the ſons of Iſrael, which offered burnt offerings, &c.* [Exod. 24. 5.] *And ſo in all ages when an Ethnick is willing to enter into the Covenant, and gather himſelf under the wings of the Majeſty of God, and take upon him the yoke of the Law, he muſt be Circumciſed, and Baptized, and*

bring a Sacrifice. And if it bee a woman, she must be baptized and bring a sacrifice; as it is written [Numb. 15. 15.] *as ye are, so shall the stranger be. How are ye? By Circumcision, and Baptism, and bringing of a Sacrifice: So likewise the stranger throughout all generations, by Circumcision, and Baptism, and bringing a Sacrifice.* Out of which words this may bee collected. 1. That the baptizing of Israel whereby they entred into Covenant, was that *Exod.* 19. 10. 2. That there is not in these passages any thing that shews, that the Jewish Baptism for entring into Covenant, was of native Jews after that time. 3. That the Baptism throughout all generations, according to the Jews, was of strangers. 4. That the Jewish baptism, which was the pattern of Proselytes baptism, according to *Numb.* 15. 15. was the baptism *Exod.* 19. 10. and not any baptism of native Jews after that time. Which if true, Dr. *Hammonds* reasons and allegations are plainly answered, that they prove not a custome of baptizing native Jews in successive generations, to the time of giving the Law at Mount Sinai. In which I am the more confirmed, because so learned a man as Mr. *Selden* l. 2. *de Jure nat.* c. 2. *de Syn. ed. Ebr.* l. c. 3. doth so expresly say it, but also, 1. Because of the speech of the Rabbin mentioned here by the Dr. and in his *Letter* q. 4. §. 11 who said, *That they found that their fathers were circumcised, but not baptized*, that is ordinarily, which the Drs. *parenthesis* seems to limit to *Abraham, Isaac, &c.* but is to be understood of the Patriarchs generally, and other Jewish ancestors, who were circumcised and not baptized. 2. Because there is no other baptism in all the Old Testament, for entring into the Covenant of the Law, of originary or native Jews mentioned. 'Tis true there is mention of *Ezek.* 16. 4. of *washing an infant in the day of its nativity to supple it*, and in the Law *many baptisms* were *Heb.* 9. 10. for purifications, none for entring into Covenant, that I find but that. 3. In the relation of the *Sichemites* being admitted to be one people with the Jews, *Gen.* 34. 24. circumcision onely was then required without baptism. 4. Where in the *N. T.* the Apostle ascribes to the Fathers baptism, he doth not mention baptism of water, but *their passing through the Sea, and being under the cloud*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 1, 2. for which baptism of water had been apter to shew correspondence to our Baptism, if such a custome of baptizing for entring into the Covenant native Jews had been then in use. 5. Dr. *Hammond* himself, *pract. Cateeh. l. 6 sect.* 2. saith, *that among the Jews when any Proselyte was received in among them and entred, or initiated into their Church, they were wont to use washings, to denote their forsaking or washing off from them all their former prophane Heathen practises*, but this could not be an end in the baptizing of native Jews ordinarily, for they were not born in uncleanness, but sanctity, according to the Hebrew Doctors, having not been polluted with idols, and therefore the end or reason of baptizing Proselytes not agreeing to the native Jews that baptism was not requisite to them, and therfore used not ordinarily of them. It is true when they had gotten strange Gods among them, which defiled them, they were required to *be clean and change their Garments*, *Gen.* 35. 2. and perhaps some defilement of the Israelites by idols in *Egypt*, might occasion that command, *Exo.* 19. 10. But there was no reason of this in the

ordinary

ordinary entring of the infants of Israel into the Covenant, who were not thus defiled. 6. The baptism of *John Baptist* for remission of sins was distastful to the Pharisees and Lawyers who thought themselves pure, *Luk.* 7. 29, 30. therefore it is likely they used not such a baptism of native Jews, as imported an acknowledgement of such defilement as they took themselves and infants to be free from. 7. The Dr. saith *Letter of Resol. qu.* 4th. §. 18. *They that were thus baptized were said to be born again, and that, as if born of a new mother, as it is oft said in the Talmud, to which our Saviour refers, when he talks of regeneration (of which saith S.* Paul, *baptism is the laver) of being born again from above of water,* &c. Joh. 3. 3, 5. *And this was so vulgar a notion among the Jews that* v. 10. *Christ wonders at* Nicodemus, *that he understood it not: Art thou a ruler in Israel and knowest not these things?* But if there were such a regeneration by water of native Israelites, which had been the pattern of the baptism of Proselytes, *Nicodemus* doubtless had known it and answered otherwise, therefore his wonderment was that Christ should require regeneration of him by water, who was a Jew by nature (who need no such regeneration) and not a sinner of the Gentiles, and consequently no such known custome ordinary of baptizing native Jews. 8. The Dr. *ibid.* §. 17. saith, *They that were thus received as Proselytes by Baptism, put off their former relations of kinred,* &c. *To which surely our Saviour refers, when he talks of leaving father and mother* Mark 10. 29. *And* Tacitus *the* Historian, *nec quicquam prius imbuuntur quàm exuere patriam, parentes, liberos, fratres vilia habere; their Proselytes are first taught after renouncing the gods, to put off their countrey, parents, children, brethren, to despise them. And the later Jews have a saying, that he that hath maried his own sister, or entred any the most incestuous bands, by becoming a Proselyte ceaseth to have that near relation of blood to her, and may now live with her as with a wife: which false superstructure in them is yet a testimony of the truth, wherein it is falsly founded by them* And this is a testimony also of this, that the Jews did not thus baptize native Jews, because they never allowed such incest, as they would have done, if they had by baptism regenerated thus native Jews, and conceived of the effect of it, as they did of Proselytes baptism. 9. We read of the circumcision of *Christ*, *John Baptist*, *Timothy*, *Paul*, but wee read not of their baptism by water as the custome of the Jewes was to enter into the Covenant Proselytes; therefore there was not a custome of baptizing native Jewes infants. 10. There is no way mentioned of initiating Jewish females by any ceremony into Judaism, no description in the *Talmud*, *Gemara*, *Maimonides*, of observing any such thing as the Dr. sets down *Letter of resol. q.* 4. *sect.* 9. concerning Proselytes to have been used towards the Jews, sundry of the things done to the Proselytes at their baptism, were such as were proper to strangers; as namely, the baptizing into the name of a freed man or a servant, the limitation of the priviledges of the baptized, which are evidences that this baptism was not used to native Jews, but onely to Gentile Proselytes. All which being considered, there was neither unkindness, nor injustice to Dr. *Hammond* or his Reader in my discourse, and it is necessary for him to consider better the considerations

which I have offered in this matter (unleſs hee will become non ſuit) which have certainly force in them, though this thing were omitted by me, which yet was not *perfectly omitted* (as his language is) *by me*, nor *the contrary ſuppoſed* without proof.

But the Dr. however refuſeth not to attend me in all my motions, and I hope I ſhall at long running overtake him. To what I ſaid, Baptiſm, it ſeems was a cuſtome of all nations as well as the Jews, citing *Grotius* for it on *Matth.* 3. 6. and *Matth.* 28. 19. the Dr. anſwers, *Of the truth of this Obſervation I ſhall raiſe no queſtion, onely I wonder what he could fancy from thence to conclude for his advantage*, and then he tals to conjecturing. But by my words he might have eaſily reſolved himſelf what I aimed at in this, to wit, to ſhew the Jews baptiſm of parents and children is not undeniably proved to be *the pattern of Chriſtian baptiſm, and Chriſts inſtitution of baptiſm but a copy according to that pattern*, if it bee true that *it were derived from the ſame common fountain, the ſons of* Noah *in remembrance of the deluge, according to that famous verſe among the Greeks, the Sea ſweeps away all the evils of men, to which S.* Peter *alludes in making Baptiſm the antitype to* Noahs *floud*, which the Dr. yeilds.

To this I added, that I knew not that Dr. *H.* or any other hath alleged one paſſage in Scripture or any of the Fathers, that might evince that the cuſtome of baptizing, or baptizing infants, was derived from the Jews initiating Proſelytes by baptiſm. To this, ſaith Dr. *H. I anſwer*, 1. *By asking Mr.* T. *whether he be ready to pay that reverence to the authority of the Fathers, as to bee concluded by their affirmations?* To which I ſay, I am ready to pay that reverence to the Fathers which is meet, but to be concluded by their affirmations is more then is fit, the ſame liberty is to be allowed mee, which learned men take uſually to diſſent from them, when Scripture or reaſon lead another way. He ſaith, *If he be, I wonder why the uniform conſent of them that infants are to be baptized ſhould not prevail with him? Anſw.* And I wonder 1. that the Dr. ſhould pretend an uniform conſent of the Fathers, that infants are to be baptized, when for the two firſt ages, there's not any juſt evidence of the conſent of one Father for it; in the third there is a diſſent of *Tertullian*, and in the 4th. of *Nazianzen*, and the rarity of its uſe; and that upon ſuch erroneous grounds, as it was practiſed with infant communion, which had alike conſent, and in ſo ridiculous a manner, as to propound queſtions of its faith and devotion to an infant, who could not underſtand or ſpeak, and put in others to undertake and anſwer for an infant, who could neither promiſe for them without arrogant preſumption what was not in their power, nor profeſs their faith without apparent untruth argue it to have been a corruption. 2. That the uniform conſent of the Apoſtles and Apoſtolical men, with *Chriſt* and *John Baptiſt* in Scripture, ſhould not more prevail with a man who makes the Scripture his Canon, then Fathers of thoſe ages, wherein many errours and corruptions were received, and either hatched or foſtered by them, but that hee ſhould not onely dare to practiſe the corrupt innovation of infant Baptiſm, of which there is no inſtance in Scripture, but alſo omit the baptiſm of beleivers, and oppoſe it, and harden men in their conceits, as if they were

were baptized in infancy sufficiently, and for that reason to bee reckoned among Christians, though meer strangers from the knowledge or practise of Christianity.

He adds, *If bt be not, why doth he mention this as usefull in this matter?*

Answ. To shew how little credit is to be given to the Drs. dictates without proof.

The Dr. adds. " But then 2dly, it must be adverted that this one con-
" taining two questions in it, 1. Whether this of initiating into the Co-
" venant by baptism were a Jewish custome? 2. Whether from thence
" Christ derived this right of baptizing Christians? The former of these
" was that which alone required proving, the latter being of it self evi-
" dent, without farther probation; supposing onely that the Fathers
" testified that to be Christs institution of Baptism, which we find to have
" been thus agreeable to the practise customary among the Jewes. And
" this he illustrates by the like examples of excommunication, and the
" *post-c nium*, from whence he conc.vs Christ derived the Lords Supper
" and excommunication by the Apostles.

Answ. For present, omitting the instances of the Lords Supper, as derive from the Jewish *post c nium*, and excommunication Apostolical from Jewish, it hath been yeeld d by me, that Christian baptism was in respect of the rite like Jewish baptism of Proselytes, acknowledged to have been a custome among them for initiating them (not of native *Jews* after the giving of the Law) into the Covenant, and it is probable that *John Baptist* followed in the external act that rite, though to another end, he baptizing with the baptism of repentance for remission of sins, they into the observance of the Law for righteousness, and other subjects; *John Baptist Jews* by nature, not so Pharises. And as *John Baptist* practised, so Christ appointed, and his Apostles practised Baptism with expres mention of the Trinity or the name of Christ somewhat differently from *John*: and if the one be said to be derived from the other by way of accommodation, I shall not contend about it, nor do I deny that Christ alluded to this baptism of Proselytes, *Joh.* 3. 3, 5. in the manner I have expressed before, and the 2d. part of this *Review sect.* 16. Nor do I deny that the Jewish, Christian, and Gentile baptisms may have their first rise from *Noahs* deluge, but that which I insist on is, that the Jewish use was was not so conformable to the Christian, as that it can be true that the Jewish was the pattern of the Christian. As for the Fathers, *Nazianzen, Macarius, Athanasius*, their words seem not to me to make a comparison between the Baptism Jewish and Christian for initiation, but the Christian and Jewish which was occasionally renewed upon any legal defilement, or often iterated by the Priests for purification or sanctifying and so the words of *Athanasius* cited by the Dr. Intimate, which say, *the 3d. is the Legal baptism which the Hebrews had, whereby every unclean person* (not every one who was so by nature, as the Dr. adds, but by accident) *was baptised in water* (as oft as he was defiled) *had his garments washed, and so entred into the Camp*; which was another baptism then that the Dr. makes the pattern of Christian baptism, to wit, that which was once onely used for initiation, and of this

I think

I think the Dr. findes no mention in the Fathers, nor of the derivation of Christian baptisme from it.

That which the Dr. saith sect. 4. p. 18. from the *Talmud*, *That when a Proselyte is received he must be circumcised, and then when hee is cured, they shall baptise him in the presence of two wise men, saying, Behold he is as an Israelite in all things*; adding, *A plain testimony (to the sense of those which we formerly produced) of baptising both Jews and Proselyte. (for else how could the Proselyte, upon receiving this, be said to be a Israelite in all things?)*

Answ. Two wayes; 1. In respect of the rite, he was circumcised and baptised, as the *Israelites* at the giving of the Law *Exod.* 19. 10. (not after that time) were baptised; and the Proselytes posterity were then not after this time of the first initiation into the Jewish people. 2. In respect of priviledges and profession, as it is said *Ester* 8. 17. *Many of the people of the Land became Jews.* Neither this then nor the other, are plain or obscure testimonies of baptising native Jews, for initiating into the Covenant after the giving of the Law.

That which I said that I alleged, that Mr. *Selden de Syned. Ebræ. l.* 1. *cap.* 3. *p.* 40, 41. mentions some, who have conceived that the Jewish baptism in initiating Proselytes, was in imitation of Christs example, though he do not believe it; and that *Schickardus* conceives, they added a certain Baptism to Circumcision, to difference them from Samaritans, to shew that notwithstanding Dr. *Hs.* supposition, that the whole fabrick he frames of Baptism, is discernable to be built on that basis the customary baptism among the Jews, yet many will conceive it needs more proof then the bare recital of passages out of Jewish writers, is *a conclusion drawn out of the premises in the first figure*, thus; That is not so discernable but that many will conceive it needs more proof then the bare recital of passages out of Jewish writers, which was not so conceived by *Schickard*, and some others mentioned by Mr. *Selden*. But the Drs. supposition was not so conceived by those, *Ergo*. The *major* rests on two things; 1. That experience shews, what some others who had understanding to conceive did not conceive to be so, many its likely will not discern. 2. That the later Jewish writers are not such certain proof of the ancient Jews customes, but that more proof may bee justly required then the bare recital of passages in them. It is nor unknown that some have excepted against *Ainsworths* allegation of Rabbins, and that in his apology for it he himself saith, *Some things I note from them, not as approving them my self absolutely, but leaving them to the further consideration of the prudent. Preface to his annot. on Gen.* Nor is it unusual for Rabbins to dissent one from another, and Christian writers from Jewish about their customs. Though *I have no engine to draw many out of two*, nor were two onely mentioned by me (for though Mr. *Selden* cite onely *Petrus Alfunsus* for the first, yet he cites him as ascribing the thing to more then one, *nec defuere ex Judæis Christiani aliquot, &c.*) yet from the instance of two such which have so conceived, I might rationally infer the likelihood, that many would not be satisfied with the passages of the writers cited by him, much less with the inference of the Dr. makes from thence.

But

But hee tels me, *so evidente to how little purpose I said thus much, I confeſs my conceit of ſuch a cuſtome of baptiſing Proſelytes afore Chriſts incarnation among the latter Jewes.* Yet I thinke it was to much purpoſe notwithſtanding this my conceit, ſith thereby the foundation of the Drs. fabrick is intimated to be ſuch, as though I pull it not down others may.

I ſaid, that either that cuſtome ſhould begin from *Jacobs* injunction to his houſhold *Gen.* 35. 2. or from Gods command *Exod.* 19. 10. for the Iſraelites to waſh their clothes afore the giving of the Law (though the Jewiſh Doctors allege theſe for it) I do not conceive (not as the Dr. miſrecites me *becannot*) thoſe places ſpeaking of waſhing Jews by nature, not Proſelytes, whereas the Jews baptized not Jews by nature, as *Selden de jure nat. &c. l.* 2. *c.* 4. ſaith, but by profeſſion.

Here, ſaith the Dr. *are many weak parts in theſe few words. For* 1. *the original of the cuſtome among the Jews is but an acceſſary wholly extrinſecal to the matter in hand, and in no reſpect neceſſary to be defined by us. If the cuſtome be acknowledged we need ask no more, for on that and not on that particular original of it, it is that we ſuperſtruct our whole fabrick as far as belongs to infant baptiſm.*

Anſw. Be it ſo, yet it was no weak part to examine the original of that cuſtome; nor impertinent, ſith if the original come from unwritten tradition of Elders, it is ſomewhat the leſs likely Chriſt would make it the pattern of his baptiſm, who neglected the traditions of the Elders, and excepted againſt them. *Mark* 7. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

But then ſecondly, ſaith he, *for the two originals here ſet down and both rejected by him, it is a little ſtrange that he ſhould think fit to do ſo, and not to ſubſtitute any third in the place of them.*

Anſw. Neither was this any weak part, ſith the originals of ſuch cuſtomes are ſo obſcure, that there are few of them, whoſe head is known. The Dr. I ſuppoſe cannot ſhew the original of the *poſt-cœnium* among the Jews, of giving milk and honey to the newly baptiſed among Chriſtians, and yet I ſuppoſe the Dr. counts not this a weak part. Yet Mr. *Joſeph Mede* in his *diatr. on Tit.* 3. 5. finds another original, to wit, *That cuſtome of waſhing infants from the pollutions of the womb, when they are firſt born, mentioned* Ezek. 16. 4, 5. *and gathered from the anſwer of an Oracle in a ſtory related by Plutarch in his quæſtiones Romanæ, not farre from the beginning.*

Hence (ſaith he p. 272.) *the Jews before Iohn the Baptiſt came amongſt them, were wont by this rite to initiate ſuch, as they made Proſelytes, (to wit) as becomming infants again, and entring into a new life, and being, which before they had not.* Which derivation of its original ſuits better with the opinion of regeneration by it, in alluſion to which as a vulgar notion among the Jews, the Dr. conceivs Chriſt ſpake *Iob* 3. 5. and the Jews imagined old kindred to be loſt, and this is a good evidence, that they baptized not native Jews, who were not by them conceived to be born again, nor to have any need as being born in ſanctity, not in uncleaneſs *Matth.* 3. 9. *Iob.* 8. 33.

"3ly,

" 3dly, *saith he*, For *Iacobs* injunction to his houshold, *Gen.* 35.2. it " is no where vouched by me as the original of this custome among the " Jews, but onely an intimation given, that that other, the command " of God before the giving the Law, was agreeable to what we read of " *Iacob* to his houshold, and so certainly it is.

Answ. Be it so, yet Jewish Writers and others derive it from *Gen.* 35.2. and therefore there was no weak part shewed in my intimation of my dissent.

" 4thly, *saith he*, the command of God, *Exod.* 19.10. in which Bap- " tism is said to be founded by the Jews, is not (as Mr. *T.* suggests) " the command to the *Israelites* to wash their clothes (nothing but the " custome of changing their garments can be founded in that) but the " command to *Moses* to sanctifie them (*Go unto the people and sanctifie* " *them to day and to morrow*) in the Hebrew notion of the word קדושין " sanctifications, for washing, either the whole or some parts of the " body, as is shewed at large §.35. If Mr. *T.* did this unwittingly, he " may now reform his mistake; if wittingly, *&c.* I shall not then hope " even this length of words will be sufficient for his conviction.

Answ. Neither in this do I think I shewed weakness or deceit, though I did it wittingly, following herein Mr. *Selden*, *l.* 1. *de Syned. Eb. c.* 3. p. 25, *&c.* where I think he hath proved *by the washing of the cloathes* is meant the washing of the whole body, and that thereby is expressed the Baptism whence the later Jews say they took the use of baptzing Proselytes, and not by the term [*sanctifie them:*] which was to be done by *Moses* not onely once, but *two days* together, and seems to be from *v.* 15. by his *keeping them from their wives*, and perhaps some other ways whether offering sacrifice, or anointing (by which way also sometimes persons are said to be sanctified as *Exod.* 40.13. and here the Priests are bid *sanctifie themselves*, *Exod.* 19.22.) or some other way. To me it is improbable that by *sanctifying*, *Exod.* 19.10. is meant *baptising*, though I think it a general term comprehending that and some other acts. And thus I hope the Reader will perceive I neither intended to *disguise* any thing, nor *misguide* any man.

" Lastly, the Dr. conceives my reason very vain, for the Jews bapti- " zed Jews by nature, and it is evidenced from it they took the baptized " Proselytes, according to *Numb.* 15.15. And so it is evident, that of " *Exod.* 19.10. being the original of baptizing native Jews, may, and " must be the original of baptizing the Proselytes.

Answ. But neither doth it yet appear to me there is any *weak part or vanity* in this reason, nor hath the Dr. proved the *custome of baptising Iews by nature*, nor do I find *the evidences the Dr. brings* to oppose Mr. *Selden*, or that I made any *misadventure* in my *few words*, *sect.* 5. Dr. *H.* thinks reason not to be tied to Mr. *Seldens* authority, which I reject when 'tis not for my turn; which I grant when the Dr. gives such reason of dissent as I did in my rejection of Mr. *Selden's* interpretation of 1 *Cor.* 10.1. And for the Drs. interpretation, neither hath he cleared it by his shewing my mistake of his meaning. For neither were the native *Iews* wont to be initiated by Baptism, nor is my reason avoided against his

his interpretation. For if the ſenſe of the Dr. bee, our Fathers were baptized into *Moſes* as native Jews are wont to be initiated by baptiſm, yet the Dr. errs from the Apoſtles meaning, which is, that our Fathers the Iſraelites were baptized into *Moſes*, as well (not as the Jews in after time by their Baptiſm, but) as wee Chriſtians by Chriſtian Baptiſm into Chriſt. Whether the Jews cuſtome was to baptize native Jews after the giving the Law, hath been argued before; I proceed to my main poſition, and the Drs. anſwer to it.

I ſet down my poſition thus; Nor do I think it true that the cuſtomary uſe of the Jews in baptizing Proſelytes and their children, was the pattern of Chriſts inſtitution of Baptiſm, and the Apoſtles and firſt Churches practiſe. For according to the cuſtome of the Jews, *John Baptiſt*, and Chriſts Apoſtles ſhould have baptized no native Jews, which was not ſo, but of all nations as Chriſt appointed, *Matth.* 28. 19. To this the Dr. anſwers 1. by aſſerting they did baptize native Jews. To this the Reply is by denial of this, and referring to the proof before.

2. Saith the Dr. *Nay ſo they might, though the Iews had baptized none but Proſelytes, for to that it would bear juſt proportion, that they ſhould baptize both Iews and Gentiles, in caſe both of them came in as Proſelytes.*

Anſw. But this anſwer is a fallacy a little too groſs to deceive any man of common underſtanding. For if the Jews baptized no native Jews, but Proſelytes (not to Chriſt) but to the Jewiſh people, and their baptiſm was the pattern (which was the Drs. word) of Chriſtian baptiſm, then Chriſt ſhould have appointed, and *Iohn Baptiſt* and the Apoſtles practiſed baptiſm to no Jew, though a Proſelyte to Chriſt; For each thing ought to be appointed and done according to the pattern, and no otherwiſe, that which is otherwiſe is not according to the pattern, though it bear a proportion with it. My argument was not as the Dr. makes it, *The cuſtome was to baptize Proſelytes and not natives; therefore Chriſt if he obſerved that cuſtome was not to baptize native Iews*, but thus; therefore if Chriſt had made their cuſtome his pattern, he would not have appointed them to be baptized. If *Moſes* had varied from the pattern ſhewed him in the Mount, he had not made it his pattern, ſo it had been in this, if the Jewiſh baptiſm had been Chriſt and his Apoſtles pattern.

2. I ſaid, Chriſt would not have avouched the baptiſm of *Iohn* to be from heaven and not from men, if it had been in imitation of, and conformity to the Jewiſh cuſtome. To this the Dr. ſaith, "But I wonder what appearance of concludency there is in that reaſon? May not any thing be from heaven or by Gods appointment which is derived from a Jewiſh cuſtome? God may appoint a ceremony known among men to be uſed in his ſervice.

Anſw. I grant it, but then the appointment of God is the pattern by which it is to be regulated, not mens cuſtome; I do not conceive that can be ſaid to be from heaven or God but from men, which is derived from, founded in and regulated by as its pattern, a cuſtome of men; as the Dr. ſaith of the Chriſtian baptiſm, that it is derived from, founded in and regulated by the Jewiſh baptiſm (not pretended to bee an inſtitution of God but an humane invention) *as the pattern whence it is*

copied out even by Christ, according to the Dr. *Letter of resol. qu. 4. §. 24.*

3. If it had been the pattern I said, it is likely some where or other some intimation would have been given, as the Directory for Christians in the use of Baptism. *This*, saith the Dr. *is too frivolous to require reply; for besides that, the negative argument were of no force, if it were as is pretended; It already appears that there are in the Jewish writers more then intimations of this custome, and some indications of it even in the Scripture it self; as* Joh. 3. 5, 10. *And for any plainer affirmations, what need could there be of them, when both the matter it self speaketh plainly, that there was no need of words to those that knew the Jewish customes, as the first writers and readers of the New Testament did, and when Christs sole authority and practise of his Apostles were sufficient Directory for the Christians in the use of baptism?*

Answ. The Dr. might more truly have said, this reason is too weighty to be removed by his reply. For 1. the thing it self is of very great moment to tender consciences, who know of what moment it is that the great solemn ordinance of Baptism should not be prophaned, but rightly used. 2. Without a certain Directory, no person can with peace seek Baptism, nor Minister give it. 3. The Apostle saith for want of right observing the Lords Supper (and there is the like reason of Baptism) Gods judgement overtook the *Corinthians*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 30. 4. That an abuse is to be rectified by Christs appointment, 1 *Cor.* 11. 23. Though the Dr. say, *the Lords Supper was derived and lightly changed from the Jewish observance of the post-canium*, yet did the Apostle not make their custome the Directory to regulate it by, but Christs appointment and example; and therefore such a negative argument is of invincible force in this case, if it be as I pretend; there is no intimation given in Scripture of that custome as the Directory for Christians in the use of Baptism, therefore that custome is not the pattern by which it is to be regulated, For otherwise it were very tyrannous, for Christ to impose a Law on mens consciences, to practise a rite after a pattern altogether unknown, and not so much as directed to. To say the first writers and readers of the New Testament knew the Jewish customes, is nothing to us, unless they had told us what they were, and that wee are to follow them. And if they did not tell us, they dealt unfaithfully in not doing that which was necessary to bee done for our information. 5. The declarations in the Jewish writers cannot be our Directory unless we were directed to them as our rule, or they were as the Canonical Scriptures to us. 6. The Jewish writers which mention this custome are later writers then the Apostles time, and therefore they could not bee the Directory, except we were referred to them by prognostication. 7. The Jewish writers could not be a Directory, except they could be had and read by those that need information from them. But how few of those millions of Christians and Preachers, who have need of direction in this thing, have heard much less have read, the Jewish writers, the *Talmud, Gemara, Maimonides*? 8. How uncertain are their determinations, even to those that read them, how cross one to another, appears somewhat by

what

what is said before. 9. Their intimations of this cuſtome are but obſcure, and their declarations in ſundry of the points in difference with ſo little evidence, that ſuch as Dr. *H.* and Mr. *Selden* differ about them. 10. The indications in Scripture *Job.* 3. 5, 10. are not ſuch but that (as hath been ſhewed) it may well be doubted, whether they point at the cuſtome of baptizing for initiating into Covenant, or another uſage at the birth of infants. 11. The matter it ſelf ſpeaketh not at all to us who know not the uſage. 12. The Dr. himſel ſaith p. 8. here, *It is highly unreaſonable that an inſtitution of Chriſts, ſuch as each Sacrament is, ſhould be judged of by any other rule, but either the words wherein the inſtitution is ſet down, or by the records of the practiſe, whether of Chriſt or the Apoſtles,* therefore it is highly unreaſonable that the controverſie of infant Baptiſm ſhould be judged by Jewiſh writers. 13. If *Chriſts ſole authority, and practiſe of his Apoſtles, be ſufficient Directory for Chriſtians in the uſe of Batiſm,* as the Dr. ſaith here, he doth very ill to make the Jewiſh cuſtome not known but by Jewiſh writers of dubious credit the pattern of it, and to expound Chriſts inſtitution by it, as if the Dial were to be ſet by the clock, and not the clock by the Dial; and all the Drs. pains about the Jewiſh cuſtome of baptiſing is ſuperfluous, and ſo onerous to the reader; and his way of probation of infant Baptiſm, which he counts more perfect then other ways, is found to be moſt imperfect and of no validity, but meerly deluſory.

I added 4. The inſtitution and practiſe would have been conformable to it. The Dr. tels me, *And ſo I ſay and have made it cleur that it was, as far as to the controverſie in hand we are or can bee concerned in it.* To which I return 1. That if the Jewiſh cuſtome were the pattern whence Chriſt copied out Baptiſm, it was ſo in all things, or elſe it was not the pattern; no man calls that the pattern, which having many particulars in it, is followed but in one. 2. The Dr. hath not made it appear by any teſtimony of Scripture or Father, but onely by his own confident ſpeeches, that ever Chriſt copied out his inſtitution of Baptiſm from the Jewiſh cuſtome, or if he did, it is moſt evident both from the Commiſſion *Matth* 28. 19. and from all the practiſe in the New Teſtament, if he altered it in any thing he altered it in this thing; though the Dr. would face us down, *He hath made clear* (by nothing but his own ſayings) *that the inſtitution and practiſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles have been conformable to it, as far as to the controverſie in hand he is or can bee concerned in it.* Yet he hath ſo much ingenuity as to add, *But ſaith Mr. T. the contrary appears, adding one main inſtance of the inconformity, and* 14. *leſſer diſparities; The main diſparity, ſaith he, is in their baptizing no infants of the Gentile at their firſt converſions, whereas the Jews baptized onely the Gentiles infants at their firſt proſelyting, not the infants of thoſe who were baptized in infancy. For the former of theſe he offers no manner of proof beyond his own affirmation, and therefore it is ſufficient to deny it as he knowes we do, and evidently begs the queſtion in aſſuming and not offering any proof to the contrary.*

Anſw. This is refuted ſo fully by all the fore going Sections of that Book of mine to which he anſwers, and the confeſſions of my Antago-

nists, and the story of the New Testament all along, besides what is said in this part of the *Review*, *sect.* 52. 94. that I think the Dr. hardly could say this without reluctancy of conscience. That he denied, that at their first conversions no infants of the Gentiles were baptized by the Apostles I did not know, yea I had reason from his own words *Letter of resolut. qu.* 4. §. 21. to conceive he did not deny it, forasmuch as if any place did evince the baptizing of infants of Gentiles at their first conversion, they must be those places *Acts* 16. 33. 1 *Cor.* 1. 16. Yet the Dr. saith, *the mention in Scripture of the Apostles baptizing a whole household at once*, Acts 16. 33. *is not of it self demonstrative or convincing: because that wider phrase may possibly be restrained to those that heard and believed in that family, and it is not certain of either of these, the Goalers or* Stephanus *household, that they had any so young as infants in their family; therefore it is confessed, that no concluding argument can be deduced thence.* If he deny it now he affirms the contrary, and so is to prove it, which that he either hath done or ever will, I do not imagine. A negative argument from Divine testimony in this case is demonstrative, till the contrary be made good.

The Dr. adds, *For the second, that of the Jewish practise he pretends no more then what hee had before cited by reference (but now sets down in words)* viz. *the affirmation of Mr.* Selden. *But I have already shewed how groundless that affirmation of Mr.* S. *was, as to the native Jews children, who were still baptized after the giving of the Law. And the same I now add for the children of those Proselytes who had been baptized in infancy, there appears not the least proof of this from the Jewish writers, who are the onely competent witnesses in it.*

Answ. If there were no more proof brought then what hath been, that the Jews baptizing the infants at first Proselytism, and the Apostles no infants at first conversion, it were proved; that the Apostles practise of baptism was not conformable to the Jewish custome: And for the other point, Mr. *Seldens* affirmation is in the judgement of such as knew both, as good as Dr. *Hammonds* negation. I confess I have not those Jewish writers he refers to, nor some Books of Mr. *Selden de successione in bona defuncti*, c. 26. *lib.* 1. *de successione in Pontificatu cap.* 2. in which by his reference I guess he hath more fully handled this point, yet do I imagin, that knowing the accurateness of the writer, any Reader will conceive that he had clear evidence for what he wrote, or else he would not have so often and so plainly avouched it, that the children of Proselytes after the first baptizing were not baptized, but onely circumcised according to the Jewish custome.

But the Dr. saith, "But for the contrary, I propose these two testi-
"nies taken notice of by Mr. S. himself *de Synedr. c.* 3. *out of Gemara*
"*Babylon*. He wants the right of a Proselyte for ever, unless he be bap-
"tized and circumcised. Here Baptism and Circumcision are joyned to-
"gether, as equally necessary to a Proselyte and that for ever. And
"Circumcision there is no doubt was to be received by every male,
"not onely at their first comming to the Church of the Jews, at their
"first Proselytism, but through all posterities, every child of a Prose-
"lyte

" lyte that was not circumciſed, became ſtraightwayes no Proſelyte:
" And then ſure this conjunction of Baptiſm with Circumciſion on theſe
" terms of equality, both of perpetual neceſſity to all Proſelytes, muſt
" needs extend the Baptiſm as well as the Circumciſion, beyond the
" firſt Proſelytes and their immediate children, to all their poſterity that
" ſhall come from them afterwards, for to all thoſe belonged Circumci-
" ſion. So again in the ſame place, And if he be not baptized, hee re-
" mains a Pagan or Gentile; Here I ſhall ask whether the childe of a
" Proſelyte who had been baptized in his infancy, were to be a Pagan
" for ever? I ſuppoſe it will be anſwered, no; And then by the force of
" that teſtimony of *Gemara* I conclude, therefore it muſt bee ſuppoſed
" that he was baptized, for elſe he would be a Pagan for ever.

Anſw. It were very ſtrange that Mr. *Selden* ſhould in the ſame chapter in which he cites thoſe words, *lib.* 1. *de Syned. c.* 3. *p.* 35. aſſert *p.* 28. before, and *p.* 41. after, *that neither Jews children after the giving the Law, nor Proſelytes children after their firſt Baptiſm, ſhould be baptized*, if the words there did import the contrary. And therefore though I want the book to conſider it, yet I doubt not the ſenſe of the words is plain thus, *that the Gentile who is not baptized at firſt as well as circumciſed, wants for ever, not onely a little while, the right of a Proſelyte*, and is the very ſame which both *Selden* there *p.* 39. cites out of *Maimonides Iſſuri bia. c.* 13 and *Ainſw. annot. on Gen.* 17. 12. *A ſtranger that is circumciſed and not baptized, or baptized and not circumciſed, he is not a Proſelyte till he be both circumciſed and baptiſed.* So that the ſenſe is not as the Dr. would, that no Proſelytes child ſhall have the right of a Proſelyte, unleſs that child be as well baptiſed as circumciſed, but this, that he that at his firſt Proſelytiſm is onely circumciſed and not baptiſed, ſhall ſtill want the right of a Proſelyte as if he were not circumciſed at all, till he be baptiſed as well as circumciſed. And that to be the meaning, is plain out of the words that *Selden* cites from the ſame Book p. 35. a little after, where *R. Eliezers opinion being that a perſon may be a Proſelyte if circumciſed though not baptiſed, becauſe ſo were their Fathers; and Rabbi Joſhuah's that he was a Proſelyte who was baptiſed and not circumciſed, becauſe ſo were their mothers*; it is ſaid, *that the wiſe men nevertheleſs have pronounced, that if any have been baptiſed and not circumciſed, or circumciſed and not baptiſed, he is not a Proſelyte till he is as well baptiſed as circumciſed*; and the ſame is the ſenſe of the other ſpeech. So that thoſe words do not ſpeak of any other then the firſt Proſelytes Baptiſm of that race, not of the poſterity, nor of the conjunction of Baptiſm and Circumciſion but at the firſt entrance into the Covenant; and therefore to the Drs. queſtion I ſay, the poſterity of a Proſelyte were Iſraelites not Pagans, though they were not baptiſed in their own perſons by vertue of the parents baptiſm, if they were not born before it.

The Dr. proceeds thus; " Beſides this two things I farther add, to
" remove all poſſible force of this ſuggeſtion; 1. that if it were granted
" in the full latitude wherein it is propoſed, that the Jews baptized no
" other infants of Proſelytes, but thoſe whom they had at their firſt con-
" verſion; yet this would nothing profit Mr. *T.* For it were then obvi-

" ous

"ous to affirm, that Christ who imitated the Jews in that, and so baptised the children of Christian Proselytes, did make some light change in "this, and farther then the pattern before him afforded, baptized all "the posterity that should succeed them, and were born in the Church "in their infancy also, the reason though not the pattern belonging equally to them as to the children of the first Proselytes, and the Jewish custome of baptizing their natives infants beeing fully home "to it.

Answ. The Dr. having tried to prove the posterity of the Proselytes born after their proselytism, to have been wont to bee baptized by the Jews, but distrusting it's likely it would not hold, yet thinks to use another engine, though it be as weak as the rest. For 1. he supposeth, *the Jews baptised native Jews infants after the giving the Law*, which is not true. 2. That *Christ imitated the Jews in baptising Proselytes children at first proselytism, and so baptised* the *children of Christian Proselytes at their first conversion*, which is manifestly false. 3. That *the Iews baptism was the pattern before Christ*, which is the thing in question. 4. That *some children are born in the Church Christians*, which is a mistake. 5. That *he made some light change in that of not baptising Proselytes posterity, and farther then the pattern before him afforded, baptised all the posterity that should succeed them, and were born in the Church in their infancy also.* Which is a palpable falshood, it being certain that Christ baptized none, nor appointed the baptizing of any Christians infants, and is against the Dr. For 1. if the custome were changed by Christ, then it was not the pattern. 2. The same proofs which shew a change in this, shew as much a change in the other. 3. This change is ill called a light change, which made so large a perpetual addition. 4. If the pattern did not belong equally to all the Christians posterity, as to the children of the first Proselytes, then the reason did not belong to them, sith the pattern according to the Dr. is all or the main reason, basis or foundation of infant Baptism with him. 6. It is also false, that *the reason of baptising* the *after children of Proselytes, or the native Iews infants after the giving of the Law was as before*, sith the reason of Baptism given by the Rabbins is the uncleanness of the baptized, which they deny of native Jews after the giving the Law, and of proselytes posterity born after their baptism. So that it may be easily perceived, that the Dr. hath not avoided the force of my objection against the Jews baptizing being Christs pattern, but heaped up many mistakes, and some against himself.

"2dly, *saith he* that it being by all granted, that the children which "the Proselytes had, at their first proselytism were baptized among the "Jews; this is as evident a confutation of the Antipædobaptist, and so "of Mr. *T.* as it would if all their infants to all posterity were baptized; "For by that very baptising of the infants at their first Proselytism, it "appears that infants may be baptized, for I hope those Proselytes infants are infants; And if any infants may and ought to be baptized, "then are all their pretentions destroyed, whose onely intereſt it is to "evince, *that no infants most or may be baptised.* And I hope this will be "of some use to Mr. *T.* when he shall have considered it.

Answ.

Answ. It is so, for thereby I perceive the inconsiderateness and vanity of the Drs. writing. I grant the one confutes me as well as the other, that is not at all. For what consequence is in this, I grant the Jews baptized Proselytes children at first proselytism, and this they did according to their custome; therefore I must grant that some infants of Christians may and ought to be baptized by Christian baptism? Did I ever grant that the Jewish baptism of any infants is to be our pattern, or was Christs pattern? Yea, do I not dispute against it? What a frivolous reason is this of so famous a Dr. *For by that very baptising of the infants at their first proselytism, it appears that infants may be baptized, for I hope those Proselytes infants are infants?* Howdoth it appear that what the Jews did we may do? Were infants of Proselytes to be baptized because they were infants? or are our infants to be baptized because infants, as the Drs. reason intimates? To omit his non sense of *hoping that infants are infants*, I tell him that I have considered this, and that I finde it *of no force to remove my suggestion*, that *my pretensions are not destroyed*, but that he hath shewed more futility in this passage, so seriously presented to my consideration, then I should easily have imagined in such a man as he is.

But yet the Dr. adds, *The onely way Mr. T. hath to confirm this of the Jews not baptising any infants of Proselytes born after their first conversion, and baptism is the resolution of the Jews, that if a woman great with child became a Proselyte and were baptized, her child needs not baptism when 'tis born. And this I had cited §. 109. out of the Rabbins, and so indeed I find it in* Maimonides. tit. Isuri bia. c. 13. *But I cannot think that (whether true or false) a sufficient proof to infer the conclusion; For the Jewish Drs. might probably thus resolve upon this other ground, because the mother and the child in her womb, being esteemed as one person, the woman great with child being baptized, they might deem the child baptized as well as the woman, and not account it needfull to repeat it after the birth, which yet (by the way) it seems they would have done, if they had not deemed the child all one with the mother, and consequenly they must bee supposed to baptise those children which were begotten to the* Proselyte *after the time of his or her first conversion and baptism. And accordingly the Christian Doctors in the Council of* Neocæsarea can. 6. *having resolved the contrary to that Jewish hypothesis, viz.* That ὅτι ἕτερον κοινωνεῖ ἡ τίκτουσα τῷ τικτομένῳ, that the mother that bears the child differs from the child, or is not at all one with it; *and her confession in baptism is, ἰδία proper or particular to her self, and belongs not to the childe in her womb, give the* (κυοφορᾶσα) the woman that is with child, *and is then converted to the Faith, leave to be baptised when she pleases, supposing that the child which then she carries, shall, notwithstanding her baptism, then be its self baptised after its birth. which as it is a clear answer to the argument deduced from the resolution of the Jews in that point, so 'tis moreover an evidence how little of proof Mr. T. had either from his own observation, or Mr.* Seldens *Testimonies, from all which he can produce no other but this, which in the sound is so far from affirming what he would have, and upon examination is found to conclude the contrary.*

Answ.

Answ. The Dr. hath a strange fancy, to think he can conclude the contrary to what I infer from those words of the Jewish Drs. that when they resolve the child needs not be baptized, therefore they were wont to baptize the children of Proselytes born after their proselytism, As if the Jewish custome were contrary to their Drs. resolution, when they say it needs not, yet they should do it; if so, how vainly doth the Dr. talk but a little before, that "The Jewish writers are the onely competent witnesses in this thing] and proves all along this Chapter their custome by these very writers?

But let's heed his reason; "the Jewish Drs. might resolve it upon "another ground, the childs being one with the mother, and so the "baptism needless to that child, which yet by the way (or rather out of "the way) it seems they would have done, if they had not deemed the "childe all one with the mother, and consequently other children must "be supposed to be baptized.] So the Dr. upon an imaginary ground, of which he brings no proof or shew of proof, and a conjecture of his own, that seems to him but to none else, infers downright *they must be supposed to baptise other children.* It must be so, because αὐτὸς ἔφα he is a Rabbin, Dr. chair, of the *irrefragabilis Magister noster*; if he say the right hand is the left we must say so too. But yet I am *Joannes ad appositum*, and think I have better cards to shew for my inference then Dr. *H.* for his. Mr. *Selden* who is also *Joannes ad oppositum l. 2. de jure nat. &c. c 4. p. 170.* speaks not doubtfully like Dr. *H.* when he puts in his *parenthesis* (*whether true or false*) but cites *Gemar. Babylon. ad Tit. Jabim. cap. 8. fol. 78. a* and *Maimonides halach Isuri bia. c. 13. Shulcan Aruch lib. Jore Dea cap. 268. b* and having set down the Jewish Doctors resolution, that "if a woman great with childe be made a Proselyte, and so received by "baptism, her child needs not baptism;] he adds, *nimirum ex eo quod nata est* בקושה *seu in sanctitate matris aut* ביהדות *in ejus Judaismo* (*nam hisce sic utuntur vocibus*) *Proselyti seu matris conditionem induebat*, that is, "to wit because in as much as it was born in the holiness of the "mother, or in her Judaism (for so they use these words) it put on the "condition of the mother,] that is, was holy, or a Jew as the mother, and so needed not baptism, which plainly shews they counted not their children who were holy, or Jews born after the parents baptism to need baptism, and consequently did not baptize them. Nor doth the resolution of the *Council of Neocæsarea* any whit help the Doctour. For what consequence is in this, there were some Christians in the 4th. Century since Christ, who did imagine the mothers baptism might serve for the child, perhaps (for that's the Drs. conjecture onely) because they thought the child and mother one, therefore the Jewish Drs. resolution is upon that ground, and to be limited to those onely? And for the Drs. mention of the words of the Council, it is against himself, though imperfectly done; For 1. it supposeth, "the mother that bears the child differs "from the child, and her confession in Baptism is, ἰδίᾳ, proper or par-"ticular to her self, and belongs not to the childe in her womb;] Therefore according to the resolution of that Council in Baptism, the parent and childe are not one, nor the parents confession of faith stands

for

for the child. 2. It expresly affirmeth two things which quite destroy Pædobaptists principles. 1. That *in baptism she that bringeth forth communicates nothing to the child brought forth*, therefore the parents faith or baptism communicates no priviledge, or right of baptism to the child. 2. That *every ones free choise in confession is shewn or to be shewn in baptism*; therefore no child is to be baptized according to that Councils determination, but upon its own confession out of free choise shewed or signified by it self. But of this *Canon* I have said something before. By this which is said it appears how far the Dr. hath bin from giving a *clear answer to the argument*, or *examining* any thing (as it was fit he should and that rather he hath so handled this point, as if his study were like *Protagoras* in *Gellius*, *to make a bad cause to seem good*, or *Anaxagoras* to prove snow black.

Sect. 6. The Dr. writes thus; "This grand disparity then being cleared to be Mr. *T.* his mistake, I shall not need to attend his other instances of disparity, this accord which hath been already mentioned and vindicated, being sufficient to my pretensions, and no concernment of mine obliging me to believe or affirm, that the parallel holds any farther then Christ was pleased it should, and of that we are to judge by what the Scriptures or ancient Church tels us was the practice of him or his Apostles; For 1. the Jews I doubt not brought in many things of their own devising into this, as into other institutions of Gods, and the later Jews more, as of the Proselytes being so born again in baptism, that lying with his natural sister was no incest, and the like: And 2. Christ, I doubt not, changed the Jewish Oeconomy in many things, as in laying aside Circumcision, in commissionating his Disciples to baptize (and they leaving it in the hands of the Bishop, and those to whom he should commit it. It is not lawful to baptize without the Bishop, saith *Ignatius*, *Ep ad Smyrn edit. Voss. p. 6.*) whereas it was not among the Jews any part of the Priests office, any more then circumcision was; And so in many other particulars. But what is that to my pretensions, who affirm no more of the accordance betwixt the Jewish and Christian practice, then either by some indications in the Scripture it self, or by the Christian Fathers deductions from the Apostles times, appears to be meant by Christ, and practised by the Apostles; and then by the Jewish writers is as evident to have to have been in use among them. And this is all the return I need make to his fourteen lesser disparities, and all that he hath at large endeavoured to infer from them, supposing and granting them all to be such.

Answ. Dr. *H.* had expresly asserted the Jewish custome of Baptising Proselytes, to be *the pattern, whence Christian Baptism was copied out, and what is set down in the* N. T. *i. e. in the words of Christs institution, or in his or the Apostles practise, he calls a copy of their custome as the pattern, Letter of resol. qu.* 4. *S.* 24. And what was the Jewish custome, he proves onely from the *Talmud*, *Gemara*, *Maimonides*, or other Jewish writers; and says *p.* 27. *they are the onely competent witnesses in it*, which if so, his pretensions are made void if there be one, much more if there be one main one, and 14. lesser disparities. For sure what is a pattern

must be followed, and is in all, or else it ceaseth to be a pattern. Had *Moses* made *that which was shewed him in the Mount his pattern*, if he had onely done according to it in two, or three, or one thing and not in the rest? Besides, how doth or can the Dr. prove the one to have been the pattern to the other, but by the universal conformity? To say, it is a pattern when they agree in one or two things and differ in 14. is all one as to say, a womans coat is the pattern of a mans doublet, because they agree in having sleeves, or a Temple is the pattern of a dwelling house, because they have both doors and windows. The Dr. therefore doth in my apprehension pull down what he hath all this while been erecting, by his acknowledging both *the Jews bringing in many things of their own devising otherwise then Christ appointed, and Christs changing their Oeconomy in many things, and making the accordance no further then Christ was pleased it should hold, and of that we are to judge by what the Scriptures or ancient Church tels us, was the practise of him or his Apostles.* For 1. then it will follow, that infant Baptism can never be proved to be from Christ or the Apostles, sith it can never be proved that they practised it or appointed it to be practised according to the Jewish custome. 2. The Dr. hath meerly abused his Reader, endeavouring to possess him as if infant Baptism might be better proved from the Jewish custome in their writers, then from the Scripture; and yet in the conclusion, the Jewish custome is disclaimed as a pattern, any farther then the Scriptures or ancient *Church* tell us was the practise of him or his Apostles, and by pretending that to be pattern, which is not to be followed any farther then we may judge by another Directory Christ was pleased it should hold. I let pass what the Dr. saith, *of Christs commissionating his Distiples to baptize, and they leaving it in the hands of the Bishop, and those to whom he should commit it*, as not pertinent to the present business, though otherwise many things might thence be gathered, to shew that Bishops were not such in late dayes as they were anciently, or they were very negligent in committing this great business of Baptism to so many ignorant drunken Priests (who often did it in their drink) which should have been done by themselves, and consider what followes.

But yet, saith the Dr. *it is evident that some of them are not such; As when he saith, the Baptism of males must be with Circumcision and an offering, 'tis clear that, though* 1. *Circumcision be laid aside by Christ, and* 2. *when it was used it had nothing to do with Baptism, yet as to the adjoyning of offering or sacrifice, the parallel still holds, the prayers of the Church being the Christian sacrifice, and those in the Christian Church solemnly attendant on the administration of Baptism.*

Answ. 1. If Circumcision when it was used had nothing to do with Baptism, how could the Dr. (as he doth here *ch.* 1. *sect.* 1.) take on him from Circumcision to prove (not the *duety*, yet) *the lawfulness of infant Baptism.* 2. The sacrifice which was required at the initiating a Proselyte, was *a burnt offering of a beast, or two Turtle Doves, or two young Pigeons, both of them for a burnt offering*; so *Maimonides tit. Issurbia. c.* 13. as *Ainsworth annot. on Gen.* 17. 12. *Selden de syned. l.* 1. *c.* 3. cite him, but that is not prayer, nor is it any more agreeable to the

Jewish

Jewish custome to use prayer without it, then to use circumcision of the heart, *Col.* 2. 11. without the outward, or the answer of a good conscience towards God without baptism with water; and yet the rubrick of the Common Prayer Book in private Baptism allowed (if time did not suffer) it to be done without so much as saying the Lords Prayer.

The Dr. adds. "So parallel to the Court of three Israelites, by the "confession or profession of whom (saith *Maimonides*) the infant was "baptized, we have now not onely the whole Church, in the presence "of whom 'tis publikely administred, and when more privately, yet in "the presence of some Christians, who are afterwards, if there be any "doubt, to testifie their knowledge to the Church; but more particu- "larly the Godfathers and Godmothers, being themselaes formerly "baptized, do represent the Church, and the Minister commissionated "thereto by the Bishop, represents the Church also, meaning the Go- "vernors thereof.

Answ. Though Baptism by women and others not commissionated by a Bishop have heretofore been tollerated, and been taken for currant Baptism, and the terming the Governours of the Church the Church, be language not like the Scripture, but the Canon law, and the use of Gossips be a vain device, and the Minister commissionated by the Bishop, with the Gossips sometimes so ignorant of the knowledge of Christ, that they are not fit to bee among Christians, nor to be taken to represent a Church of Christ, nor do they stand under that notion at the usual baby sprinkling, but as sureties or proxies to the child; and in private Baptism there's none of these sometimes, yet were all the Dr. saith yeilded, this is not according to the Jewish custome, which *required a kinde of court of three Israelites skilfull in Law to approve it*, or else it is void, and so as Judges of the Baptism, of which sort the other are not.

The Dr. adds; But I shall not proceed to such superfluous considera- "tions, and so I have no need of adding one word more of reply to his "24. Chapter (as far as I am concerned in it) unless it bee to tell him "that the Bishops Canons are not the rule by which I undertake to de- "fine, wherein the Jewish custome must be the pattern, wherein not; "(but as he cannot but know, if he had read the resolution of the 4th. "Quære) the practise of the Apostles of Christ, by the testifications of "the Fathers of the Church made known unto us, to which as I have "reason to yeild all authority, so I finde the Canons and rituals as of "this, so of all other Churches in the world (no one excepted) to bear "perfect accordance therewith, in this particular of infant Baptism "(though in other lesser particulars they differ, many among themselvs, "and all from the Jewish pattern.) And this I hope is a competent "ground of my action, and such as may justifie it to any Christian Ar- "tist to bee according to rules of right reason, of meekness, and sound "doctrine, and no work of passion, or prejudice, or singularity, or "(as Mr. *T.* suggests) of the Drs. own pleasure, as if that were the "mutable principle of all these variations from the Jewish pattern.

Answ. 1. To call *Cyprian*, *Augustine*, &c. Fathers of the Church, which is elsewhere stiled their mother, is scarce consistent. 2. To yeeld all au-

thority to the practise of the Apostles of Christ, by the testifications of the Fathers of the Church made known to us there is no reason; this is due onely to the holy Scripture: they testifie sundry things as the Apostles practise, which was not so, they speak sometimes in these things confidently upon false reports, this would be an inlet to many superstitions, the Canons of Councils, and Rituals of Churches are so full of weaknes and blemishes, as that they would be counted most useless writings to direct in faith or worship, did not their age make some men dote on them. That all Churches accord in infant Baptism cannot be true. The Common Prayer book is not justifiable in the allowing that which is termed privat baptism, in the use of sureties their mimical or false answers, saying they desire to be baptized, when it is not so. The Drs. exposition *Letter of resol. q.* 4 §. 116. *I believe*, i. e. *this child stands bound by by these presents to believe*, &c. is so ridiculous (and *Augustines tom.* 2. *Ep.* 28. *ad Bonifacium* is like it) as that did not prejudice, or preingagement, or some other like reason prevail with Dr. *H.* he would never defend it. That which the Dr. makes *a competent ground of his action*, doth not justifie his tenet of infant Baptism to be according to rules of reason and sound doctrine, whether he vary or not in his determinations from that which hee makes the pattern as hee pleaseth, or the Bishops Canons order, let the Reader judge by what is said, and that which followes.

"Of this score, saith he, 'tis somewhat strange, which he thinks fit "to add concerning the form of Baptism, in the name of the Father, and "the Son, and the Holy Ghost; In this one thing, saith he, which Christ "did not prescribe, nor did the Apostles, that we finde so conceive it, "yet saith the Dr. Christs prescription must be indispensably used. In "reply to this I shall not spend much time to evidence this form to bee "Christs prescription, if the expres words at his parting from the "world, *Matth.* 28. Go ye therefore, and teach or receive to discipleship, all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the "Son, and the Holy Ghost, be not a prescription of Christs, and if "the universal doctrine and continual practise of the whole Church "through all times, be not testimony sufficient of the Apostles conceiving it thus, and a competent ground of the indispensable continuing "the use of it; I shall not hope to perswade with him, onely I shall "minde him of the words of S. *Athanasius in his Epistle to Serapion tom.* "*p* 204. He that is not baptized into the name of all three, receives no"thing, remains empty and imperfect. For perfection is in the Trinity, "no Baptism perfect it seems but that. And if this will not yet suffice, "I shall then onely demand, whether he can produce so expres grounds "from Christ or the Apostles, or the universal Church of God through "all ages, or from any one ancient Father, for his denying Baptism to "infants."

Answ What grounds we can produce from Christ, and Apostles for denying infant Baptism, may be seen in the 2d. *Part of this Review sect.* 5, &c. what from Fathers in this, and some other of my writings; that which Christ prescribed is indispensably to be used, to baptize into the Name

Name of the Father, Son and Holy, but all the queſtion is about theſe words [*I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt*] whether Chriſt have preſcribed them to be indiſpenſably uſed; ſo as that if any ſay, I baptize thee in the name of Chriſt, or the Lord Jeſus, or be thou baptized, or as the *Greeks* uſe it [Let this ſervant of Chriſt bee baptized] into the Name of Father, Son and Spirit, or, This perſon is baptized by me into the profeſſion and owning of the Father of Chriſt the onely true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom he hath ſent, and the Comforter whom he ſent as his Lord and Maſter, this be not agreeable to Chriſts preſcription. I conceive it is, and that neither did Chriſt preſcribe thoſe very words the Dr. ſets down, but the thing (of which *Grotius Annot. in Matth.* 28. 19. may be ſeen, where the Dr. may ſee, that *to be baptized into the Name*, is not all one with baptizing with the expreſs naming of each of theſe, but another thing, and how the ancients varied in their expreſſions; and how *Irenæus lib.* 3 *c.* 20. ſaith, *In nomine Chriſti ſubauditur qui unxit, & ipſe qui unctus eſt, & ipſa unctio in qua unctus eſt.*) Nor the Apoſtles when they preſcribed Baptiſm into the name of Chriſt, without mentioning the other perſons, *Acts* 2. 38. & 10. 48. & 8. 16. *Lumbard l.* 4. *ſent. diſt* 3. *Qui baptizat in nomine Chriſti, baptizat in nomine Trinitatis, quæ ibi intelligitur*; and this *Ambroſe* before ſpake, *in lib.* 1. *de ſpir. ſanct. c.* 3. *piſcat. ſchol. in Matth.* 28. 19. *But it is not to be thought that in theſe words, Chriſt commands Miſters or Paſtors of the Church, that in baptizing they ſhould pronounce theſe words, I baptize thee into the Name of the Father, &c. For neither do the words of Chriſt ſo ſound? nor may this be concluded from them by neceſſary conſequence. But he onely commands, that they baptize in the Name of the Father, &c. which may be done, although theſe words be not pronounced in baptizing.* And therefore that which I ſaid, needed not bee ſomewhat ſtrange to the Dr. And for the words of the Drs. *Practical catech. l.* 6. §. 2. the words do ſhew what I ſaid the Dr. confeſſed, to have been no miſ-reporting of his words; who did not ſay, *he affirmed the putting under water (uſed by the primitive Church to be appointed by Chriſt, excluſively to ſprinkling*, but that *by Chriſts appointment the baptized was to be dipt in water*, i. e. *according to the primitive ancient cuſtome to bee put under water*, and ſaid expreſly he allowed of ſprinkling, and yet varied from the Jewiſh pattern which required immerſion; and from Chriſts appointment (which though he propounded diſjunctively, yet I knew it could not be ſo underſtood) and from the primitive cuſtome, and yet in another thing not ſo preſcribed, will have it to be indiſpenſably uſed, which ſhews his variableneſs.

SECT. XCVII.

Matth. 28. 19. *Infants are excluded from being ſubjects of Baptiſm, notwithſtanding Dr.* Hammonds *pretenſions.*

TO what Dr. *H. Defence of infants Baptiſm ch. 2 ſect.* 1. ſaith, I reply. 1. That his writing for the Common Prayer Book, is evidence of aſcribing more then was meet to the Canons of Prelates, ſith the Common Prayer Book ſtood as well by the Prelates Canons, as the Act of Parliament, and thoſe that are for the one are for the moſt part for the other. 2. It appears to me that he hath offended much againſt the Sacrament of Baptiſm, in his Defence of infant Baptiſm, the uſe of ſureties, ſprinkling in ſtead of Baptiſm according to the Common Prayer Book, all which are mentioned before. 3. This to me is a ſigne that the Dr. aſcribes too much to the Canon which enjoyned ſubſcription and conformity to the Common Prayer Book, in that he hath oppoſed, as much I think as any man of his rank, the reformation of theſe and ſuch other faults as were in it. 4. If there were a *Catechesis* in the term *allegation*, then my uſe of it proves not my ſignification that the Dr. did *produce Matth.* 28. 19. *as a proof of his poſition*: yet when I conſider how the Dr. *Letter of reſol. q.* 4. *ſect.* 24, 25. doth make *the Jewiſh baptiſm the pattern whence the Chriſtian is copied out*, and ſaith; *Chriſtian baptiſm hath nothing in the Copy to exclude Chriſtians children, which copy is ſet down in the N. T.* i e. *in the words of inſtitution, and theſe words* §. 25. *are no other then thoſe Matth.* 28. 19. which he endeavours to prove not onely not to exclude, but alſo to include Chriſtians children, as he ſpeaks §. 121. *Chriſts baptiſm being founded in the Jews cuſtome of baptizing of Proſelytes, and the cuſtome among them being known to be this, to baptize the Proſelytes and their children, the indefinite command of baptizing all nations, was all that was needfull to comprehend the children alſo of thoſe that received the faith of Chriſt.* I do ſtill conceive he did allege *Matth.* 28. 19. as a proof of his poſition, though not by it ſelf, yet with his imagined pattern of the Jewiſh cuſtome, and that though he would not openly, yet by his contending ſo much for the equivalency of Diſciple and Proſelyte, and the extent of the term Proſelyte, and his acknowledgement of theſe words to be the copy in the *N. T.* he did tacitely yeeld, that if thoſe words *Matth.* 28. 19. include not infants under the diſcipled, then there is ſomething in the *N. T.* which excludes infants from Baptiſm. Nor is he at all relieved by what he ſaith, that *whatever were the notion of Diſcipling there, yet hee could not deem infants thereby excluded from Baptiſm, whom by another* medium, viz. *the Apoſtolical practice hee ſuppoſed to be admitted to it by Chriſts inſtitution*; for that very *medium* is to prove it to have been Chriſts inſtitution, and *Matth.* 28. 19. comprehends the words of inſtitution, and is the copy of the original, and therefore it's tacitely implied, that if infants be not proved to bee included

ded *Matth.* 28. 19. there is ſomething againſt infant Baptiſm in the *N. T.* nor is it true that *in that which is not included, is not preſently excluded*, for in all ſuch inſtitutions or appointments, what is not included is preſently excluded. Our Lord argues *Matth.* 19. 5, 6. *two ſhall bee one fleſh*, therefore more then two are excluded; the Apoſtle 1 *Cor.* 11. 23. thus Chriſt appointed the Lords Supper, therefore no otherwiſe, wine is appointed therefore water is excluded, eating is preſcribed therefore reſervation is excluded, let the ſelf-examiner eat, therefore infants excluded; the Dr. himſelf, *baptizing in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, preſcribed* Mat. 28. 19. *therefore that from indiſpenſably to be uſed* If the Dr. would look on ſuch a deſpicable piece, he might ſee this further proved in that Book a part whereof hee anſwers, *Review part.* 2. *ſect.* 5. if not he may finde enough in *Jewels Sermon at Pauls Croſs* 1560. and in all ſorts of Proteſtant writers, which by reducing things to the primitive inſtitution, exclude other things added by men as abuſes. But the Dr. tels me, *he that ſaith man is a living creature, doth not thereby deny an Angel to be ſo alſo*; True, but this is impertinent, ſith this is a propoſition not a command; and as impertinent is the other, *when Chriſt gives his Diſciples power to heal diſeaſes*, Matth. 10. 1. *he cannot be deemed to with hold from them power of raiſing the dead, for that we ſee comprehended in their Commiſſion v.* 8. for this is not an inſtance of an inſtitution of what they ſhould do, but a relation of what CHRIST gave them.

To my arguing from paſſages of the Doctors *Letter of reſol. q.* 4. §. 55, 92, 94. *pract. cat l.* 6. §. 2. that infants are not baptized according to Chriſts inſtitution, and Baptiſm no Sacrament to them, he tels me; 1. *That Chriſts inſtitution of Baptiſm was not (nor is ever affirmed by him to be) ſet down in thoſe words of* Matth. 28. *that having been long before inſtituted and practiſed, as appears by plain words, Joh.* 4. 1, 2. Whereto I anſwer; 1. The firſt is not true, for in his *Letter of reſol. q.* 4. § 24. he mensions, *the copy of Baptiſm ſet down in the* N. T. i. e. *in the words of inſtitution, which* §. 25. ſhews are thoſe *Matth.* 28. 19. and §. 29 having as he thinks avoided the excluſion of infants, from the command *Matth.* 28. 19. he ſaith, *Nothing is diſcernable in Chriſts inſtitution of Baptiſm, which can exclude infant children of Chriſtians from it*, and again he terms them, *that inſtitution of Baptiſm for all nations.* 2. His reaſon is as frivolous. For though it were inſtituted before, yet it was ſet down *Matth.* 28. 19. as the inſtitution of the Lords Supper was before the Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, yet is ſet down 1 *Cor.* 11. 23.

"Secondly, ſaith hee, that though Chriſts will and inſtitution for "baptizing infants be not ſo manifeſtly expreſt in thoſe words, *Matth.* "28. 19. as ſhall be able by the bare force of the words to convince any "gain-ſayer, without any other way of evidence or proof added to it, "yet by the Apoſtles practiſe of baptizing infants (appearing to us by "other means) it is moſt evident that they who certainly did not mi"ſtake Chriſts meaning, did thus underſtand and extend his inſtitution "and commiſſion. The truth of this is there made more evident §. 30, "*&c.* I ſhall not here repeat it.

Anſw.

Answ. 1. It is to be observed, that here the Dr. makes Christs will, institution, and commission, to be expreſt in thoſe words *Matth.* 28. 19. and yet in the next words before he ſaid, *Christs inſtitution of Baptiſm was not (nor is ever affirmed by him to be) ſet down in thoſe words* Matth. 28. 19. *Quo teneam nodo?* 2. That he acknowledgeth *Christs will and inſtitution for baptizing infants, is not ſo manifeſtly expreſt in thoſe words* Matth. 28. 19. *as ſhall be able by the bare force of the words to convince any gain-ſayer.* Now ſure if not there, nowhere. As for his other proof from other places, it is ſo fully proved here to be vain, that if the Dr. do not, others will ſee it to be ſo.

Yet he adds, *Secondly that the infant when he is to bee baptized, doth though not by his own voice perſonally, yet by his lawfull proxies, which the Church accepteth in his ſtead, profeſt the believing in three, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, deliver himſelf up to three,* &c.

Answ. How comes any man to bee a childs proxy, who doth not make him ſo? By what law becomes he a lawful proxy? Where did God allow him to become a proxy or ſurety for an infant? How dares any take upon him to be a ſurety of the Covenant, which is Chriſts office *Heb.* 7. 22? With what face can any Chriſtian ſay the child believs, or deſires to be baptized, when the child at that very inſtant, by its crying ſhews its unwillingneſs thereto? How dares any undertake it ſhall believe, when it is not in his power to give faith, and ſo many do not believe, but oppoſe the faith, who are thus baptized? What warrant hath any parent, or (as Mr. *Baxter* terms the Goſſips) *proparent*, to profeſs the faith of Chriſt in behalf of an infant, and to deſire Chriſtian baptiſm for it? What is the Church the Doctour means, that accepts a proxies profeſſion in ſtead of the childe? Who gave them or that perſon the name of the Church? What Commiſſion, whence have the Church power to exchange and commute ones profeſſion for anothers? Who gave the Miniſter authority to alter Chriſts inſtitution, and to accept of that which Chriſt never appointed in ſtead of that which Chriſt appointed? It is undoubtedly a moſt high preſumption, derogatory to Chriſts peculiar office, forbidden *Matth.* 23. 8. for any Miniſter, or Biſhop, or Council, or Congregation, who are all to be ſubject to Chriſt, and to follow his preſcriptions, to take on them in ſtead of the perſons own profeſſion before Baptiſm to accept of anothers, as a proxy, parent, or proparent his confeſſion, inſtead of the baptized perſons profeſſion? Though I marvail not that Dr. *Hammond* a man Prelatical, who too much favours corruptions in Fathers, Councils, and Prelates, diſguiſing them under the name of the Church, which is a pretence for many ſuperſtitions, ſhould thus determine: yet I wonder how Mr. *Baxter* and thoſe who have oppoſed the uſe of the Croſs in Baptiſm, and other abuſes of Papiſts and Prelates, ſhould having proved in his ad. *Diſputation of right to Sacraments*, that none but Profeſſors of ſaving faith and repentance are to be baptized, yet without the leaſt proof or ſhadow of proof, but a parents or proparents profeſſion inſtead of an infants, and without any inſtitution or practiſe in the New Teſtament, dare to teach and accordingly to practiſe infant Baptiſm, and to require

par-

parents or others to profeſs the faith to that end, and in their ſtead. Juſt zeal to the glory of God and honour of Chriſt, and his truth, makes me thus earneſt; no man can juſtly blame me in inveighing againſt, if not the hypocriſie of ſuch men, yet certainly the iniquity of them who oppoſe humane inventions in one thing and not in another, and the wickedneſs of them who either by Conſiſtorial ſentences excommunicate as Heretiques, or by exciting Magiſtrates againſt them perſecute, or in preaching exclaim, or otherwiſe oppoſe thoſe that will not yeeld to ſuch corruptions, though obtruded under the name of the Church.

I had ſaid, yea if the poſitive will of Chriſt be the reaſon of Baptiſm, they uſurp upon Chriſts prerogative, who baptize otherwiſe then Chriſt hath appointed, and then if the precept of Chriſt doth not neceſſarily infer infant Baptiſm (which the Dr. ingenuouſly acknowledgeth) it doth by manifeſt conſequence deny it, ſith hee forbids that to be done otherwiſe then he hath appointed when he hath determined how it ſhould be done. The Dr. when hee ſaith above, *the words [I baptize into the Name of the Father, Son, and Ghoſt] muſt be indiſpenſably uſed*; me think by the ſame reaſon ſhould conceive Chriſts inſtitution ſhould bee unalterably uſed in baptizing thoſe onely whom he hath appointed to be baptized; Hereupon the Dr. ſaith thus.

" To this the grounds of anſwer have been already laid alſo, *viz.* that " they that baptize infants, baptize no otherwiſe then Chriſt appointed, and the Apoſtles appear to have underſtood his appointment. " By Chriſts appointment not meaning particularly his words *Matth.* 28. " but his will, otherwiſe made known to his Diſciples, when and in what " words ſoever it was that he inſtituted baptiſm, which muſt be long before this, even before his Apoſtles took on them to baptize any, which " yet they did in great abundance, *Joh.* 4. 1. And of this appointment " or inſtitution of Baptiſm by Chriſt it is moſt true, that if that precept of Chriſt, whereby hee firſt inſtituted Baptiſm, did not indeed " comprenend, and ſo neceſſarily infer infant Baptiſm, and was ſo underſtood to do by the Apoſtles, it ſhal conſequently be deemed to deny " it. But then herein lies a great fallacy, when from another appointment of Chriſt, *viz.* that *Matth.* 28. which I acknowledge not to infer infant Baptiſm neceſſarily, he aſſumes *in univerſum*, and reports " it as my confeſſion, that Chriſts Precept (indefinitely taken, " and ſo extending to all Chriſts Precepts at any time) doth not neceſſarily infer infant Baptiſm. Which is that grand illogical fault in diſcourſe of inferring an indefinite or univerſal concluſion from particular premiſes. As for the compariſon which he makes betwixt the indiſpenſable uſe of the words of Baptiſm *Matth.* 28. and the as unalterable obſervation of Chriſts inſtitution in reſpect of the Perſons to be " baptized, I willingly grant it, on the condition premiſed, that he miſtake not the text *Matth* 28. to be the words of that inſtitution, wherein Chriſt defined who are to be baptized. Thoſe words are a Commiſſion to the Apoſtles to go Preach to or Diſciple all Nations, and thus " far extends to point out the perſons, *viz.* that they ſhould (as Diſciple " ſo) baptize Gentiles as well as Jews; and again, they are expreſs for

"the form of Baptiſm, that it ſhould be in the name of the Father, the "Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, but they are not any kinde of direction to "that other matter of receiving and admitting infants or not infants. "That I ſuppoſe ſufficiently notified to them before, both by the com-"mon practiſe of their anceſtors in the Jewiſh Religion by the vulgar "notion of Baptiſm, whileſt it was familiarly uſed among the Jewes, "both to their own and their Proſelytes children, and alſo by Chriſts "ſpecial direction (though the Goſpels, which expreſs not at all the "words of the firſt inſtitution of Baptiſm do not ſet that down) in the "time of his Preaching among them, ſome while before that paſſage of "ſtory related, *Joh.* 4. 1, *&c.* From both of theſe, I ſuppoſe the Apo-"ſtles learnt it (and not from *Matth.* 28.) and we learn it onely from "the Apoſtles, as ſhall hereafter appear.

Anſw. That the Apoſtles learnt infant Baptiſm from Chriſt, or Dr. *Hammond* from the Apoſtles, hath not been made appear as yet. What he hath produced from *Tertullian* and the *Greek Fathers*, from 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. and from the Jewiſh cuſtome, hath been already examined and ſhewed to be inſufficient to that end. His grants are, that if Chriſt did not inſtitute at firſt infants Baptiſm, nor the Apoſtles ſo underſtood it, it ſhould conſequently be deemed to deny it; and if he did otherwiſe appoint it, then infants are excluded; and what is *Matth.* 28. 19. preſcribed, is indiſpenſably to be uſed; but he ſuppoſeth a fore-going inſtitution comprehending infant Baptiſm, notified otherwiſe then by *Mat.* 28. 19. that *Matth.* 28. 19. determines neither *pro* nor *con:* for nor againſt infants Baptiſm, that I infer illogically, becauſe not in *Matth.* 28. 19. inſtituted, therefore no where elſe. And I do acknowledge I do ſo conceive, that the Dr. having made *that the copy*, and confeſſing infant Baptiſm *not to be neceſſarily inferred thence*, and *that wee muſt do no otherwiſe then Chriſt appoints* he muſt tacitely deny infant Baptiſm; and this inference of mine is logical. What the Dr. ſaith to the contrary doth not avoid it. For 1. it is not true that *Matth.* 28. 19. *the words are not any kinde of direction to this matter of receiving and admitting infants or not infants.* For 1. it expreſſeth who are to bee baptized, when it ſaith, *baptiſing them*, now [*them*] muſt refer either to [*all nations*] without any other circumſcription, and then he muſt appoint them to baptize every man in the world, believer or not. But that is abſurd, *Ergo.* Or [*them*] muſt refer to [*Diſciples*] included in the Verb [*Diſciple* or *make Diſciples*] but if ſo, not onely the Gentiles as well as Jewes are pointed out, but alſo the qualification of them, whom they ſhould baptize, they are to be Diſciples, now infants are diſciples and not diſciples, there's no middle term between contradictory terms, therefore there muſt be ſome direction to baptize infants or not infants. 2. Theſe words are *the copy of the pattern* as the Dr ſaith *ubi ſupra*, therefore if theſe words have no direction for infant Baptiſm, the pattern had not; For the Copy and Pattern do agree with each other, as the Decree and the Copy of it out of the Court.

2. It is not true that this is not the firſt inſtitution wee are to have directions from in our practiſe, who baptize Gentiles. For there is

is no institution concerning baptizing the Gentiles before that *Matth.* 28. 19. and therefore hence must be direction for baptizing or not our infants, there being no institution preceedent as concerning them. Nor did the Apostles follow any other, as is proved in the 2d. *part* of this *Review sect.* 5.

3. It is false, that *the former institution did comprehend infant Baptism.* The contrary is proved, 1. From the place which sets down their practise, *Joh.* 4. 1. it is there said, *they made Disciples and baptised.* Whence I argue. 1. Those onely whom the Apostles baptized, Christ appointed to be baptized; But they baptized not infants, *ergo* Christ did not then appoint them to baptize them. The *major* is out of doubt their practise onely shewing Christs institution. The *minor* is proved, 1. They baptized none but whom they made Disciples, but they made no infants Disciples, as will be proved in that which follows, and may bee further thus proved. Such persons were made disciples by Christ and his Disciples, as were made disciples by *John*, But he made no infants disciples as might be proved by the descriptions and acts of *Johns* disciples in the Gospels, *Matth.* 9. 14. *&* 11. 2. *&* 14. 12. *Luk.* 7. 18. *Joh.* 1. 35, 37. *&c.* 2. The Disciples baptized in the same manner and sort as *John* did his disciples, but *John* baptized penitent persons, who were not infants, *Matth.* 3. 6. *all the people who were baptised by him*, are said to *bear him* and *to justifie God*, *Luk.* 7. 29. but these were not infants, *Ergo.* 3. Dr. *Hammond* saith *Letter of resol. q.* 4. §. 25. *To make disciples*, Joh. 4. 1. *and baptise, is all one with disciple baptising*, Matth. 28. 19. But *in this* according to the Dr. *there is not any kinde of direction to that matter of receiving and admitting infants or not infants*, therefore *Joh.* 4. 1, is no mention of their baptizing infants, and so no infants baptized by them. 2. If Christ had instituted infant Baptism, doubtless hee would have appointed it, and the Disciples practised it on those mentioned *Matth.* 19. 13, 14, 15. *Mark* 10. 13, 14, 15, 16. *Luk.* 18. 15, 16, 17. But he did not appoint nor they practise baptism on them, for it is said *Matth.* 19. 15. *that when he had put his hands on them he departed thence*, which shews no more was done to them then was before set down, whereof none was their baptizing, *Ergo*

4. It is false, *that direction to baptise infants was sufficiently notified to the Apostles by Christ.* For 1. *the common practise of the Jews* could not *notifie it* to them, Christ no where appointing them to baptize according to the Jewish manner, nor did they, For they baptized rather after *Johns* manner, *Joh.* 4. 1. but that was not as the Jews, as appeares by their excepting against and rejecting his Baptism *Luk.* 7. 30. 2. *The vulgar notion of Baptism did not notifie it.* For 1. the notion of baptism did not express one sort or other, yea they used to baptize other things *Mark* 7. 3, 4. besides persons. 2. If the vulgar notion of Baptism did notifie infant Baptism, then it did notifie it *Matth.* 28. 19. where it is expressed. But the Dr. saith, *those words are not any kinde of direction to that matter of receiving and admitting, infants or not infants*, Ergo. 3. *The special direction of Christ did not notifie* it, if it did, let it be shewed. To say, *the Gospels expres not at all the words of the first institution of Bap-*

Anſw. never do ſet that down, is againſt the Dr. For it is an high preſumption in any man to aſſert ſuch a ſpecial direction of Chriſt, as neither the Goſpels nor other ſacred writings ſet down, and if this may bee done, Apocriphal traditions may bee vented, as Papiſts and others have done, telling us *all that CHRIST did and ſaid is not written*, *John* 20. 30. Beſides, Chriſt gave no other ſpecial direction to the Apoſtles towards the Jewes about Baptiſm, afore that was done which wee read *John* 4. 1. then hee did to them towards the Gentiles, *Matth.* 28. 19. For that was *a copy of the Pattern*. But he did not there appoint infant Baptiſm as the Dr. acknowledgeth, *Ergo*. From all which I infer, that Chriſt gave no other direction about Baptiſm, then what is expreſſed *Matth.* 28. 19. and that there hee gave directions about infants baptizing or not baptizing, and that the preſcription there is to bee indiſpenſably uſed, not onely about the form of words in baptiſm, but alſo about the perſons whom we may baptize; and that infants are excluded ſhall bee proved in that which followes. Nor is this a *praluſory* ὀκτομαχία, as the Dr. termes it, but ſuch a juſt diſſertation as toucheth the main of the cauſe, and ſhewes the Doctors uſurpation on Chriſts prerogative, in defending ſuch Baptiſm as is otherwiſe then Chriſt appointed, nor hath he brought one proof for what he ſaith, hee *hath made evident that* Matth. 28. 19. *was not the inſtitution of Baptiſm, nor any intimation on either ſide whether infants ſhould be baptized or not*, but contradicted himſelf, and manifeſtly perverted the Scripture.

Sect. 2. The Dr. ſaith to my exception [that though μαθητεύσατε is well rendred *make Diſciples*, yet μαθητεύσατε βαπτίζοντες is not well paraphraſed by *receive into Diſcipleſhip all Nations baptizing them*, For by this the making Diſciples is made the ſame with receiving into Diſcipleſhip or receiving Diſciples, and Baptiſm the ceremony of receiving into Diſcipleſhip, which is as truly the act of the baptized, thereby profeſſing or avouching his Diſcipleſhip] thus. "Here is another ſubtilty of a refined nature, making a difference betwixt making Diſciples, and receiving into Diſcipleſhip or receiving Diſciples: As if "theſe two were not perfectly ſynonymous, and by me evidently uſed, as ſuch. I ſhall not diſpute of words, when the matter is clear, and "when it is equally to my purpoſe which phraſe is uſed, whether making or receiving Diſciples.

Anſw. Either phraſe would not have been equally to the Doctors purpoſe, making Diſciples not being applicable to infants, as perhaps it may be thought receiving Diſciples may, but whether either ſerve the Doctors turn or no, and however the Dr. uſe them, or cenſure my diſtinction of them, yet I take his confounding them to bee a groſs miſtake, and ſuch as perverts the text, and ſhould have been proved by him, afore he thus uſed it. And againſt it I thus argue. 1. Thoſe termes are not *perfectly ſynonymous*, whereof the one imports that which may bee without the other, this I think none will deny. But making Diſciples may bee without receiving them. This is manifeſt. For a perſon is not a Diſciple afore he is made, but he is made a Diſci-

a Diſciple before he is received, therefore the one may bee without the other. 2. The agents may be divers in making and receiving Diſciples, a woman may make a Diſciple, but not receive him. 3. The meanes is different, the making Diſciples is by teaching, as ſhall bee ſhewed in that which followes, and is an act of diligence; the receiving is admiſſion by authority. 4. Making imports an action, receiving rather a paſſion. 5. Making Diſciples doth preſuppoſe a privation of it, yea perhaps averſeneſs from it; receiving preſuppoſeth a habit attained, and a willing offer. 6. The making Diſciples may be to another, but receiving Diſciples is to bee aſcribed to the maſter to whom they are Diſciples, as to himſelf receiving them. 7. Dr. *Hammond* acknowledgeth μαθητευσαι *to import the ſame with* ποιειν μαθητας *John* 4. 1. *Letter of reſol. q.* 4. §. 25. but *John* 4. 1. it cannot bee rendered *receive Diſciples*, therefore neither *Matth* 28 19. 8. Neither *Matth.* 28. 19 nor any where elſe hath any tranſlator I knew, rendered [*receive Diſciples*] but many, *make Diſciples*, and make it as the Dr. *the phraſe parallel to John* 4. 1. and therefore it is ſingular and abſurd to render it here *receive Diſciples.*

Secondly, ſaith he, "When hee affirms of Baptiſm which I make "the ceremony of the Apoſtles receiving them, that 'tis as truely the act "of the baptized, this is no ſubtilty, but groſs and viſible enough. For "certainly Baptiſm in the active ſenſe (as it is plain I underſtand it "in that place where I paraphraſe, Go and make Diſciples and Bap-"tize) is not the act of the baptized but of the Baptiſt, The comming to "Baptiſm indeed and the undertaking the vow, and making the pro-"feſſion, is the act of the baptized, either perſonally or by his pro-"xy, which in reputation of Law and in acceptation of the Church, "is his alſo, but ſtill baptiſm, or (to remove all poſſible miſtake) "baptizing βαπτιζειν *Matth.* 28. 19. is an act of the Baptizer onely, "and ſo the Ceremony of receiving into Diſcipleſhip, whomſoever they "thus duely baptize. I hope I need ſay no more of this.

Anſw. I ſaid not baptizing, but Baptiſm the Ceremony (not as the Dr. miſ recites my words, *of receivers into Diſcipleſhip*, but) of receiving into diſcipleſhip is as truely the act of the baptized, thereby profeſſing or avouching his diſcipleſhip as of the Baptizer, and therefore the baptized is not meerly paſſive in it, nor an infant doth undergo it. And I prove it thus. 1. Baptiſm is a duty of the baptized as well as of the baptizer, as may bee proved from *Acts* 2. 38. where the Apoſtle exhorts them *to repent and bee baptized every one of them, in the Name of Chriſt Jeſus for the remiſſion of ſins*; Now that which a man is exhorted to as his duty, is his own act. *Ergo.* If any ſay it is βαπτιζω in the paſſive voice, hee may underſtand that *Luk.* 11. 38. εβαπτισθη though it bee the ſame ſenſe and voice, yet notes the action of the baptized. 2. It is manifeſt alſo from the command to *Paul*, *Acts.* 22. 16. that baptiſm is the act of the baptized. For firſt, it is a thing commanded to bee done by him. 2. It is in the middle voice, βαπτισαι, which though I deny not to have a paſſive ſignification, yet here, απολουσαι τας αμαρτιας cannot have any other then

active

active signification because of the accusative cause following, so neither can the other, both being injoyned as duties, and the washing away sins being not meant of forgiveness of them but turning from them; baptism being the signe of his repentance, and both being to be joyned together, *Acts* 2. 38. and therefore Baptism being called, *the baptism of repentance*, *Mark* 1. 4. *Acts* 19. 4. 3. *Baptising into the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost*, notes the act of the baptized as well as the baptizer, and this is fully taught by Dr. *Hammond* himself *practic. cat. lib. 6. sect.* 2. where he saith [*I baptize thee into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*] *being prescribed by Christ to his Disciples must indispensably be used, and the meaning of them is double.* 1. *On the Ministers part, that what he doth hee doth not of himself, but in the Name or power of, or by Commission from the blessed Trinity* (which by the way, I am sure none can say without apparent falshood when they baptize infants, much less when they onely sprinkle them.) 2. *And more especially in respect of the person baptised.* 1. *That he acknowledges these three, and by desiring baptism makes profession of that acknowledgment, which is in effect the sum of the whole Creed.* 2. *That as he acknowledges these three, so he delivers himself to them, as to the three principles or authors of faith or Christian religion, and acknowledges no other as such* (*as to be baptised in the name of* Paul, *signifies to say, I am of* Paul, i. e. *to pin my faith on him in opposition to* Cephas *and all other*) *to receive for infallible truth whatsoever is taught by any of these and nothing else.* 3. *That he delivers himself up to be ruled as an obedient servant by the directions of this great master, a willing Disciple of this blessed Trinity, and so the Greek phrase* [*into the name*] *doth import; and these three acts of the baptised together, make up his part by way of condition required of him to make him capable of that grace, which the Minister from God thus conveys upon and ensures unto him.* Besides which it notes the calling on the Name of the Father by the Son, through the holy Spirit, as *Acts* 22. 16. shews, where *Paul* is bid *to be baptized or baptize* himself, *calling on the name of the Lord*, when baptized; and this I have proved to be meant from *Luk.* 3. 21. and other wayes *Review part.* 2. *sect.* 5. *p.* 89, 90, 91. So that baptism is as well (or rather more) the ceremony of the baptized, as of the baptizer. Which might be proved from those texts which speak of the use of it, as *Rom.* 6. 3, 4. *Col.* 2. 12. *Gal.* 3. 26, 27. 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. in all which and sundry more the act of the baptized is noted, who doth thereby signifie *his baptism into Christs death, being buried by baptism into death*, and *his rising to newness of life, putting on Christ, joyning into one body*, &c. which I have cleered more fully in the same place *pag.* 96, 97 98, 99. And this, the Dr saith rightly, *is more especially meant by baptising into the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.* Therefore it notes their act as well as the administrators. 4. If baptism were not as truely the act of the baptized as the baptizer, then it should be true baptism, if the baptizer did dip without any concurrent act of the baptized, yea though he were forced to it, and against his will put under water, and this were warrantably done by the baptizer, For he should do what is prescribed, But this is absurd, neither School men nor any other allow

low such baptism, *vide Th. Aquin. sum. part. 3. qu. 68. art. 7, 10.* The *Spaniards* driving the *Indians* into the water forcibly for baptism, and their going in thus under water is excepted against as neither rightly done, nor true baptism. Therefore certainly *baptizing* prescribed *Mat. 28. 19.* doth comprehend not onely the act of the administratour, but also the act of the baptized, in yeilding to it and concurring with it. When *Peter Acts 10. 48. commanded* Cornelius *and those with him to be baptised in the name of the Lord*, there were three acts concurrent. 1. The Apostles command, by way of authority appointing it to be done. 2. Of the administratour by way of Ministry. 3. Of the baptized by way of submission and putting himself under water. Yet hee is not thereby a meer Sebaptist, as it is reported some heretofore have been, but is partly passive in consent, and submission to what the baptizer doth, and partly active in concurring with him. So that my speech is cleered from *being gross*, as th Dr. would.

Dr. *H.* adds. *His second branch of exception is to those words of mine, wherein I say that the making or receiving Disciples, supposeth not any precedent instruction, but looks wholly on it as subsequent.* Against this I gave reasons of dissent thus. 1. That which is expresst in *Matthew* by, *Go ye therefore and make Disciples all Nations*, is in *Mark*, *Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every living creature*; which shews, how they should disciple all nations; now they who are made Disciples by preaching the Gospel, are made disciples by precedent instruction, *Ergo*, the making or receiving disciples *Matth. 28. 19.* supposeth precedent instruction.

"But to this (saith the Dr.) I answer; 1. That the words in *Mark* "are no otherwise parallel to those in *Matthew*, then as an Epitome is "parallel to a larger discourse, such we know S. *Marks* for the most part "is, an abbreviation of S. *Matthews* Gospel, as in many others, so in "this particular; some passages indeed there are in S. *Mark* in this "place, which are not in S. *Matthew*, as shall anon be shewed, but in "the particular now before us, S. *Mark* is according to wont more con-"cise: there is no mention in him of baptizing in the Name of the Fa-"ther, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, nor consequently of "discipling, of which that was the ceremony, as in S. *Matthew* "there is.

Answ. This doth rather confirm my *major* then oppose it. For if *Mark* expresse the same more briefly and *Matthew more largely in this particular*, and there is no other expression in *Mark* besides, *Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature*, which answers to *Matthews* words, *Go make Disciples all nations*; then what is expresst in *Matthew* is the same with that which is expresst in *Mark*. And indeed the time, occasion, and expressions do so plainly evince this, that almost all editions and translations (which use marginal references) and commentators I have seen, expound the one by the other.

Secondly, saith he Dr. "That Christs appointment κηρύξαι εὐ-"αγγέλιον, to preach the Gospel, in S. *Mark*, doth no way infer the "precedent instruction of every single person that was received to bap-"tism

" tism: the phrase signifies to proclaim or promulgate the happy ty-
" dings brought into the world by Christ, grace, and mercy, and eter-
" nal felicity to all that should come into him, and take his yoke upon
" them, and learn of him. And upon the publishing of this to all the
" world to every creature, *i e.* to the Gentiles universally, as well as the
" Jews, I suppose 'tis very possible, that many of them should make all
" speed to come unto Christ, and come out at the Apostles preaching,
" they and their whole households together (παντοσὶν, as the Oracle
" commanded in *Homer*) and to bring their infant children, as they
" used to do, that became Proselytes to the Jews, and then the Apostles
" knowing their Masters minde for receiving of infants, and that (as from
" the institution I suppose them fore-instructed) to baptism, receive
" them all, and (as many as interposed no voluntary hinderance) bap-
" tize them; and having taken them into the School of Christ, make
" good provision for the future instruction of them, as soon as ever they
" should be capable of it. That thus it was, I pretend not (still) to de-
" duce from these words *Matth.* 28. but to infer from another *medium*,
" the practise of the Apostles otherwise notified to us: All that I am
" now to manifest is, that this passage hath nothing contrary to our hy-
" pothesis, but is perfectly reconcileable with it, and this is done by
" the scheme thus laid: And so 'tis most visible how no force there is
" in this first reason of exception.

Answ. It is most visible that the Dr. was in a dream when he wrote this; 1. Because he talks of *an institution* (which is onely imagined by him) *of receiving infants, and as many as interposed no voluntary hinderance to baptize them* (not excepting infidels children, contrary to his own interpretation of 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. which declares them *unclean*, that is, not to be baptiz-d in the Drs. sense) *and to take infants into the School of Christ*, as if the School of Christ were to nurse up infants, for that was all could be done to them, and *to make good provision for the future instruction of them, as soon as ever they should be capable of it.* Which is so ridiculous a conceit, as no waking man me thinks should fancy it. For what *provision* could the Apostles, who were to *go and preach the Gospel to every creature, make for the future instruction of them, as soon as ever they should be capable of it*, who were not to stay till they were able to speak, or receive any commands from them? 2. The Dr. as if he forgot his matter in hand, saith; *All that he was then to manifest, was that this passage* Matth. 28. 19. *hath nothing contrary to his hypothesis, but is perfectly reconcileable to it*; whereas his business was to answer my argument against his position, *that the making or receiving Disciples* Matth. 28 19. *supposeth not any precedent instruction, but looks wholly on it as subsequent*, 3. The Drs. answer, *that Christs appointment to preach the Gospel in S.* Mark, *doth no way infer the precedent instruction of every single person that was received to Baptism*, might be true, yet his position false, *that the making Disciples* Matth. 28. 19. *supposeth not any precedent instruction, but looks wholly on it as subsequent.* 4. His reason *why to preach the Gospel in S.* Mark, *doth no way infer the precedent instruction of every single person that was received to baptism*, shews his talk

to

to have been incoherent, like the talk of a man in a dream; For what consequence is in this, *The phrase signifies*, &c. Ergo, *To preach the Gospel in S.* Mark, *doth no way infer the precedent instruction of every single person that was received to Baptism*? Might not all this be true, that *the phrase so signifies, they so publish, the thing set down be possible, the Apostles know Christs minde*, as the Dr. imagines, and yet *to preach the Gospel in S.* Mark, *infer the precedent instruction of every single person that was received to Baptism*? So that in all this which the Dr. saith, there is no answer to my argument. But the truth is, by the Drs. own grants my argument is made good. For if preaching the Gospel be instruction, and this be the way of making Disciples, which are not denied; then it must needs go before making or receiving Disciples, sith the meanes in order of actual being, must be before the effect, and so the Drs. position false; That *the making or receiving Disciples supposeth not any precedent instruction*, Matth. 28. 19. *but looks wholly on it as subsequent.* Again, if afore baptizing they were *to publish the Gospel to all the world, to every creature*, i. e. *to the Gentiles universally as well the Jews, then* afore any single person was received to Baptism, instruction was to be precedent, unless there were any single person which was not comprised under all the world, every creature, Gentiles universally as well as Jews: Yea the terms [*every creature* and *all nations*] comprehend every person that was to be baptized, and more; but they were every one to be made Disciples, and that by preaching the Gospel to them, afore they were to be baptized; *Matth.* 28. 19. *Mark* 16. 15. therefore instruction of every single person was to be precedent to his reception to baptism. Hereto agree the words of *Athanasius, Hierom* and others, cited by me, *Review part.* 2. *sect.* 5. *p.* 86, 87.

The 2d. saith the Dr. *followes*, that such as the making Disciples was, *Joh.* 4. 1. such is the making Disciples *Matth.* 28. 19. For by the Drs. confession they are all one. But that was by preaching, as is plain concerning *John, Matth.* 3. 1, 2, 5, 6. and concerning the Apostles, *Mat.* 10. 5, 6, 7. *Ergo.* Whence 3. I further argued, that way the Apostles were *to Disciple all nations*, by which they were to disciple *the lost sheep of the house of Israel*, but that was by preaching, *Ergo*, discipling supposeth precedent instruction.

"To this, saith the Dr. I answer, that the account last given is fully satisfactory to this exception also; For supposing the Apostles to "publish whersoever they came the εὐαγγέλια, the good news that "was come into the world by Christ, and the hearers not onely to "come in themselves, but to bring their whole families, and so their "infant children with them, there is no difficulty to imagine, that they "had thus made proclamation, received all, and made all disciples, "young and old, that either came or were brought, and so it being the "instrument to draw the parents themselves, and to move them to "bring their children to discipleship, it is still very visible how chil-"dren should be discipled, and consequently baptized by them, Bap-"tism being the constant ceremony of discipling. And though I am not "able to affirm how it was actually in *Johns* Baptism, yet this I may say,

" that as far as can be discerned or inferred from the phrase in either " place (μαθητεύειν and μαθητὰς ποιεῖν) thus it very possibly might be " both in *Johns* and the Apostles baptizing.

Answ. It is so far from being satisfactory, that there is neither pertinency nor truth in this answer. For the Dr. answers, as if the thing I proved were not, that making disciples presupposeth instruction, because it is by preaching, but that infants might be made disciples, though making disciples be by preaching; which is indeed not to answer to the argument, but to a consectary deducible from the conclusion of it, which though it were not inferred nor consequent, yet the conclusion might be true that discipling presupposeth some precedent instruction, and is not wholly subsequent to it. Nor is it true. For 1. supposing the Apostles should do as he speaks, and the hearers come in as hee imagines, yet *there is difficulty to imagine, that they that had thus made proclamation received all, and made all disciples, young and old, that either came or were brought unto them*; specially considering how *John* received none wee read of but such as confessed their sins, and the whole people that were baptized of him justified God, *Luk.* 7. 29. *believed him*, *Matth.* 21. 32. others nor, and the Apostles are said to make disciples afore they baptized, *Joh.* 4. 1. and afore they baptized required repentance, *Act.* 2. 38. those who *were baptized gladly received the word*, v. 41. 2. *It beeing granted that they made disciples by preaching, preaching being the instrument to draw the parents themselves, and to move them to bring their children to discipleship, yet it is not very visible how children should bee discipled*; For fond affection or conceit, might move them to do that upon preaching, which yet might not take effect, nor be received by the Apostles. 4. Nor is *Baptism consequent on such a discipleship*, by offer or vow of parents, without profession of the party to be baptized, there being no institution for it, which is the onely rule about baptizing. 5. Neither is it true, that *Baptism is the constant ceremony of discipling*, though it be granted to be the ceremony of disciples, a person is first a disciple afore baptized, *Joh.* 4. 1. they first made disciples then baptized them. 6. It is not true, that *as far as can be discerned or inferred from the phrase in either place (μαθητεύειν and μαθητὰς ποιεῖν) it might not very possibly be both in* Johns *and in the Apostles baptizing as the Dr. imagines*, sith (if there be degrees of possibility) it is not very possible they should make any other disciples and baptize them, then such as the Evangelists story relates they did.

But the Dr. tels us. 1. For *John*, *'tis true indeed that his Baptism attended his preaching, yet doth it not thence necessarily follow that none were baptised by him, but those who particularly heard and obeyed his preaching*; *For* 1. *why might not those that heard it, divulge it to others, and bring them before they heard him to desire to bee baptised, and upon their confessing their sins, and professing amendment, bee baptise them?*

Answ. Not likely before he had preached somewhat to them, however if his preaching were brought to them by others, they were not baptized afore instruction.

" 2. Why

" 2. Why might not thoſe that heard it, or heard of it, give that " heed to it, as to bring all that were dear to them of what age ſoever, " by that means to ſecure them from the wrath to come; when *Noah* " preacht repentance to the old world, and upon the decree of ſending " the flood upon the world of the ungodly, called all to come into the " Ark to him to eſcape the deluge, ſuppoſe others beſides *Noahs* fami- " ly had hearkened to his preaching, or ſuppoſe hee and his ſons had " had infant children, can we imagine they would have left their in- " fants to that certain ruine, and not have taken them into the Ark " with them? And *Johns* baptiſm was anſwerable to that Ark, in re- " ſpect of that approaching ruine on the Jews, ſtiled the kingdome of " heaven *v.* 1. and that evidenced to be a bloudy kingdome, explicated " by caſting into the fire *v.* 10. And can we imagine the Jews that be- " lieved *John*, and came to his Baptiſm, did not bring theſe children " with them to ſave them from the predicted evils, and then I profeſs " not to ſee any reaſon to render it incredible that *John Baptiſt* ſhould " thus receive and baptize thoſe infants (though the Scripture affirm- " ing nothing of it, and tradition, as far as I know, as little, I ſhall " neither affirm nor beleive any thing.) This only is certain, that a- " mong the Jews of that time, infant children were known to be capa- " ble of entring into covenant with God after this manner, and of being " partakers of the benefit of the Covenant by that means. And one " thing more I may add, that Chriſt himſelf, who was by his ſinleſneſs, " as unqualified for the repentance which *John* preacht, as the infants " were by their incapacities, did yet come and was received to *Johns* Bap- " tiſm, *v.* 13. and then in caſe infants were brought, why might not " they be received alſo?

Anſw. Becauſe it was not appointed to them. And this is a reaſon (which the Dr. *may ſee* if he will) *to render it incredible that* John *ſhould receive and baptize infants*, though infants of Proſelytes born a- fore their Proſelytiſm were by Jews baptized, who baptized upon a far different reaſon, to wit, the pollution through idols, which did adhere to the Gentiles nativity, to waſh away that, and to engage them to the obſervance of *Moſes* Law for righteouſneis: whereas *John Baptiſt baptized with the baptiſm of repentance for remiſſion of ſins*, even native Jews, directing them to *the Lamb of God who was to take away the ſin of the world*, and that he might be known was to be baptized of him. We can therefore eaſily imagine, that the Jews that believed *John* and came to his Baptiſm, did not bring infant children with them to ſave them from predicted evils becauſe wee reade that they that were baptized of him *confeſſed their ſins*, *Matth.* 3. 5. 6. *juſtified God*, *Luk* 7. 29. Nor was Baptiſm appointed to them as to Proſelytes infants, nor do wee reade that *John Baptiſt* gave any inkling of his minde to have infants brought. And it is ſigne to me that the Dr. is confident that hee can leade men in a ſtring, who adventures to ſuggeſt ſuch things as he confeſſeth *the Scripture affirms nothing of it, and tradition as little, as far as he knows, and neither affirms nor beleives any thing in it*, and onely upon a ſuppoſition that infant children would have been brought into

Noahs Ark if men had beleived *Noah*, and *Johns* Baptiſm was as *Noahs* Ark ſtiled *the Kingdome of heaven*, whereas *Johns* and *Chriſts* Baptiſm are not made anſwerable to *Noahs* Ark in reſpect of the bare outward baptiſm, nor is it ſtiled *the Kingdome of heaven*, but *the anſwer* or *interrogation of a good conſcience towards God by the reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt*, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. and the preaching, beleiving of the Goſpel throughout the world, *Mar.* 1. 14, 15. which they who were baptized were to entertain, and not infants, and therefore not to be baptized till they did. And wee may with better reaſon, then the Dr. gives of his fancy, conceive Gods providence rather ordered there ſhould be no infants in *Noahs* Ark, that we might not fancy infants baptiſm thence, then that we ſhould as this Dr. or doatard ſuppoſeth.

Yet again, ſaith he, *Then* 2. *for as much as concerned the Apoſtles*, Mat. 10. *Firſt 'tis there evident that they were ſent to the loſt ſheep indefinitely, and ſure that phraſe comprehends the lambs alſo, the infant children being loſt in* Adam *as well as the grown men, by the addition of their actual to original ſin? And then why ſhould we doubt but the Apoſtles miſſion extended to them alſo?*

Anſw. Becauſe we reade of no ſuch thing done or appointed to be done, nor do we know that baptiſm was appointed to bee a remedy of original ſin, though ſome of the Ancients talk ſo beſides the Scripture.

The Dr. adds. "And 2. for their preaching, it is juſt as as *Johns* "was, to warn them to beware of the imminent deſtruction, that vindi- "cative act of Gods kingdome, *v.* 7. that all that ſhould give ear and "heed them, might haſten to get out of that danger by reformation and "new life; and the ruine being impendent to the young as well as old, "even the whole nation, why ſhould not the infant children be reſcued "from that by their Parents care in bringing them to baptiſm, and time- "ly ingaging them to flye from the wrath to come, as ſoon as they "ſhould come to underſtanding, injoying in the mean time the benefit "of others charity?

Anſw. It was fit they ſhould enjoy the benefit of others charity in their Prayers, and ſupply of ſuch things as were meet for them, of which ſort the Apoſtles Baptiſm was not, nor did they underſtand it was Chriſts minde that they were ſent to baptize them, for then they had baptized them, and *not rebuked thoſe that brought them to Chriſt*, *Matth.* 19. 13. Nor by bringing them to Baptiſm were children reſcued from the wrath to come, but by reformation and new life.

Thirdly, ſaith he, *after their preaching though there be no mention of baptizing (and ſo it was not fit to be produced to our preſent buſineſs) yet other things are appointed to be done, wherein infants were concerned as well as others, as healing of diſeaſes*, &c. *and if being incapable of receiving benefit from preaching ſhould be deemed an obſtacle to their being baptized, why ſhould it not to their receiving cures?*

Anſw. Becauſe that they might be baptized, it was neceſſary they ſhould be made diſciples by preaching, not ſo that they might be cured of diſeaſes. *Nay I may add*, ſaith the Dr. *How ſhould the dead in that*

place

place (who sure were as uncapable of understanding as the tenderest infants) be capable of being raised by those Apostles, which yet is there affirmed of them, v. 8.

Answ. And I may add, that after this rate of reason, if mere capacity of outward Baptism, and the charge of Christ to the Apostles to do acts of power on any thing, without making it a disciple by preaching to it (as the Dr. here fancieth of infants) fit it for Baptism, then the dead are to be baptized, which was practised of old, and the giving them the Eucharist, as appears by the prohibition of it in the third *Synod* of *Carthage Canon 6.* and *Balsamous* note thereon. But the Dr. it seems thought it fit in this reply to me, to write what came next to hand, whether *it were fit to be produced to the present business* or not, of which sort also is that which he talks in answer to my third reason, of *preaching to the nations, and receiving all that came in to the discipleship, whether on their own legs, or in others arms, whole families at once, the parents, and upon their undertaking their infant children also*, which perhaps the Dr. might write early in the morning or late at night, between sleeping and waking, it is so like a dream.

The Dr. goes on thus, "His fourth proof is taken from the use and "notation of the word, which is so to teach as that they learn, and so, "saith he, is used *Matth* 13. 52. μαθητευθεὶς is rendred [instructed] "by our last translators, and can no otherwise be rendred then [made a "disciple by teaching] so *Acts* 14. 21. it is said, Having preached the "Gospel to that City, καὶ μαθητεύσαντες, having taught or made many "disciples. For the notation of the word we have formerly said sufficient, that it signifies to receive *ad discipulatum*, as into a School of "spiritual instruction, μαθητὴν ποιεῖν, to make a disciple, and such he "is made, who by any motive or means either comes or is brought into "the school, this indeed in order to teaching in the Master, and to learning in the Scholler, and the one so to teach, as that the other learn, "but this subsequent to his being made a disciple, the youth wee know "enters into the School, is admitted into the Colledge and University, "before he learns a word there, the instruction or learning is still lookt "upon as future, at his entring into discipleship.

Answ. How vainly doth the Dr. talk of his former sufficient saying, when he neither formerly nor now, gives one instance in the New Testament or any other Author, wherein μαθητεύειν is as much to *receive ad discipulatum*, nor any Translator or Lexicographer that so renders it *Matth*, 28. 19. or elsewhere! μαθητεύειν to disciple, *Matth.* 28. 19. is confest by the Dr. *to bee all one with* μαθητὰς ποιεῖν *to make disciples*, *Joh.* 4. 1. Now sure the Dr. might well take his Readers for dunses, if they could not distinguish between *making disciples* and *receiving ad discipulatum*, *to be made disciples*, entring into a school that they might learn, and being made a disciple, which alwayes notes learning of something antecedent. Nor is any termed *a disciple*, at least not in the New Testament, till he hath learned some of his Teachers doctrine; None were the disciples of the Pharisees, *John Baptist*, the Seducers, *Acts* 20. 30. till they learned some of their teachers lessons, nor do I think in

the

the Jewish writers are any termed the disciples of their Rabbins, or said to be discipled till they learned. The terming youths schollers at their first entring is nothing to the purpose, sith neither is a disciple and a scholler all one, the one being from learning, the other from vacation from other imployment that he may learn. Nor is the use of words in our Universities and Schools, any rule whereby to expound the use of words in the N.T. but Scripture is to be expounded by the use in Scripture, which the Dr. in vain attempts to evade thus.

"And this is all the importance of the word μαθητευειν Matth. 13. "52. onely some accidental differences may bee observed, 'tis in the "passive and in the Aorist in the preter tense, πᾶς γραμματεὺς μαθη-"τευθεὶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, every Scribe which is or hath "been entred as a disciple unto the kingdome of heaven, who since his "entrance hath been instructed, and (as real passives import) received "influence, been really affected and changed by discipleship, still no "way supposing that he was instructed in the learning or mysteries "of the kingdome of heaven, before he was thus admitted a disciple to "it; After his admission, there is no doubt but he doth (or ought to) "learn, nay being here γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεὶς, a Scribe discipled, a "grown man and learned among the Jews, before he came to Christ, I "doubt not but some knowledge he had of it before he entred himself a "disciple (see baptizing of infants p. 199.) but this not by force of the "word μαθητευειν, for still a disciple he may be before he learns, and "is therefore obliged to learn, because he hath assumed and undertaken "to do so, either personally, or by others susception, by his comming, "or being brought to be a disciple.

Answ. Were not the Dr. a very bold paraphrast, he would never have dared to say, that *this is all the importance of the word* μαθητευειν *Matth.* 13. 52. *to be entred into a school for a subsequent instruction without any precedent, which is or hath been entred as a disciple into the kingdome of heaven, who since his entrance hath been instructed, but this not by force of the word* μαθητευειν *for still a disciple he may be before he learns.* Hath the Dr. the face to say that the words might be so understood *Every Scribe that is or hath been entred as a disciple unto the kingdome of heaven is like unto a man that is an housholder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old?* Doth not our Lord Christ infer this as a consequent of their hearing, and understanding of the parables wherein he had instructed them in the foregoing part of the Chapter? Is there any Translator or Commentator afore him that hath thus expounded it? The vulgar *Hieronie, Figurine*, reade *doctus learned. Beza, edoctus, well learned. Hieronie* expounds it thus. *Instructi erant Apostoli, scribæ & notarii salvatoris, qui verba illius & præcepta signabant in tabulis cordis carnalibus regnorum cœlestium sacramentis. Grotius annot. in locum, Doctor inquit, bene paratus atque eruditus ad tradenda præcepta regni cœlestis.* Yea the Dr. himself here explains μαθητευθεὶς thus, *a scribe discipled, a grown man and learned among the Jews, before he came to Christ*; though he doth grossly abuse the text by making as if *the scribe* were taken for one so termed among the Jews afore he came to Christ, whereas

whereas the term is used of Christian teachers, allusively to that order of men among the Jews termed Scribes, in which sense Christ saith, he would *send them wise men and Scribes*, *Matth.* 11. 34. which is *Luke* 11. 49. *Apostles*, and that text *Chrysostome* in his *Homily* on *Matth.* 13. 52. makes like to it, and *Grotius annot. in locum*, *propriè autem τοις γραμματευσιν respondent ii qui in Ecclesia Christiana dicti sunt διδασκαλοι, quod nomen in Actis & Epistolis Pauli aliquoties legitur.* μαθητευθεις מחכם *Psal.* 58. 6. and *Prov.* 30. 24. It is no better then a whimzy which the Dr. here vents, as if the force of the word μαθητευθεις noted not learning but admission to school, when the very use of the word notes in this place one well learned; and to affert a man may bee a disciple before he learns, being onely obliged to learn, by his own or other susception, by his comming or being brought to be a disciple, when the very derivation is from μεμαθηται *hath learned.*

The Dr. saith further. "So in the other place *Acts* 14. 21. μαθητευ-
"σαντες ικανους] signifies no more then having received or initiated, *i.e.*
"(I suppose) by this right of baptism, made and baptized many disci-
"ples, which though it be there set down as a consequent of the Apo-
"stles preaching the Gospel in that City (for otherwise it were not ima-
"ginable that they should receive any disciples there, they must first
"proclaim admission to all that come, before any can be expected ei-
"ther to come or to be brought to them) yet may it very reasonably be
"extended to more persons then those that understood their preaching,
"*viz.* to the infant children of their Proselytes brought to them by their
"parents, and dedicated to Christ.

Answ. This text was produced to prove that the Drs. position was false when he said, *That the making or receiving disciples supposeth not any precedent instruction, but looks wholly on it as subsequent*, sith the word notes teaching as our Translators, *the Vulgar*, *Erasmus*, reade it, and the way of making disciples is expressly made in the text, *the preaching of the Gospel.* The Dr. saith, *it signifies no more then having received or initiated* i.e. (*he supposeth*) *by Baptism*, but this none else saith, and that *it may be reasonably extended to infants*, but he gives no reason, nor answers the objections to the contrary, but he keeps his wont of vain cracikng.

"Thus invailid (*saith he of me*) are his attempts from the notation
"of the word, and by consequence his inference from thence (which is
"set down as his fifth proof) that thereby it may appear how the Apo-
"stles understood the precept of Christ to preach the Gospel to persons
"and thereby make them disciples. For although the practise of the A-
"postles be indeed the meanes by which we may discern how they un-
"derstood Christs precept (and those two places cited by Mr. *T.* from
"*Matth.* 13. and *Acts* 14. do no way belong to that, they tell us not
"whether they received infants to Baptism or not) yet I may very
"well ward my self from any inconvenience, which this use of the
"word μαθητευειν in other places can threaten, it being alrsady vindi-
"cated from all necessity that it should be confirmed to grown men, and
"not communicated to infants also.

Answ.

Answ. How well the Dr. hath *vindicated the use of the word μαθητεύειν from all necessity that it should be confined to grown men*, may appear from that which goes before, in which it may be seen that he hath neither brought one place to shew that ever it was applied to an infant, nor answered one objection to the contrary. And me thinks he here overthrowes himself. He had said before, that *Acts* 14. 21. μαθητεύσαντες ἱκανοὺς] *signifies no more then having received, or initiated*, i. e. (*I suppose*) *by the rite of Baptism made and baptized many disciples*, yet he saith here, *those two places cited by Mr. T. from* Matth. 13. *and Acts* 14. *do no way belong to that, they tell us not whether they received infants to Baptism or not*, how then can they be *reasonably extended* to them? How is *the word vindicated from all necessity that it should be confined to grown men?* Are not these cross capers? Again, if these texts tel us not whether they received infants to Baptism, or not, it is because the word μαθητεύσαντες is not meant of infants, or because it imports precedent instruction, or Christs precept *Matth.* 28. 19. was not meant of infants, or the Apostles practise was not to baptize infants, or the word μαθητεύειν signifies more then receiving or initiating by baptism or some other reason, what ever it be it will overthrow the Drs. supposition, that *the discipling Matth.* 28. 19. *did not exclude infants.* I would further ask, whether the Dr. imagins that the verb μαθητεύειν to disciple, be as much as to baptize? If he say it is, then I would know how he can acquit the words *Joh.* 4. 1. where he confesseth, *that making disciples is the same with discipling, Matth.* 28. 19. and then the meaning must be, he baptized and baptized, and *Matth.* 28. 19. baptize baptizing, from inept tautology? If he say it is more, then it is false, that *Acts* 14. 21. it signifies no more, and if it signifie more, let him tell us what it is except teaching, that we may practise it according to the command *Matth.* 28. 19. If that be it, let him shew how that's extended to infants, if he cannot, then the Apostles practise expressed *Acts* 14. 21. is to be so understood; and the Apostles practise being indeed the meanes to discern how they understood Christs precept, by that we may discern that the Apostles understood the discipling *Matth.* 28. 19. of no other then making disciples by preaching the Gospel to each, and thereby teaching them, and consequently infants are excluded, which I was to demonstrate.

I added a sixth proof thus, A disciple and a believer appear to be the same, by comparing *Matth.* 28. 19. with *Mark* 16. 15, 16. For as the way of making disciples is more fully expressed by preaching the Gospel; so the Disciple to be baptized is expressed by [*the believer*] which is put before baptism.

"To this, *saith the Dr.* I answer, 1. That that passage in St. *Mark*, "He that beleiveth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that beleiveth "not shall be damned, and so on to the end of the Gospel is (as even "now I intimated) added by that Evangelist, to the words, as they "are set down in *Matthew*, and so being an addition, cannot bee "looked on as exactly parallel to the words in *Matthew*, Go and disci-

"ple

" ple all nations baptizing them — And this we also know is ordinary " for one Evangelist to set down more fully what is omitted or more " shortly set down in the other, and S. *Mark* that in other things was " willing to abbreviate St. *Matthew*, doth now visibly inlarge; And " so the comparison cannot regularly be made betwixt these two Evan- " gelists words, something being abbreviated in *Mark*, which was more " at large in *Matthew*, and something more concisely set down in *Mat-* " *thew*, and more largely in *Mark*. And then what necessity is there, " that *Mark* not mentioning discipling but believing, and *Matthew* " mentioning discipling but not believing, the discipled and believers " should be deemed the same.' It is true indeed of grown men, none can in " reason be admitted disciples, which are not also believers (the ground " of which I have set down in the *vesol of the quaere*. p. 199.) but of infant " children this is not true, for those, though they cannot come, may " yet be brought, and though not upon their own confession, yet by the " suscepion of others, made capable of the Churches charity, and so " may be disciples without actual or personal belief.

Answ. Though the words are not exactly parallel, yet they being of the same matter at the same time, the one interpret the other, and then any man may easily perceive, *discipling all nations*, to be the same with *preaching the Gospel to every creature*, and thereby making disciples, and *baptizing them*, that is disciples, to answer *to he that believes and is baptized*, and accordingly all along the Acts of the Apostles, disciples and believers are the same, and before Baptism believing is required, and they that were baptized were first said to believe, and so generally Commentatours expound the words as synonymous, nor doth the Scripture make one qualification to Baptism for infants, and another for grown men, nor any where term infants disciples; and if *none of grown men can in reason be admitted disciples, which are not also believers, content to be disciples of Christ*, then infants by their susception and bringing, are not made nor to be admitted disciples of Christ, without actual or personal belief, there being no such distinction of disciples in Christs words, nor any such appointment of baptizing disciples by such bringing or susception; but in such actions there is great sin of rashness in those that undertake, of prophaneness in those that bring and admit nor is there any true charity, but errour, arrogance, and folly in the Church, which shall thus presume to put one kinde of disciples fancied by themselves in stead of another appointed by Christ, who is the onely institutor of Baptism, and so the onely regulator of it, and the term [*disciple*] in grown men, being the same with [*believer*] nor any other termed a disciple but a believer, it is clear none are discipled, and consequently none are to be baptized according to *Matth.* 28, 19. but actual and personal believers.

But the Dr. hath not yet done, but adds. " Nay 2dly, if Mr. *T.* his " argument had power to infer it, 'twere that which I might safely a- " vouch, that infants may be comprehended under the stile *πιστευοντες*, " they that believe and are baptized; so even now we had it in the ex- " press words of Christ, the litle ones (and S. *Luke* specifies them to

" ὁ τὰ βρέφη little infants) that believe on him; *i. e.* juſt as they are ſaid " elſewhere to come unto him, when they are as uncapable for want of " bodily ſtrength of perſonal comming, as for want of ſtrength of mind " or judgement of perſonal believing, and yet in reſpect of others brin- " ging them to Chriſt (and ſo to the Church in baptiſm) they are by " Chriſt himſelf ſaid to do both of theſe, to come in one place, and to " believe in the other.

Anſw. Comming imports onely a local motion to a place or perſon, and may be by either a perſons or things motion from an inward or outward principle in elder or younger perſons, he that is carried in a coach, or on horſeback, or by barge, is ſaid to come to *London* or home, as well as he that goes on foot; but believing is an immanent act, which neither is, nor can be anothers act then the perſons, nor by any others motion then his own, nor from any other principle without his own underſtanding. No where are infants in age termed believers, *one of theſe little ones*, *Matth.* 18. 6. cannot be meant of little ones in age, for it ſuppoſeth then more little ones in age then preſent, whereas there was but one preſent *v.* 2. and then it would be a very great ſin to offend a little one in age; but the words following *v.* 10, 14. ſhew the term *little ones* to be meant of thoſe Chriſtians who were apt to be deſpiſed, and liable to going aſtray.

But if infants were meant *Matth.* 18. 6. yet it is falſe which the Dr. ſaith, " That he might ſafely avouch that infants may be comprehended " under the ſtile πιστεύοντες, they that believe and are baptized, *for it followes in the Drs. own words*; " But then 3dly, I willingly acknow- " ledge that the word [*believe*] in *Mark*, belongs peculiarly to the " grown men and women who are called by the preaching of the Goſpel, " of whom though it bee ſaid, that believing and being baptized they " ſhall be ſaved, and not believing they ſhall be damned, yet it no way " followes, that none but ſuch as thus perſonally believed, ſhould be " baptized, or that being baptized they ſhould not be ſaved; but loſe " all the benefit of their Baptiſm.] So that the Dr. yeilding that *Mark* 16. 16. *is meant of grown perſons peculiarly*, he could *not ſafely avouch* (unleſs an untruth might be ſafely avouched) *that infants may be comprehended under the ſtile* πιστεύοντες, *they that believe and are baptized*, which is onely *Mark* 16. 16. and then it follows hence that none are to be counted diſciples but believers, nor any to be baptized but ſuch. The benefit of Baptiſm to infants I think is none, ſure not ſalvation without faith in act or ſeed, or ſomething equivolent.

It followes in the Dr. " The latter part of the words is conſiderable, " He that believeth not ſhall be damned, infidelity is pitcht on as the " thing peculiarly that incurs the certain damnation, *i. e.* the voluntary " reſiſting the faith when it is preached convincingly to them, and of " that none are capable, but thoſe that are arrived to years of under- " ſtanding; which as it is an indication that that *v.* and thoſe that follow " in S. *Mark* of believers caſting out devils, *&c. v.* 17, 18. belong to " *adulti* peculiarly, ſo it no way hinders, but S. *Matthews* words being " different from them, and ſuppoſed to be preeedent to them in Chriſts

" delivery,

" delivery, may comprehend infants alſo, as ſuch who are capable of en-
" tring into diſcipleſhip, and of being brought and preſented to the A-
" poſtles by believing parents. This being the way whereby the faith of
" the parents may be ſignally beneficial to the child, in bringing him
" thus early into the School, and ſo to the benediction of Chriſt, the
" parents together with the infant children, as among the Jewes ſo a-
" mong Chriſtians, entring together into Covenant with God.

Anſw. I did ever conceive and ſo do others, and me thinks the Dr. ſhould conceive ſo too, that the commiſſion *Mark* 16. 15, 16. is the ſame, though with ſome variation of words, but not of matter, with that *Matth.* 28. 19. and if ſo, the Dr. hath granted and proved enough here to ſhew that *believers* Mark 16. 16. are onely *adulti capable of underſtanding*, and ſo none other diſciples to be baptized *Matth.* 28. 19. which is that I was to prove; and need therefore adde no more to refute his ſtale *crambe* of his Jewiſh pattern, but ſhall conſider what he ſaith for his poſition of making diſciples without precedent inſtruction.

Dr. *Hammond* Defence of infants baptiſm *ch.* 1. *ſect.* 2. *p.* 41. writes thus; " I ſay that the making or receiving diſciples, ſuppoſeth not any
" precedent inſtruction, but looks wholly on it as ſubſequent. This I
" there concluded not from the bare negative, becauſe there was no pre-
" cedent mention of ſuch inſtruction, where diſcipling and baptizing
" were both mentioned, but becauſe in that place on which the Anti-pæ-
" dobaptiſt ſo much relies, *Matth.* 28. 19. the [διδάσκοντες *teaching*]
" is expreſly mentioned after diſcipling and baptizing, and ſo is in rea-
" ſon to be deemed, and lookt on, as ſubſequent to both, and ſo the
" receiving *ad diſcipulatum*, refer to that then future inſtruction, *p.* 49.
" In this matter Mr. *T.* is willing to finde a difference betwixt teaching
" them to obſerve all things whatſoever Chriſt hath commanded them,
" *Matth.* 28. 20. and the preaching of the Goſpel in S. *Mark*: think-
" ing by that means to avoid the importunity of that text in *Matthew*,
" which evidently ſets baptiſm before inſtructing. But this can avail him
" nothing. For if by the Goſpel in *Mark* we underſtand the whole Go-
" ſpel, as in reaſon we muſt, for that is it which muſt be preacht to e-
" very creature (the Gentile world) then is that directly all one with
" teaching them to obſerve whatſoever he hath commanded; But if by
" preaching the Goſpel we mean no more then, as Mr. *T.* here ſaith, that
" Jeſus is the Chriſt, *i. e.* the propoſing him as a Maſter, and calling all
" to come to him as diſciples, then this being ſuppoſed precedent to
" mens comming to diſcipleſhip, or bringing their infants to it (for with-
" out this they cannot be expected to come themſelves, or to bring their
" infants) all the reſt is left to follow baptiſm, and ſo all particular
" Chriſtian inſtruction is ſubſequent, not precedent to baptiſm, an ef-
" fect of their diſcipleſhip, attending it no way neceſſary to prepare for
" it, which is the utmoſt ὅπερ ἦν δεῖξαι, which from that circum-
" ſtance of that text I undertook to demonſtrate.

Anſw. That the Dr. ſaith not true in this, is manifeſt from his words, which were, not as here, that *all particular Chriſtian inſtruction beſides the propoſing Chriſt as a maſter, and calling all to come to him as*

disciples is subsequent, but this *letter of resol. q.* 4. §. 25. having said that μαθητευσατε *is not duly expresst by our English, teach, but make disciples, or receive into discipleship all nations, baptizing them in the name, &c. making this form of Baptism their ceremony of receiving them*; He adds, *where the baptizing being immediatly annexed to the making or receiving disciples, and the receiving disciples not supposing any precedent instruction, but looking wholly on it as subsequent, all that are thus brought and received* ad discipulatum, *to be for the future instructed and instituted in the Christian faith, may surely bee received by baptism, the ceremony which is there prescribed by Christ, with which to receive disciples.* From which words it is evident he made μαθητευσατε, without teaching to import the receiving of disciples, even infants brought by others, and not onely all particular Christian instruction subsequent to baptism, but even instruction and institution in the Christian faith, and the receiving disciples supposing no any precedent instruction, but looking wholly on it as subsequent; which if he now retract and acknowledge that μαθητευσατε imports more then bare admission of disciples, and includes preaching of the Gospel that Jesus is the Christ, *i. e.* proposing him as a master, and calling all to come to him as disciples, and this precedent to baptism, then is some instruction in the faith necessarily precedent, and teaching by thus preaching the Gospel included in μαθητευσατε, make disciples, and none appointed to be baptized but they that are thus made disciples, and so no infants, and thus it will avail me something which I noted.

As for what he saith, that *in reason we must understand* Mark 16. 15. *the whole Gospel*, and *that then is that directly all one with teaching them to observe whatsoever he hath commanded.* Neither is it true, that in reason we must understand the whole Gospel, but so much at least as the Apostles were wont to preach to persons afore they baptized them (for they best understood Christs Commission *Mark* 16. 15.) which may be seen in these and such like places, *Acts* 2. 36, &c. & 8. 12, 35, 37. & 10. 36, &c. & 16. 31, 32. & 17. 18, &c & 18. 5. 1 *Cor.* 15. 3, 4, &c.

Nor if it were true doth it follow, that *then that is directly all one with teaching them to observe whatsoever hee hath commanded.* For 1. I no where finde *agenda* things to be observed by us, termed the Gospel, but *credenda* things to be believed *Rom.* 1. 16, 17. & 2. 16. 1 *Cor.* 15. 3, 4. *Gal.* 3. 8. 2 *Tim.* 2. 8 and accordingly no where is the Gospel propounded in the imperative, as a thing to be done by us, but in the indicative mood, as a thing to be believed; and accordingly wee are commanded *Mark* 1. 15. *to believe the Gospel*, and thus it is meant *Mark* 16. 15. For after it is appointed to the Apostles *to preach the Gospel*, it is presently added *v.* 16. *Hee that believeth*, to wit the Gospel preached, *and is baptized, shall be saved.* 2. If it were so that the Gospel did contain *agenda*, commands to be observed by us, yet to *preach the Gospel could* not *be directly all one with teaching them to observe all things whatsoever Christ hath commanded*, for Baptism is a command of Christ, yet is not any part of the subsequent instruction after baptism, which is

meant

meant by Christ in those words, and yet if any, is to be accounted part of the Gospel. So that it is evident, that the distinction I made between teaching the Gospel and other commands was right, and that the Dr. by making all the teaching *Matth.* 28, 19. subsequent to Baptism, hath perverted the order of Christ, and abused the text for the countenance of his errour of Infant Baptism's consistency with Christs appointment, *Matth.* 28. 19. *Mark* 16. 15, 16.

The Dr. adds, p. 41. *And to this sense I there made it manifest, that the definition of Baptism*, 1 Per. 3. 21. *did refer that Baptism is* ἐπερώτημα *seeking to God, as to the Oracle to enquire for the whole future life, no way pre requiring actual instruction, but comming to Christ and the Church, to receive it and obey it for the future (and that done in some sort by those that are brought when they are not able to come, and by the charity of the Church received there.)*

Answ. There is neither a definition of Baptism 1 *Pet.* 3. 21, nor any thing like it, nor doth the drift of the speech lead to such a conceit. That it is not a definition of Baptism may appear by the properties of a definition, for a definition sets down what a thing is, and is reciprocal with the thing defined, but the *genus* of Baptism cannot bee *answer*, or *interrogation*, or *stipulation*. Baptism actively taken being an act of hands, passively of the whole body, answer, interrogation or stipulation, if by words of the tongue, if of the conscience of the minde, nor any difference from prayer, or vow, or such like act. Nor is there any thing like it, there being no expression of the nature of baptism in the Church, but the use before God, nor is the intent to shew what Baptism is in it self, but when it saves, and the speech is a comparative expression, like that in the same Chapter *v.* 3, 4. *Matth.* 12. 7. and other the like; in which the meaning is, that baptism saves not when there is onely *a putting away of the filthinesse of the flesh*, but when there is with it also the *answer, interrogation, or stipulation of a good conscience towards God*, so that the predication is not formal but connexive, not shewing what it is, but what it is accompanied with when it saves. Nor is the Drs. sense true. For such seeking to God as he speaks of by baptism, when a child is brought by others to learn, and by the Churches charity received, doth not save as the answer of a good conscience towards God is said to do, nor is the answer, interrogation, or stipulation of a good conscience towards God without actual instruction, there is no man that makes an answer, or promises or makes an interrogation without some precedent instruction whose act soever it bee there must bee some knowledge of God and Christ, afore there is seeking or enquiry and address to him; nor is there any intimation of any ones bringing and the Church receiving, nor any propounding any question to learn, but if the allusion be to the use of the old questions and answers, *abrenuncias? abrenuncio. Credis? credo. Spondes? spondeo*: as *Beza annot. in locum* and others conceive: Or the term note an answer or stipulation as *Beza*, or interrogation as the Vulgar Latin, or confession as the Syriack, or examination and proving (which as *Heinsius Exercit. in locum* conceives, is intimated as pre-requisite to baptism as well as the Lords Supper) it is evidently

dently another thing, then Dr. *Hammonds* tendring a child, or a mans own offer of himself to be entred into a school that he might learn. It is in my apprehension an act of plerophory of faith, through the resurrection of Christ from the dead, the same or near that demand of the Apostle, *Rom.* 8. 33, 34. Not such a low act which comes so many degrees short of saving faith, as the Drs. enquiry or address as to an Oracle for future instruction, by a mans own presenting himself or his child to the Church for Baptism is, which is so childish a conceit, as I should think should hardly have comen into the head of such a man, did it not happen to him, as to men that talk with children, to talk as a child. But he adds more of the same stuff when he saith.

And this farther illustrated as by the manner of children brought by parents to school, without either knowledge of letters, or choise, or so much as wish of instruction, so by the manner of Christs disciples being received of him, particularly of Philip *Joh.* 1. 44. *who was called and received into discipleship as soon as ever Christ met with him,* i. e. *before he was at all instructed by him; and so also by the story of the Jews,* Exod. 19. 8. *who undertook to obey all the commandements of God, which hee should give, which yet were not then, but after given them,* v. 20. *which are clear evidences, that those may be received into discipleship, which have not yet had precedent instruction. Against this all that he hath to pretend is set down by him in these words.* Let putting to school be as early as the Dr. will imagine, yet none is put to school till he doth know his teacher, and so none is Christs disciple in Scripture language till he know Jesus to bee Christ, and take him for his Lord, which infants being not capable of, they are not disciples, not to be baptized according to Christs appointment. *To this I answer, 1. That the example which I had used of children being brought to school by the care of their parents, was designed to shew no more then this, that they may be delivered up to be schollers, who as yet know nothing of what they are to learn, nor have actual willingness to acquire knowledge, and consequently that entrance into discipleship refers onely to subsequent, supposes not any precedent instruction. And this is competently evidenced by that example, though it were supposed of the child that goes to school, that he knowes his teacher, this bare knowledge of the person of his teacher, being none of the documents which hee comes to learn, but the good letters that are profest and taught in the school, nor indeed is it imaginable why a blind child which is brought to school, or put to an instructer, and so cannot bee deemed to know the master before assuetude hath acquainted him with him, should not yet bee said, with as full propriety of speech, to come to school, as he that useth his own eyes as well as feet to direct him thither.*

Answ. No child is ever entred a scholler without some such document as this, you must hearken to your master, which is some precedent instruction, and though he be a blind or a lame child, or both, he that puts him to school gives him some *item* who is his master, and to what end he is brought to him (whereof none is done to an infant) and though these be not the documents which he comes to school to learn, yet they are documents which he is taught afore he comes to school.

The

The Dr. adds. "2ly. It is as true, that children that are brought to "school do not alwayes know their masters before their entrance, no "not by the most superficial knowledge; many are brought to publike "schools, who never so much as saw their masters till they are by their "parents delivered up into their power and discipline; if this bee not "plain enough, then change the similitude from the Schoolmaster to "the parent or guardian, or the very nurse, every one of these are to "feed, and nourish, and as he shall be capable, to instruct the child, and "so doth Christ in a spiritual sense, whosoever is intrusted (by be-"ing brought) to him in baptism. And we know God and nature doth "thus bring a child to the parent, to the nurse or guardian, when the "child knowes none of these, nor understands any more of all these "transactions, then the infant doth at the font conceive what is done to "it there. And so still this evidenceth the vanity of this answer concer-"ning the childs knowing his teacher.

Answ. It doth indeed evidence the vanity of this Drs. answer, who being to shew how the words of Christ *Matth.* 28. 19. do not exclude infants from baptism, sith they are first to be made disciples, afore they are to be baptized whom he appoints to be baptized, having first turned the precept of *making disciples*, into *receiving of persons to be discipled*, and making them disciples by preaching the Gospel to them, into preaching it to others who may bring them to school, and being urged with this that none are brought to school till he know his teacher, hath no better shift then here he useth to avoid it. For bee it that *some are brought to school that have not a superficial knowledge of their master, as having never seen him*, yet they are not brought till they be told they are to go to a master, nor entred into the school (which was the Drs. notion of *making Disciples, Matth.* 28. 19.) till he have some knowledge who is to be his teacher. As for his other shift by changing the similitude, it is worse, for thereby he quits the cause, the precept being not *Matth.* 28. 19. set to nurse, but *make disciples*, and therefore though it be true, that a father, guardian or nurse, are to receive a child that knows none of them, and are to feed, nourish and instruct it as it is capable, and it is a good office to bring an infant to such persons to such ends, yet is it neither agreeable to use nor reason, but rather the part of a frantique man out of his wits, to bring an infant to be admitted into a school to be taught, or matriculated in the University, nor doth Christ appoint such to be admitted as disciples to him; nor is it true which this Dr. saith, *that Christ doth in a spiritual sense feed, nourish and instruct whosoever is intrusted (by being brought) to him in baptism*; nor do I think but that the infant knowes more the nurse, and the bringing of it to that end, *then the infant doth at the font conceive what is done to it there.* So that hitherto the Dr. hath not avoided this objection, that though it were granted him (which yet is not true) that *making disciples, Matth.* 28. 19. is no more then receive to discipleship or to school, yet infants are excluded, who are by none received to discipleship, or entred into schools. But the Dr. hath one more lift at this block which thus lies in his way.

"But

" But then, saith he, 3dly. This so imperfect superficial knowledge " of the teacher, is in no wise worth considering in this matter; For I " shall demand, doth such very imperfect knowledge of Christ, as a " school-boy hath of his teacher, the first hour he comes into the school, " qualifie him for discipleship to Christ or no? if it do, then his Coun- " try men and Kinsmen, before he revealed himself to be the *Messiah* " and the Pharisees, which believed not his miracles were sufficiently " qualified, and then 'tis evident that those might be admitted to disci- " pleship, which were not believers, and so all Mr. *T.* his hypotheses " are destroyed, and then infants may be discipled and baptized though " they be not believers.

Answ. This is very Doctor-like arguing, to put a question and then make the answer absurd if it be affirmative, but shew no absurdity in it, if it be made negatively, as indeed it is. Which I should not have mentioned, but that he twits me (though unjustly) in the beginning of the next Section, with setting down a first reason without a second. I answer then to his question negatively, and yet such imperfect superficial knowledge of a teacher, is worth considering in this matter, to shew that no infant who hath not so much knowledge of Christ as such a school boy of his master, is to bee termed Christs disciple or admitted to discipleship. And yet if I had answered affirmatively, I think none of my hypotheses had been destroyed; For such imperfect knowledge of the master might be with faith in him, as able to teach him and willing to do him good, and so a Christian who hath but such imperfect knowledge of Christ as a school-boy of his master the first hour he comes to school, may be a believer, and know him to be the *Messiah* afore he bee baptized, and not, as his Kinsmen, Country men, or Pharisees, an unbeliever.

Yet the Dr. tels us, *As for that which he here interposes [the knowing Jesus to be Christ, and taking him for his Lord] this bears no proportion with the childs bare knowing of his master, but is far above it, equal to his making it his own choise to have this master, rather then any other, and promising exact obedience to him, which is much more then is to bee found in most young schollers, or indeed in any that are brought by their parents or guardians, who alone are the persons who bear proportion with the infants brought by others to baptism.*

Answ. This might have been omitted, but that the Dr. was willing to write something though it be impertinent, sith it opposeth not me; who said not that the knowing Jesus to be Christ and taking him for his Lord, bears any even proportion with the childs bare knowing his master, but onely said as none is put to school till he doth know his teacher, so none in Scripture language is Christs disciple till hee know Christ, not just so imperfectly as a school-boy. And yet I think there are some young schollers brought by parents or guardians, who make choise themselves of their master, and promise exact obedience to him.

The Dr. concludes this Section thus. " So that this reasoning of " his, is soon salved by distinguishing of disciples, that they are either " such

" such as come, or such as are brought to School, Proselytes of their " own choise, or children under the care of others; of the former sort " there are none but such as have some rude imperfect knowledge of " Christ, upon which they make this choise, and without it would not " probably be expected to make it; But for children which as *minors* " in their guardians hands, have no will of their own, there is no ne- " cessity they should have knowledge to move their will, they may ve- " ry reasonably bee acted by the will of others, and by their charity bee " made partakers of those priviledges which are communicated from " Christ in his Church to all true members thereof, and to that end be " discipled and baptized, entred by this ceremony into the Church of " God, where instruction is to be had as soon as they are capable of it, " and in the mean while partake of those other advantages, of which " their condition is capable.

Answ. When the Dr. hath proved out of Scripture, that there is any such sort of Disciples of Christ as he here describes, who come not but are brought to school by others, I shall acknowledge he hath sa'ved my reasonings till then I take this for vain babling, and conceive it little better then to speak of a disciple who hath no will of his own, nor knowledge to move it then to speak of a man that is irrational, and to say they may very reasonably be acted by the will of others, who are not so by their own, is in my apprehension all one as to say, they may very reasonably be acted, who are acted as bruits. The instance of *Philip, Joh.* 1. 44. servs not the Drs. turn, for though he were called and received into discipleship as soon as ever Christ met with him, yet not afore Christ spake to him, and bid him follow him, which implies some instruction by him, and therefore it is false that the Dr. saith, he was received into discipleship before he was at all instructed by Christ, nor doth that of the Jews *Exod.* 19. 8. who did then answer as disciples, but as servants, or persons that covenanted.

But the Dr. hath yet one more string to his bowe, though the rest be crackt. *Lastly*, saith he, *I concluded that the making or receiving disciples, supposeth not any precedent instruction by the nature of Proselytism, which as it is all one with entring into Gods Covenant, and (in the Christian sense) with coming to Christ and being received into discipleship, so 'tis that which children are known to be capable of, not onely by that text* Deut. 29. 0. *but by the custome of baptizing infant Proselytes among the Jews, and by Christs command to suffer them to come unto him, whensoever they were thus brought.*

Hereto I said, that it is not true, that a Disciple and a Proselyte are perfectly all one. For a Proselyte notes one that is by birth an alien from the Commonwealth of *Israel*, and comes to *Israel* to own their God, and bee part of their policy, not to bee taught, but to enjoy priviledges with other Jews, whether civil or ecclesiastical. But a disciple of Christ is one that owns Christ for his teacher and Lord, onely for spiritual benefits.

But certainly, saith the Dr. *this is no reason of difference, for besides that I in that §. 27. acknowledged this accidental difference, that a Prose-*

lyte denotes a comming from some other nation (as a disciple doth not) adding, that this difference had no place in this matter, where the disciples are specified to be received from all nations; besides this, I say, it cannot be unknown to Mr. T. that I speak of Proselytes in such a notion as is equally competible to all of what nation soever they are, that enter into Covenant with God.

Answ. Who but he that writes at randome, would assert that a Disciple and Proselyte are perfectly all one, and yet acknowledge this accidental difference, that this is no reason of difference, and yet say, that a Proselyte denotes a comming from some other nation (as a disciple doth not) that this is but an accidental difference, and yet in his own description make this very difference, and when he expresseth the Hebrew word for Proselyte, still terms him גר a stranger, that this difference had no place in this matter, when his inference is from Proselytes who were strangers to the Jews, to prove Disciples and Proselytes the same, and to tell me I must know his use of a word, which hee neither shews that he or any else have so used. But the Dr. adds.

"Thus do we finde a Proselyte defined, *Heb.* 11. 6. by ὁ προσερχόμενος τῷ θεῷ he that commeth to God, thus doth a Jew when he "enters into Covenant of obedience to him, and thus did a Gentile "when he undertook the whole Law of the Jewes, and was therefore "גר עדקה and גר ברית a Proselyte of the Covenant, and a Proselyte of their righteousnes, and such is every one whether Jew or "Gentile that commeth to Christ, and as the two former of these were "made partakers of priviledges by this means, particularly allowed "freely to enter into the Congregation, and infants as well as grown "men were thus among them admitted into Covenant; so it is not imaginable why it should not hold of the Christian Proselytes also, nor "why the Christian infants thus received into Covenant by Christ, after "the same manner as Jewish and Gentile infants were among the ancient people of God. *i. e.* by Baptism, should not as properly bee called Proselytes of Christ, though they neither come from any other "nation, nor ever associate themselves with *Israelites* according to the "flesh.

Answ. If the notion of a Proselyte were according to *Heb.* 11. 6. I should agree that a disciple of Christ and a Proselyte were the same; For such a Proselyte is one that is a believer, as the words shew; *But without faith it is impossible to please God; For he that commeth to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.* All such Proselytes of Christ I doubt not are admitted into Covenant, to be baptized, to partake of priviledges in the Christian Church whether they be Jewes or Gentiles, according to that 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. and when infants are proved to be such, there will be no question about their Baptism, though not by reason of the Jewish custome, yet by vertue of Christs institution to baptize disciples and believers on him. But that *infants of Christians are thus received into Covenant by Christ after the same manner as Jewish and Gentile infants were among the ancient people of God, i. e. by Baptism*, or that afore they believe they should

be

be *called Proſelytes of Chriſt*, or, that *every one whether Jew or Gentile that commeth to Chriſt, is as a Gentile when hee undertook the whole Law of the Jewes, and was therefore a proſelyte of their Covenant and a proſelyte of their righteouſneſs*, or that a Chriſtian believer is either termed in Scripture *a Proſelyte*, or any Jew is to be ſo termed *properly* is not to be imagined, all theſe things being the meer dreams of the Dr. ſuitable to his fancy of infant Baptiſm inſtituted among Chriſtians after the Jewiſh pattern.

The Dr. proceeds thus; "And whereas he ſaith of the Proſelytes "comming to the Iſraelites, that they came not to be taught but to en- "joy priviledges, I cannot divine what motive he had to affirm it, for "ſure the infant child that was baptized, and ſo received into the Con- "gregation of Iſrael did come to learn the Jewiſh religion, into which "he was thus early initiated, and that was one ſpecial priviledge (the "reſt of the Heathen having not knowledge of theſe Lawes) the imme- "diate end of his proſelytiſm, yet not excluding thoſe other ends "of injoying all other priviledges both Civil and Eccleſiaſtical "thereby.

Anſw. The infant had no end but ſuch as the parent, who was indeed the Proſelyte, had, and the parents end was not to be taught, for hee was taught the *Jewiſh* religion before, and at his Baptiſm, the precepts of *Moſes* being recited to him while he ſtood in the water, by the Elders at whoſe command he was baptized, and admitted into the *Jewiſh* policy, afore which admiſſion he was to undertake the obſervance of them, the proper and immediate end of his proſelytiſm, was his injoying thoſe priviledges which native Jewes had as one of that body, which ſhews that the admiſſion of a Proſelyte was not into a ſchool to learn, and therefore the notion of Proſelytiſm not like the notion of receiving to diſcipleſhip, which the Dr. fancies to be meant *Matth.* 28. 19. and to be the ſame with admiſſion to Proſelytiſm; to ſhew the miſtake of which was the motive why I ſet this difference between a Proſelyte and a Diſciple of Chriſt, as the Dr. might eaſily have divined, if hee had been minded to do ſo.

The Dr. ſaith of me, "And when he adds, but a Diſciple of Chriſt "is one that owns Chriſt for his teacher and Lord, onely for ſpiritual be- "nefits, I might as well acknowledge it, and ask why then an infant "who hath need of thoſe ſpiritual benefits, as ſoon as he is born ſhould "not be haſtened to a participation of them.

Anſw. I know no reaſon why hee ſhould not, nor do I know any reaſon why he ſhould be baptized, nor how by it an infant may be haſtened to the participation of ſpiritual or other benefits, but know reaſon why an infant ſhould not bee baptized, becauſe Baptiſm is thereby profaned, and the infant afterwards uſually hardened through pernicioue preſumption, as if he were thereby made a Chriſtian. The Dr. ſaith alſo.

"But it is farther evident, that ſpiritual benefits beeing firſt and "principally deſigned, other even ſecular advantages, may very law- "fully bee reſpected, and reaped by them that are thus early brought

"in, whether as Disciples or Proselytes to Christ.

Answ. That by Baptism infants are brought in as Disciples or Proselytes to Christ, or attain any advantages spiritual or secular I know not, sure I am none are lawfully respected in the use of infant Baptism, being wholly besides Christs minde, and if the end of Proselytism was (as manifestly it was) for far different purposes from that of a Disciple of Christ the Proselyte and Disciple of Christ are not perfectly one, which I was to demonstrate.

Yet again, saith the Dr. "Two sage observations he here addeth; "1 That there is no mention of the Disciples of the Priests, but of the "Pharisees and Sadduces, and I can verily well grant it, who speak "not of any lower kinde of Disciples, but either of God among the "Jewes, or of Christ, among us Christians, those being the onely "Discipleship, to which they were admitted by the Ceremony of Bap. "tism, the Disciples of the Pharisees and Sadduces being but a subdi. "vision and notification of several Sects among the Jewes, as there are "different denominations of Christians (the more the pity) which "divide unity, but use not new Baptism to discriminate them, I am sure "contradict the Apostle if they do.

Answ. How sage the Drs. observations of making Disciples as all one with receiving to discipleship, of baptizing after the Jewish pattern, *&c.* are is seen before. This observation is not denied by the Dr. nor any thing said by him to evacuate the use I intended to make of it, to shew that to be a disciple, doth not note the comming to God to enjoy benefits, as the Dr. made the notion of a Proselyte to import, for then persons should be termed disciples of the Priests, which is not so, but to learn, and so the disciples of Pharisees were those who learned their opinions. That which the Dr. saith is not true, that *by Baptism persons were admitted to discipleship*, nor that *disciples of the Pharisees and Sadduces were but a subdivision under Disciples of God or Christ*, for their disciples were no disciples of God or Christ, nor pertinent to the avoiding the use of my observation. 'Tis true *there are different denominations of Christians (the more the pity) which divide unity*, and of them I know none so great as that of the Prelatists, who will neither hear the Preacher who preacheth the faith of Christ, nor joyn in prayer unless the Common Prayer Book be used, nor own them as Presbyters who were not ordained by a Bishop distinct from a Presbyter, nor joyn with that society as a Church lawfully constituted where there is not Episcopal government, which I take to be a manifestly unjust schism and recusancy. I know none that *use new Baptism*, but Pædobaptists, who therein contradict Christs institution and the Apostles practise. Pistobaptists or baptizers of Believers of age, upon their profession of faith, use the old Baptism which Christ appointed and the Apostles practised, not *to discriminate them from others*, but to do their duty, and to supply a defect in infant sprinkling.

The Dr. saith, *His second observation is, that the Holy Ghost doth not at any time call Christians Christs Proselytes, but his Disciples, that, saith he, we might not confound the notions of these termes. But I answer,*

1. That

1. *That those Texts that expres the Christians entring into discipleship, by comming unto him (of which there are good store) do in effect call them Proselytes, for a Proselyte is a Greek noun, derived immediately from the Verb* προσέρχεσθαι, *to come unto.*

Answ. 1. I think this not true, sith the texts which expres the comming to Christ, do mean by it believing in him, as *Joh.*6.35. shews, but that is not in effect to call them Proselytes in the Drs. sense, nor is the notion of a commer unto and a disciple all one, sith a person may come to a person, yea to learn, and never yet be his disciple.

And secondly, saith the Dr. *that if this word whether in it self, or in the Verb from whence it comes, had never been used in the N. T. yet would it not thence follow, that we might not confound the notions of Proselytes and Disciples.*

Anſ. Nor do I make it any demonstrative argument but probable, as it is probable, that the Holy Ghost calls not the Christian society the Synagogue, nor the preachers of the Gospel its *Priests*, that we may not confound them. I have often given a firm reason, why *infants capable of coming to Christ, blessed by him, and affirmed to be qualified for the Kingdom of heaven, should be denied water to be baptized*, even this, that neither Christ appointed it, nor the Apostles baptized them, though he did the other to them. The Christian Church or Ministter might not deny baptism to infants, if they were qualified as *Cornelius* and the Gentiles that came with him were *Acts* 10. 46, 47. & 11. 18. What I said of *infants being unqualified for Baptism, till by hearing they own Christ as their Master*, is fully proved in the 2d. part of this *Review*, *sect.* 5, &c. and it is therefore too too boldly said by the Dr. *that it is a begging of the question without the least tender of proof.* Whether or in what manner the little ones mentioned *Deut.* 29. 10. did enter into Covenant, is so fully discussed before *Sect.*44,45,61,66,67. chiefly this last, that I need here add no more. Either in one of those Sections or some where before in this part of the *Review*, I have proved from the Text and Commentators, that *those that were not with them that day*, v. 15. were unborn, chiefly in that *v.* 2. *Moses called unto all Israel*, and they are said *v.* 10. *all to stand there that day*, and therefore I might more justly wonder (though it be no wonder that the Dr. thus abuseth me) that hee should have the face to say, *I impose on the Reader.*

He tels me, *there is no mention of any act of the Fathers engaging them under a curse or oath, but onely of Gods oath which he maketh to them*, v. 12. But he might have seen *v.* 14. these words, *Neither do I make with you onely this Covenant and this Oath, but with him also that is not here with us this day*, which I know not how it should be meant of any other then the unborn, for none but they of *Israel* were then absent, and entering into an oath and curse as they did *Nehem.* 10.29.

And for what hee adds, "If they had thus adjured or laid oath or "curse upon their children, yet would this make no difference betwixt "their and our entring into Covenant, we by the oath of Baptism which "is laid on the child (by him to be performed when he comes to ability, "unless he will forfeit all the benefits of his Baptism) do in like manner

"adjure

" adjure our infants, though while they remain such, they hear it as " little as the Jewish infants did.

But sure there is a great difference between the solemn adjuration of *Moses* and all *Israel* binding their posterity and recorded in the book of the Law, and the obscure charge of an ignorant officiating Priest to three Gossips, whereof some are so ignorant, that they know not what the Christian faith is at a Font, which hee terms the oath of Baptism, which is seldome either heeded or remembred by any present.

And whereas he saith, *my rejecting his inference, that by parity of reason infants may be entred into discipleship and baptized, to be a denying the conclusion when the premises cannot be denied*; It is not true, for the consequence is plainly denied, and the reason is given of that denial, and each branch proved in the Book before *sect.* 5, *&c.* And therefore I shall say no more to this section, *it being pity* (to use the Drs. words) *to lose time* on such trifling conceits empty of all proof, as this Dr. hath dictated for infant Baptism. He said better *Pract. cat. l.* 5. §. 1. *The Apostles powers were to preach and baptize those that received their doctrine.*

SECT. XCVIII.

The testimonies of Cyprian, Augustin, *and other Latin Fathers for Infant Baptism, are shewed to have come from their mistakes; and the evidences why the antiquity of Infant Baptism should not be deemed such as is pretended, are vindicated.*

I Now return to the examination of the Testimonies brought out of the rest of the Latin Fathers besides *Tertullian* for infant Baptism, whereof *Cyprian* was the chief, and his testimony is thus urged by Dr. *Hammond. Defence of infant Baptism, chap.* 4. *sect.* 2. *p.* 99. " In the midst of this third Age, *An. Chr.* 248. was S. *Cyprian* made Bp. " of *Carthage*, and ten years after he suffered martyrdome, *i. e.* 158 " years after the Age of the Apostles. In the year 257 he sate in Coun- " cel with 66 Bishops (see *Justellus* in his preface to the *African* Ca- " nons *p.* 21.) and their Decrees by way of Synodical Epistle are to be " seen in his *Ep.* 58. *ad Fidum fratrem*, which is now among his works, " *Pamel. edit. p.* 80. The Councel was in answer to some questions about " Baptism, and accordingly he there sets down his own opinion, together " with the Decrees of that Councel of 66 Bishops which were assembled " with him; And so this, as it is an ancient, so it is more then a single " testimony, that of a whole Councel added to it; and yet farther to en- " crease the authority of it, S. *Austin* cites this Epistle more then once, " and sets it down almost entire, as a testimony of great weight against " hereticks; and so 'tis cited by S. *Hierom* also, *l.* 3. *dial. cont. Pelag.* " In this Epistle the question being proposed by *Fidus*, whether infants " might be baptized the second or third day, or whether as in Circum- " cision the eighth day were not to be expected, he answers in the name

" of

" of the Councel, *universi judicavimus*, 'twas the resolution or sentence " of all, *nulli hominum nato misericordiam Dei & gratiam denigandam*, " that the mercy and grace of God was not to be denied to any human " birth, to any child, though never so young (by that phrase [mercy " and grace of God] evidently meaning Baptism, the right of convey- " ing them to the baptized) adding, that 'tis not to be thought that this " grace which is given to the baptized, is given to them in a greater or " less degree in respect of the age of the receivers; and that God as he " accepts not the person, so nor the age of any, confirming this by the " words of S. *Peter Act.* 10. that none was to be called common or un- " clean, and that if any were to be kept from Baptism, it should rather " be those of full age, who have committed the greater sins, and that " seeing men when they come to the faith are not prohibited bap- " tism, how much more ought not the infant to be forbidden, who be- " ing new born, hath no sin upon him, but that which by his birth " from *Adam* he hath contracted as soon as he was born, who therefore " should more easily be admitted to pardon, because they are not his " own but others sins which are then remitted to him, concluding that as " none were by the decree of that Councel to be refused baptism, so this " was the rather to be observed, and retained about infants and new-born " children. Thus much and more was the sentence of that ancient Fa- " ther, and that Councel, and as the occasion of that determination was " not any Antipædobaptist doctrine (there had no such then so much as " lookt into the Church, that we can hear of) but a conceit of one, that " it should be deferr'd to the eigth day, which was as much infancy as " the first (and so both parties were equally contrary to the Anti pædo- " baptists interests, the condemned, as well as the Judges) so that it " is no new doctrine that was then decreed, or peculiar to S. *Cyprian* " (who had one singular opinion in the matter of baptism) appears al- " so by the concurrence of the whole Councel that convened with him, " and by the expres words of St. *August. Ep.* 28. *ad Hieronym.* Blessed " *Cyprian* not making any new decree, but keeping the faith of the " Church most firm, decreed with a set number of his fellow Bishops, " that a child new born might fitly be baptized. Which shews it the re- " solution of that Father also, that baptizing of infants was the faith of " the Church before *Cyprians* time, not onely the opinion, but the faith, " which gives it the authority of Christ and his Apostles.

Answ. I have been willing to set down these words at large sith none urgeth this authority more fully, though Mr. *M.* Dr. *H.* Mr. *B*, &c. do all alledge it, and it is the chiefest of all the testimonies *Augustin* produced for infant Baptism, and therefore was translated by me into English, and printed at the end of my *præcursor*. Concerning which act, Mr. *B. præfest. mor. p.* 401. saith thus, *It seems to me God ordered Mr. T. to translate* Cyprians *Epistle to the disgrace of his cause with the vulgar themselves. For none can be so blinde as not to see in it the antiquity of infant Baptism, which is all that we urge it for.* But if the cause I maintain be disgraced by translating that Epistle, I shall take it as a sign that a spirit of dotage is faln on men, so as to be enamoured on the blemishes

of

of the ancient: Sure me thinks none of the vulgar, much leſs the learned, ſhould be ſo blinde as not to diſcern, that infant Baptiſm was an errour, which was maintained by the prime aſſertors, upon ſuch vain reaſons as are in that Epiſtle, which are not excuſed by what Mr. *B.* ſaith, *That the arguments are onely for confutation of the objection concerning infants uncleanneß before the eighth day*, and *not to give the grounds that warranted infant Baptiſm*; For the truth is, both are done together, and the beſt grounds they had for it are ſet down by them, which will appear to be ſo frivolous by examination of them, that notwithſtanding all the credit Dr. *Hammond* endeavours to gain to it, yet men of mean underſtandings, I doubt not, will by reading of it diſcern how ill that Councel did in that determination. Nor doth it any whit better the matter to ſay, that it was not *Cyprian* alone, but alſo a whole Councel of *66* Biſhops which did thus agree with him. For in like manner did the ſame *Cyprian*, with a more famous Councel [See *Epiſt.* to *Jubaia. ponep. Quir. Janu. Steph.*] at the ſame place, determine the rebaptizing of the baptized by Hereticks, with better ſhew of Scripture and reaſon then in his Epiſtle to *Fidus*, and alledged Apoſtolical authority as much as in this, and yet he is deſerted therein not onely by the Biſhops of *Rome* that were then, but alſo by *Auguſtin*, and the *African*, and other Churches. Beſides his maintaining *the perfuſion of the Clinici*, in his *Epiſtle to Magnus l. 4. Epiſt. 7.* his maintaining *the neceſſity of water with the wine in the Lords Supper, as the Lords tradition, l. 2. Epiſt. 3. ad Cæcilium*, with other things, do ſufficiently diſcover the weakneſs of *Cyprian*, and the Biſhops of thoſe times in their determinations, and the ſlightineſs of their reaſons, which no intelligent Divine ſhould now urge, and therefore me thinks ſhould not adhere to their practiſe or tenents, grounded on ſuch frivolous reaſons. Nor in this matter is *Auguſtins* or *Hieroms* authority ſuch, as that we ſhould relye upon their approbations and ſpeeches, their corruptions in this point, and in other points ſhewing their miſtakes both in matters of doctrine, and fact, ſome whereof are before noted ſection 88. and more will bee in that which followes.

As for what Mr. *B.* ſaith, *That the antiquity of infant Baptiſme is all that he with others urge Cyprian for*, I reply, he and others need not to have done that, ſith I acknowledge it to have been as ancient as *Cyprian*, not as it is now; but 1. in the practiſe, uſed onely in caſe of imagined neceſſity, to ſave an infant in apparent danger of imminent death from periſhing, as the words of *Tertullian de bapt. c.* 18. and *Greg. Nazianz. orat.* 40. *de ſanct. bapt.* and ſundry relations ſhew to have been the practiſe. Now in this if Proteſtant divines have rejected antiquity, and deny ſuch infant Baptiſm as they practiſed, determining that there is not ſuch a neceſſity of baptizing infants for that reaſon, nor that they are to be baptized with private Baptiſm upon ſuch a fear, and accordingly declining it as ſuperſtitious, they thereby juſtifie us from their crimination of innovation in deſerting the Fathers, when they themſelves do it in the ſame thing as well as we. And if Mr. *Baxter* (as hee doth *plain Script. proof. l. 2. c. 15. p. 153.*) except againſt *Tertullians reaſons as poor*, and therefore

therefore reject his advice, why ſhould not we reject *Cyprians* and his Collegues determination, which was built on as poor, if not poorer reaſons then *Tertullians*.

2. In the Doctrines taught: For they taught, that *by Baptiſm the grace and mercy of God was given, that without Baptiſm infants muſt periſh, that every one that is born of mankind is to be baptized*, in which Mr. *Baxter* and other Proteſtants do diſſert them: Now if they diſclaim their Doctrine in that which led them to their infant Baptiſm, we have no reaſon to be bound to their authority. Nor is the Doctrine the leaſt matter to be conſidered, or the reaſons of their determination impertinent to a right judgement of their practiſe. For as in other controverſies between us and Papiſts, as about Monkiſh profeſſion, Lent faſt, Prayer for the dead, *&c.* the main thing conſidered, is, how far the Ancients practiſed theſe, and upon what grounds, as may be ſeen in *Uſhers anſwer to the Jeſuites challenge*, and other learned Proteſtants writings, ſo it is in this: By which we may diſcern, that the Fathers practiſe of infant Baptiſm was upon the ſame grounds with thoſe of the Papiſts, which we reject; and therefore the Fathers teſtimonies do indeed diſgrace the cauſe of infant Baptiſm, and plainly ſhew upon what erroneous opinions it came in; and if prejudice did not dazle their eys, learned and godly Proteſtants would rather ſuſpect and judge infant Baptiſm a corruption, then alledge their determination for their juſtification. And for what is alledged, that *Auguſt. Ep.* 28. *ad Hieron.* ſaid, that *Cyprian did not make any new decree, but kept the faith of the Church moſt firm*, it is manifeſt, that the faith *Auguſtine* means was that *infants had original ſin, and without Baptiſm muſt periſh*, which in like manner he taught about the Lords Supper (which was given to infants in *Cyprians* time, as his *Sermon de lapſis* ſhews) *l.* 1. *de pecc. merit. & remiſ. c.* 24. *l.* 1. *adv. Julian. c.* 2. *contra* 2 *Epiſt. Pelag. l.* 4. *c* 4. Now as we and the Romaniſts have rejected infant Communion, though as ancient as infant Baptiſm, or very near as ancient, ſo ſhould infant Baptiſm be rejected as upon the like miſtake brought into the Church. The like might be ſaid of the exorciſing, or exufflation, that is, blowing away or puſhing out the Devil, of which *Auguſtine* ſpeaks ſo much as uſed with Baptiſm to infants, the anointing with oyl, giving milk and honey, cloathing with white garments mentioned by *Tertullian* as common in his time before *Cyprian*, which yet are left by us notwithſtanding he make them in his *l.* 1. *againſt Marcion, lib. de Corona militis, Apoſtolical traditions*. Out of which and many more inſtances this may bee collected, that the Fathers teſtimony of the uſe of their time, or of Apoſtolical traditions, is not to be received without examining their reaſons, to which in this thing how little credit or heed is to be given, will appear by the exceptions I have made in my *Examen*, and ſhall now vindicate from what Mr. *Ms.* friend, and Dr. *Homes* ſay to them.

The firſt was, that in *Tertullians* time infant Baptiſm was not defined, ſith he diſſwades it, *De Bapt. c.* 18. *Scult. med. patr. part* 1. *l.* 7. *c.* 42. *Tertullianus l. de Bapt. eos duntaxat baptizandos cenſet, qui Chriſtum noſſe potuerunt.* The anſwers are, 1. that *he was for infant Baptiſm, as appears*

pears by his book *De anima*, c.39. But this is refelled before. 2. *That he mentions it as then in use.* Ref. It is true, but not allowed. 3. *That he allowed it in case of necessity.* Ref. This is against those that deny the use of it for that reason in that case. 4. *That he disswaded onely the Baptism of infants of infidels, sith they onely were in need of sureties, and likely to fail in answering the engagement for them.* Ref. This is not likely. 1. It's not likely such were brought in the times of persecution, nor that there were any Christians who would become sureties for them. 2. It was usual then, as the custome hath been since, to have sureties at Baptism of infants of believers, and also at the Baptism of the aged, as is gathered out of *Tertul. de corona militis, Inde suscepti*, which is spoken of the aged. 3. The words of *Tertullian* shew he argued against the Baptism of any little ones in respect of their age. 4. His reasons (be they what they will) are against the Baptism of any little ones, with expres direction for them to come not till they were of age to understand. *Veniant ergo dum adolescunt, veniant dum discunt, dum quo veniant docentur, fiant Christiani, cum Christum nosse potuerint.* That is, *Let them come therefore when they be grown up, let them come when they learn, when they are taught wherefore they come; let them be made Christians when they shall be able to know Christ.* Which makes it certain he meant this even of believers infants, whom he presumed would be taught to know Christ, and that *Antipadobaptist doctrine had then looke into the Church*, though Dr. *Hammond* say otherwise.

The 2d. Exception was, *Augustines* and *Hieroms* relying on this Councel, shewed their darkness.

Answ. Mr. *M.* p.38. of his *Defence. Though* Augustine *approved* Cyprians *judgement, yet he relied not upon his reasons to make good infant Baptism; this to him is no new doctrine; he had another eye upon the constant and sure faith of the Church, which in that point he followed faithfully.*

Ref. It appears by the words of *Augustine, ep.28. ad Hieronym.* where he alledgeth this very thing for infant Baptism [*that* Cyprian *said not that the flesh, but the soul unbaptized should be lost*] that he relied on his reasons; and the like is apparent, where he and *Hierome* set down his words, and argue from them, *tom.7. l.3. de pecc. mer. & remis. c 6 contra Julian l.1. c.* where *Augustine* hath these words, *Sed Cyprianus dicit perire parvulum nisi fuerit baptizatus, quamvis ei non propria demittantur, sed aliena peccata. But* Cyprian *saith, a little one perisheth unless he be baptized, although not his own but anothers sins are forgiven him.*

My 3d. Exception was, That *Fidus* started the question out of a Judaizing conceit, *that the law of Circumcision which was not to be till the 8th day, was to be considered, and that the footstep of an infant being in the first days of his birth is not clean*; which shew a relique of Judaism in him.

To this it is said, 1. *That* Cyprian *did not concur with him, nor the Councel.*

Refut. 1. However it appears that the Baptism of infants was then practised upon the superstitious conceit as if we were to do in Baptism

as the Jews did in Circumcision. 2. Nor doth *Cyprian* appear by his *Ep.7. l.4.* and elsewhere to be free from thinking the ceremonial Law to direct us about Baptism.

2. *That other learned men,* as Athanasius, Nazianz. August. Chrysostome, *reasoned from Circumcision to Baptism.*

Resut. No doubt of it, for as in the controversie about Easter, so in other things they appeared too much to imitate the Jewish ceremonies, by which the simplicity of the Christian service was altered.

My 4th. Exception was, That the resolution of this Council was the spring-head of infant Baptism.

Answ. *Before that time Baptism of infants was in use.*

Resut. Yet it was not determined before, but disswaded, nor was any authority of any Council which was as a spring head to it, whence it continued a stream afore that, nor doth *Augustine* in his allegations for it, find any higher spring of it then *Cyprian* and his Council.

My 5th. and chief Exception was, That the Council determined the baptizing of infants upon these errours, which are now rejected by Protestants as Popish; 1. *That they thought baptizing giving Gods grace, and the denying it denying Gods grace;* 2. *They thought the souls to be lost, which were not baptized;* 3. *That therefore not onely infants of believers, but all infants were to be baptized.*

Mr. *M. acknowledgeth the two first to be rightly gathered from the words of the Epistle, but that he also urged that Baptism comes in stead of Circumcision, and if some arguments were used by the Ancients which were not good, the truth is not to be rejected, when some other are.*

Ref. 1. The Council determined infant Baptism on no other argument. 2. If infant Baptism could be proved by other arguments, I should yeeld to it; however the credit and authority of this Council is taken away by reason of the falshood of the grounds of their determination.

2ly. For the 3d. inference, though he lays it down in general terms, that none are to be hindered from comming to Christ: Yet what he saith ought to be understood of the Church, because he speaks of such as God hath cleansed or purified who were common.

Ref. 1. The words are as expres as may be, *we all judged that the mercy and grace of God is to be denied,* (by not baptizing them) *nulli hominum nato, to none born of men, as much as in us lies, if it may be, nulla anima perdenda est, no soul is to be lost for want* of Baptism. 2. The very words Mr. *M* alledgeth for a restriction to the Church are against it, they are thus. *Sed putamus omnem omnino hominem admittendum ad gratiam Christi, cum & Petrus in Actibus Apostolorum loquatur & dicat: Dominus mihi dixit neminem communem dicendum & immundum. But we think every man altogether should be admitted to the grace of Christ, when* Peter *also in the Acts of the Apostles speaks and saith, The Lord hath said to me that no man should be termed common and unclean:* Which is meant of all men, nor onely of the Church. And this enough to answer Dr. *Homes*, who in his *animadversions*, p.138. *finds not that passage in* Cyprian, *which I alledge*, and p.139. saith, Cyprian *doth not say, infants perish if they be not baptized*, though *Augustine* expresly saith the contrary, and *p.*137. takes

takes on him to defend the sayings of that Councel, as *having no errour or hurt to say that Baptism gives grace instrumentally, and that without warrant wittingly to deny Baptism is to deny Gods grace.* But Protestant writers generally (as *Austin* before) judge the words to have a further sense, and the words of the Epistle plainly shew that they held by the very Baptism infants had remission of sin and were saved, and without it were lost, and to deny them Baptism was to deny them Gods grace. That which he saith of me, p. 139. *That I would not have it, that* Cyprian *doth at all put in original sin among his arguments for baptizing of infants,* is not true; I onely denyed that he put it in, in the manner Mr. *M.* conceived.

What I said of the absurdity and nakedness of that Epistle, hath no more immodesty then is common to Writers Protestant and Papists, who charge Fathers and ancient Councils with errours, blemishes, and oft times with harder censures; if I had given that Epistle a tarter censure I had done right, that I spake was soft enough, considering the great hurt which hath come to the Church of God by that Epistle, which determined childrens baptism by childish reasons.

Next to *Cyprian* of the Latine Fathers, are recited *Ambrose* and *Hierome*, and *Paulinus* by Dr. *Hammond*, whose words with *Augustines*, and such Councels as were in their times in the 4 th. and 5th. Century, I shall forbear to recite, it being acknowledged that in those ages it was practised, and by reason of *Augustines* esteem Baptism of infants was practised in following Ages almost without controul; and in process of time, that which was before *Augustines* dayes a rarity, became so frequent, as that it almost swallowed up the right Baptism, which appears from the words of *Walafridus Strabo*, placed by *Usher* at the year 840. in his *Book de rebus Ecclesiasticis*, c. 26. who is termed by Mr. *George Gillespie* in his *Aarons rod blossoming*, p. 567. *a diligent searcher of the antients which were before him, and of the old Ecclesiastical rites*, which with other observations tending to reduce the testimony of *Augustine* to its just weight, are set down in my *Examen*, *par.* 1. *sect.* 8. and are now to be vindicated by me from what Mr. *Marshal* and others reply.

Dr. *Homes*, p. 158. excepts against what I said, that it was *Augustines* authority that carried infants Baptism in the following Ages almost without controul; and 1. he asks, "What carried it 300. or 400. years be-"fore? For all that time it was frequent.] But this is not true, nor ever proved by Dr. *Homes*. *Chamier*, *paustr. cath. tom.* 4. *l.* 5. *c.* 15. §. 19. saith truly, *who seeth not that the custome of the scrutiny of the baptised was in that time, when scarce the thousandth person was baptised afore he came to age, and was diligently exercised in Catechism.* Dr. *Hammond* in his *pract. Catech. l.* 1. §. 3. *p.* 23. *All men were instructed in the fundamentals of faith anciently before they were permitted to be baptised.*

"2. They that were carried by *Augustine*, were not carried by the "authority of the man, but by the Scriptures and reasons he urged. Which I grant; but those Scriptures and reasons had never carried infant Baptism, if the name of the man had not been more prevalent then his reasons.

"3. It

" 3. It cannot be ſaid that *Auguſtines* authority did in his time carry " infant Baptiſm in a manner without control, ſeeing he had ſo much " bickering with the Pelagians about it, who under ſome notion did con- " againſt it, as we ſhewed before.] But by his leave it might be ſo ſaid, and that truly, ſith in the bickerings againſt the Pelagians, *Auguſtines* authority grew; yea, *Hierome* in the end of his 3d. *Dialogue againſt Pelagians*, in the words cited by Dr. *Homer.* p. 149. doth himſelf refer the Reader to *Auguſtines* works about baptizing infants, as the chief prop of that cuſtome. However, that which I ſaid is manifeſtly true, that after his time, in the following Ages, *Auguſtines* authority carried the baptiſm of infants almoſt without control.

Dr. *Homes* further excepts againſt my alledging *walafridus Strabo*, and ſaith, 1. *Strabo is againſt me*, 2. *in ſaying in the firſt times, Baptiſm was wont to be confirmed by impoſition of hands.* But the Dr. wrongs me in ſaying I deny it *Exercit. ſect.* 14. who onely ſay it was a part or appendix of Baptiſm, as *Chamier* ſaid *pauſtr. cath. tom.* 4. *l.* 4. *c.* 11. *ſect* 11. &c. not as among the Papiſts or Prelatiſts uſed many years after baptiſm. But of this enough is ſaid *Review part.* 2. *ſect.* 23.

2. *About* Athanaſius, *that in* Athanaſius *his time, to his knowledge there was baptiſm of little children.* But how is this againſt mee, who doubted not concerning *Athanaſius* his fact of imitating baptizing when he was a Boy, and of *Alexander* his approbation of it, but ſaid I marvailed I found nothing produced out of *Athanaſius* works for infant Baptiſm, if it were ſo manifeſt as Mr. *M.* ſaid. Now this was not in *Athanaſius* his works, and the ſtory doth not at all prove infant Baptiſm either in uſe or approved then, but rather the contrary. For that fact was done by *Athanaſius* at play, among boyes at play, and it was approved as baptiſm, becauſe the baptizer and the baptized uſed the ordinary actions done at baptiſm of the aged: which ſhews that Baptiſm was then uſed to and by perſons of age, though imitated by boyes at play.

3. *About infant Baptiſm, for which* Strabo *quotes many authorities and antiquities, as of the Concilium Gerundenſe*; But this is not againſt me, who deny not, but acknowledge many Councils for it, after and in *Auguſtins* time, but know of none but that of *Carthage* in *Cyprians* Epiſtle to *Fidus* afore, and do judg thoſe Councils weigh no more then one *Auguſtin*, whoſe authority they relied on, and ſome of them uſed his very words in their Canons.

2. That " *Strabo* faulters, and is much faulty in the thing he is quo- " ted for. For firſt, he calls the times of *Auguſtine*, who is but of late " in compariſon of many ancients we have quoted *prima tempora*, that " is, the firſt times, for *Walafridus* quotes *Auguſtines* practiſe, that was " not baptized till of ripe years, to prove, that in the firſt times (as " *Walafridus* calls them) men were not baptized till able to know well, " and make profeſſion; when as *Auguſtin* himſelf, as we have ſhewed, " and Mr. *T.* hath confeſſed, did refer himſelf to ancienter times a great " deal, as to *Cyprian* that was almoſt 200 yeares afore him, for the pra- " ctiſe of baptizing infants. 2. *Walafrid* ſaith, *illis ſolummodo*, &c. " that is, to them onely the grace of Baptiſm was wont to bee given,

" who

"who were of integrity or ripeneſs of body and minde, &c. but gives "not proofs or reaſons, but onely one ſingle inſtance of *Auguſtine* him- "ſelf for an univerſal propoſition.

Anſw. It appears not that *Strabo* faultered in either of theſe. He cals the times unto *Auguſtine*, not onely *Auguſtines times*, *prima tempora*, *the firſt times*; and though he knew that *Cyprian* was alledged by *Auguſtine* for proof of infant Baptiſm, yet *Strabo* might rightly ſay (not as Dr. *Homes* makes him, *men were not baptized* (but) *the grace of Baptiſm was wont to be given to them onely who might know well and make profeſſion.* And for this having ſet down the ancient cuſtome, he alledgeth the inſtance of *Auguſtin*, not becauſe there were no more, but at that time the thing being well known, and *Auguſtines* authority being the chief meanes of making infant Baptiſm ſo frequent as it was after his time, it was enough for his purpoſe to inſtance in *Auguſtines* own example, as ſufficient to ſhew how the ſtate of things was before. Nor is it likely that *Walafridus Strabo* faultered in the third thing the Dr. objects, but that (not he, but) ſome of the writers of his Book miſtook, and put XXV. for XXXV. And for the 4th. thing that hee confeſſeth, that religious wiſe men did baptize infants more frequently after *Auguſtines* time, upon the apprehenſion of danger if they neglected it, it confirms my obſervation, that infant Baptiſm grew to be ſo frequent as it was by *Auguſtines* authority, but doth not at all prejudice my allegation of *Strabo*; For though he being corrupted with the ſuperſtition of the age in which he lived, did judge well of the practiſe of infant Baptiſm, yet his relation of the ancient uſe is uſefull for me to ſhew, that it was but an innovation Nor did my mention of his relation of the uſe of Goſſips, and the imagined ſpiritual kinred contracted by it, either blemiſh *Walafridus* or *break my ſhins*, but ſerved my turn to ſhew what ſuperſtition crept in by infant Baptiſm, as ariſing from the want of the primitive uſe of the baptized perſons own engagement at Baptiſm, which being not done by infants, was ſupplied by this vain invention of men, and did (as generally ſuch inventions do) occaſion that evil opinion of the ſpiritual kinred contracted, which ſuperſtition turned to a conceit of inceſt between Goſſips. This opinion, though it did not neceſſarily follow on that uſe (For there might be Goſſips without ſuch opinion, as there might be tranſubſtantiation without adoration) yet as the nature of ſuperſtition is to adde one humane invention to another, and the latter worſe then the former, and the juſt judgement of God leaves men to err, when their fear of him is taught by the precepts of men, *Iſa.* 29. 13, 14. (as I have ſhewed in my Sermon intituled, *The leven of Phariſaical will worſhip*) ſo it happened both in Baptiſm and the Euchariſt, infant Baptiſm brought in Goſſips, they were taken for parents, thence conceived to be of ſuch affinity, that their copulation would be inceſtuous, and ſo in the Euchariſt the opinion of the Lords Supper, as if Chriſts body were in the bread, begat Tranſubſtantiation, that kneeling and adoration, which have more connexion then a rope of ſand or pebles in a Wyth, notwithſtanding Dr. *Homes* his conceit, and *Strabo's* words need better anſwer then he gives.

All

All that Dr. *Homes p.* 161, 162, 163, 164, 165. saith against my allegation of *Cluniacensis*, doth not either prove, that *Peter de Bruis* did not deny infant Baptism, or that *Cluniacensis* did not alledge *Augustine* for it, and *de Bruis* rejected it, and appealed to the Scriptures (though I have acknowledged in my *Apology sect.* 8. my mistake about the words of the ignorance of Greek, and the mention of the Greek Church and the Council of *Arles.*) For why should *Cluniacensis* say, *Ecce non de Augustino sed de Evangelio protuli cui cum maxime vos credere dicatis*, &c. but that *Augustine* was wont to be urged against them, but they rejected him and appealed to the Gospel. As for *Peter de Bruis* and *Henricus*, their opinions I set them down as I found them reckoned in the argument of *Cluniacensis* Epistle, not thinking fit to set down all that *Cluniacensis* chargeth them with, having by Mr. *Gataker's Defence of Mr. Wotton against Mr. Walker* concerning *Abailardus*, learnt how uncertain *Bernards* charge was against him; and the like perhaps against *Peter de Bruis* and *Henricus* by *Cluniacensis* in some things: yet I have given reasons concerning their denying infant Baptism, in my *præcursor sect.* 9. to which Mr. *Baxter* hath not made reply in his *præsestin. mor.* to avoid them, though he had most unchristianly accused me of impudence and unconscionableness, for alledging them as adversaries to infant Baptism.

What I said of the Councils that condemned Palagianism, and the Drs. who refuted it, that they followed *Augustin*, I did in some mistake, as in putting *Arles* for *Orange* a City near, and perhaps in something else, being at that time without all my printed books, which I had read before the year 1642. in which I was plundered of them, and wrote my *Examen* in *London anno* 1644. and my *Exercitation anno* 1647. But I had some remembrance of my reading to that purpose, which I imagin was by reading the words of Dr. *Frideaux* in his 3d. Lecture *de Gratia universali*, which are thus to the same effect. *Augustinus (qui præcipuè sudabit in hoc argumento, quemque Prosper, Fulgentius, & Scholastici saniores sequuntur, imò ex ejus scriptis decreta Concilii Arausicani 2 contra Pelagianos & Semipelagianos (ut ipse agnoscit Binnius) contexuntur) sit vice omnium.*

And for *Augustins* being *counted one of the four Doctors of the Church, esteemed like the four Evangelists*, the speech (as I remember of *Gregory the Great*) is so rife, that I presume it unknown to few Students in Divinity. Nevertheless I said, I for my part value *Augustines* judgement just at so much as his proofs and reasons weigh; of which Dr. *Homes* saith, *that's well*; but Mr. *Marshal* saith, *I slight him*, which is an unjust crimination of me, neither *Augustin* nor any other writer, being not imediately inspired, requiring or deserving any higher regard; and Protestant writers frequently in their determinations ascribe authentique authority onely to the holy Scripture, *Ames Bellarm. enerv. tom.* 2 *l.* 1. *c.* 3. *asseritur à nobis Episcoporum in concilio sententiam tantùm inquisitionem quandam esse, & dictionem sententiæ ministratoriam & limitatam ita ut tantum valeat decretum concilii, quantùm valeat ejus ratio*; which if right, my speech is unblameable. Nor am I to be blamed

for

for not canvaſſing every particular teſtimony alledged out of *Auguſtine*, it being not denied he held infant Baptiſm at that time, and in ſuch a manner as Proteſtants reject, and how much credit is to bee given to his ſpeeches of Apoſtolical tradition, is conſidered before ſection 88. Proteſtant writers do often charge *Auguſtin* with doting, in this point of infant baptiſms neceſſity (whereof ſome ſpeeches may be ſeen in Mr. *Gataker de bapt. infant. vi & effic. ſect. 6. num. 27. ſect. 8. num. 35.*) and for my part I muſt ſay, that *I* judge his reaſons ſo light and his proofs ſo vain, that the teſtimonies out of *Auguſtine* do very much confirm me, that infant Baptiſm is an errour, and a very pernicious abuſe needfull to be taken away out of the Church of God, the reaſon of which may in ſome meaſure appear by my vindication of my exceptions againſt *Auguſtines* judgement.

1. If infant Baptiſm had been ſuch an univerſal and Apoſtolical tradition as *Auguſtine* would have it, then the Church would have thought it neceſſary, that all children of Chriſtians by profeſſion ſhould bee baptized in their infancy, and the cuſtome would have been ſo uſed; But that it was not ſo, appears firſt from the baptiſm of *Auguſtine*, *Adeodatus*, *Alipius*; ſecond, from other obſervations ſet down in my *Examen. p.* 14.

The teſtimonies Mr. *M.* brings for univerſal practiſe, have been conſidered before.

Hee adds *p.* 45. of his *Defence*, That "*Epiphanius* in the end of his "work, relating what was generally obſerved in the Church, tels us, "The baptiſm adminiſtred in the Church in his time, was performed "according to the tradition of the Goſpel, and the authority of the A-"poſtles, as well as other myſteries then in uſe, and we know, that in "his time Baptiſm was adminiſtred to infants; therefore in his judge-"ment, what the Church did therein, they had authority for it from the "Goſpel and the Apoſtles;] But there is more reaſon to conceive that either he knew no infant Baptiſm, or that he took it to be an aberration from the Goſpel tradition and authority of the Apoſtles, not onely in that he mentions not infant Baptiſm, but alſo *in Ancorato* where he ſets down the uſe of Baptiſm he ſaith, "Yee ought not onely to ſuffer "every one inſtructed in the faith, *and willing* to come to the holy la-"ver, that he ſhew himſelf to your ſons that he believes in the Lord, "but alſo, that with uttered words, as the ſame mother of all your and "our Church hath received, he teach and ſay, I believe in one God "the Father Almighty, *&c.*] Whence the *Magdeburgenſes cent. 4. c. 6. de ritibus circa Baptiſmum*, ſay; *It is conjectured from theſe words, that in the Churches of* Cyprus, *the rite of Confeſſion was uſual afore Baptiſm*; where he alſo ſaith, that *Baſil. exhort. ad bapt.* writes, *that no other then catechized perſons were baptized, who were called together at Eaſter*; Although I deny not that there was ſometimes infant Baptiſm, yet by all the inſtances of the rite of Baptiſm gathered by thoſe Hiſtorians in that place, it appears to have been very rare, and onely in the caſe of apparent peril of immanent death. And this is very probable to have been the reaſon why *Socrates hiſt. l. 5. 22 relating diverſities of ſeve-*

ral

ral Churches about persons that had power to baptize, and the time in which Baptism was commonly administred, and Sozom. 7. 19. *several customes of several Churches neither exclude nor mention infant baptism*, because it was so rare a thing to baptize an infant, and done so obscurely that no instance is apparent of it in any history, in that or the fore going ages. And Dr. *Homes* p. 171. wrongs me in saying, *Mr. T. himself chargeth Augustin and Cyprian, that they thought too many infants were to be baptized, namely all that had Christian parents or undertakers*, for these latter words are not mine, though I yeeld the former to be true.

To my instance of *Augustins* late Baptism, it is said by Mr. *M. defence* p. 46. *One swallow makes not a spring peradventure some (though born of Christian parents) were not in that age baptized in infancy; yet that is no way prejudicial to the universal practise of the Church in which Padobaptism was received.* But by his leave it is a great evidence, and seemed so to *Strabo* nearer to those times then we are, that infant Baptism was not so universal as Mr. *M.* makes it, when so eminent a person of so eminently godly a mother, did not take care to have him baptized in infancy. But besides, wee have the words of *Optatus Milevitanus* about the same time, in his 4th. book against *armenium the Donatist*, thus; *No man is ignorant that every man, who is born, though he be born of Christian parents, can be without the spirit of the world; which it is necessary should be excluded and separated from the man before the saving Baptism. This Exorsim does, by which the unclean spirit is driven out, and made to flye into desert places. The house is made empty in the breast of the believer; the house is made clean: God enters and dwels as the Apostle saith, ye are the Temple of God, and God dwels in you.* Whence it is apparent, that even those who were born of Christian parents were believers afore they were baptized, though I deny not that it was not the common doctrine, that infants should be baptized; nor do I make that inference which Mr. *M.* intimates I do, from that example of *Augustin*, that children of Christians by profession in that age were not baptized in their infancy, but that they were seldome so, nor except in case of apparent danger of imminent death: Which is manifest by the instance of *Augustin.*

Mr. *M.* and Dr *Homes impute the delay of* Augustins *Baptism, either to his Fathers hindering, who was not then a Christian, or to friends permission of him to have his own will, or to persecution.* But all these are but mere shifts, his own words *confes. l.* 1. *c.* 11. declaring the true state of the thing, which are thus: "I had heard being a boy, of eternal life "promised us by the humility of our Lord God descending to our pride, "and I was already signed with the signe of his cross, and was seaso-"ned with his salt already, even from the womb of my mother, who "much hoped in thee. Whence it is apparent that she was then a "Christian when she bare him in her womb, and dedicated him to Chri-"stianity, but did not baptize him. *After he goes on, and saith*, Thou "savest Lord when I was yet a boy and on a certain day pressed with a "pain of the stomack, I was suddenly sick almost about to dye, thou "savest my God, because thou wast my keeper already, with what mo-"tion of minde, and with what faith I asked from the piety of my mo-"ther,

"ther, and thy Church the mother of us all, the Baptism of thy Christ "my God and Lord. And the mother of my flesh was troubled, because "also she did bring forth my everlasting salvation with a chast heart in "thy faith, now being very hasty, did take care that I might be initiated "and washed with saving Sacraments, confessing thee O Lord Jesus, "unless I had been presently recreated. Therefore my cleansing was "delayed, as if it should bee necessary that I should be defiled if I did "live, because to wit, after that washing, greater and more dangerous "guilt of sins in filthiness would be. So I did already believe, and she, "and all the house except my Father alone, who yet did not overcome "in me the right of my mothers piety, that I should not believe in "Christ, as he had not yet believed.

Whence it may be easily perceived, 1. That the childe of a godly affectionate Christian, who devoted him to Christ, and educated him for Christ, yet was not baptized then in infancy, nor by the Church required to be baptized. 2. That when he was sick and like to die when hee was but a boy, he earnestly required from his mother and the Church baptism. 3. That it was not to have been done without his confession of Christ. 4. That his recovery afore it could be done put it off, and no other reason was thereof, but that living he was likely to be more guilty of sin if baptized so young. 5. That baptism was counted cleansing, and a greater and more dangerous guilt apprehended if he did sin after baptism. 6. That even then he did believe, and his mother and all the house except his Father, and yet it hindred not his Christianity, nor is it likely could or would hinder his baptism in infancy, if his mother and the Church had thought it meet, or it had been the use out of the case of apparent danger of imminent death. As for *Adeodatus*, it is apparent his Father believed before he begate him, and *he was bred up by him in Gods discipline*, as he saith, *l.* 9. *confes. c.* 6. and though the Father was not baptized, yet the Grandmother was, and yet *Adeodatus* was not baptized till 15 years old; and for *Alipius* it is somewhat probable hee was born of Christian parentage and bred up so, but not baptized till of age. However that were, the case *of Augustin* is full to prove what I conceived.

For a further declaration of the practise of infant Baptism, I alledged *Grotius* his words, who conceived *the baptism of infants more frequent in Africa then in Asia or other parts of the world*, and he gave his reason of it, *because of the mention of it in the* African *Council at* Carthage, *not in like manner in other Councils*, to which Mr. *M.* saith, *the Councils might not mention it, because none did scruple it*; But it is more likely none did scruple it, because there was no occasion to do so, there being little or no practise of it; which is made very probable from the 6th. *Canon* of the *Council of Neocæsarea anno* 315. and the words of *Nazianzen* before mentioned. As for the *constitutions of Clement*, in one whereof they are bid *baptize their little ones*, Mr. *M.* doth well to confess they are not *Clements*, and if *the compiler of them did relate the ancient customes of the Greek Church*, hee did relate later customes also, among which that of baptizing infants is to bee conceived one for the reasons

given.

given. *Grotius annot. in Matth.* 19. 14. saith, *And many of the Greeks from every age unto this day, keep the use of deferring the baptism of little ones, till they could make confession of their own faith.* But of this before, *sect.* 89. 90. I said that I did not find in *Affrica* infants baptized but in case of danger of death or for health of body. Dr. *Homes* saith *he hath shewed the contrary out of several antiquities, and particularly out of Cyprian.* But neither in *Cyprian* nor any where else do I find it, but the contrary in *Tertullian.* And as for *Augustine* it was not as he saith, that *Augustines sickness whiles young was some occasion of deferring his baptism for that time*, but his sickness occasioned the hastning and his recovery ere it was done put it off for that time. Nor doth my saying that they baptized infants for health of body (which is manifest from *Augustines* 23d. *Epist. to* Bonifacius) *clash with that which I said of Augustines* asserting the necessity of infant baptism to take away original sin, and ascribing salvation to it, for he both might and did conceive it to be done for both ends. My mention of the continued use of catechizing in *Augustines* time, and long after, and the mention of baptizing whole Countries upon the baptizing of their Kings was very pertinent, though not to shew no infants were baptized then, yet to shew how and by what means the ancient custome of baptizing ordinary believers upon profession of faith after catechizing was so strangely changed, that whereas the preface in the common prayer book before the administration of baptism saith, *it appeareth by ancient writers that the sacrament of baptism in the old time was not commonly administered but at two times in the year, at Easter and whitsontide: At which times it was openly ministered in the presence of all the congregation*, the persons to be baptized having been before catechized, now it is quite otherwise, so that in most Protestant and popish Countries baptism is ordinary even of infants, at all times in obscure manner, and except of late in these nations, in which God hath begun to restore the right use of baptism, and what *Bellarmin* in his 2d. *book de bonis operibus in particulari. C.* 17. saith, that *in the City of* Rome *there is no year in which there are not many baptized at Easter, who were catechised*, the baptizing of believers is almost unheard of and counted a hainous thing, and punished in some parts as a crime deserving death or banishment. So great is the enormity of Pædobaptism, and so great the wickedness of Pædobaptists.

The 2d. and main exception I took against *Augustines* judgement which might move us to examine his reasons, was the ground upon which *Augustine, Ambrose*, and generally the Popish pædobaptists held and urged infant baptism, to wit the damning of the infant if dying unbaptized, which made *Augustine* to be termed *the hard Father of infants*, and affrighted so people in after ages, and doth to this day, that they will have their children by all means, as they count it, baptized. it's no matter by whom it be done nor how, so somewhat be done; else they count them lost.

To this which is of so great moment to shew the abuse of Pædobaptism it is said, that *Augustine pressed it upon other grounds*, but that doth not appear, he urged it, it is true, from circumcision, but upon the same ground

ground that the uncircumciſed male ſhould be cut off from Gods people; nor did *he ſo retract his errour*, but that he ſtill held infants ſhould be damned although with the mildeſt damnation of all. How the ſchoolmen and others do follow *Auguſtine*, Mr. *Perkins* ſhews in his *probleme*, and many elſewhere, and the Common Prayer, both in allowing at firſt Baptiſm by Midwives, and in their Preface in the adminiſtration of Publique Baptiſm do plainly ſhew it was the mind of the compoſers of that book at firſt; nor is there any thing therein, or any of the Ancients, of Baptiſm as belonging to infants of believers as federally holy. Which is a ſtrong evidence that *Auguſtines* judgement was very corrupt in this point, and that the Baptiſm of infants was introduced, and grew to ſuch an exceſs upon that errour, and for that reaſon both *Auguſtines* judgement and it are to be ſuſpected as evil, and to be rejected.

A 3d. Exception againſt *Auguſtines* judgement, to ſhew that he and *Cyprian* were in theſe points of Sacraments not to be reſted on, was That *Auguſtine* Epiſt. 23. relates the ſtory in *Cyprian de lapſis* about the giving the Wine to a girl with credit to it, and ſome uſe of it without diſlike of the cuſtome; yea, *l.* 1. *de pecc. mer. & remiſ. c* 20 he makes giving infants the Euchariſt neceſſary to ſalvation, alledging *Joh.* 6. 53. for it; and *ch.* 2. he makes it an ancient and Apoſtolick tradition to give the Communion to infants, beſides what he ſaith *Epiſ.* 106. 107. to the like purpoſe, and he aſcribes to *John Chryſoſtome*, *l.* 1. *adv. Jul c.* 2, the like; and *Epiſ.* 93. *Innocentius Biſhop of Rome* held the like; and this not onely *Maldonat* on *Joh.* 6. acknowledged to continue 600. years in the Church, from *Cyprians* time to *Charls the Greats* time (as I remember the account is) but alſo *Eraſmus Reſp ad Archiep. Hiſp. Chamier*, *pauſ. cath. tom.* 4. *l.* 1. *c.* 13. §. 5. *Gataker de Bapt. infant. vi. p.* 269. ſay the uſe of infant Communion was ancient; and to the objection, that this was not defined, Dr. *John Rainold*, *Apolog. theſ.* §. 10. anſwers; nor doth Mr. *M.* or Dr. *Homes* deny it, but Mr. *M.* asks *what is your argument hence?* I anſwer, There is no reaſon to rely on *Auguſtines* judgement concerning the antiquity and neceſſity of infant Baptiſm, or to preſs it on others, who did ſo fouly miſtake about the antiquity and neceſſity of giving the Communion to infants, nor to adhere to the Ancients determinations and uſe about infant Baptiſm, who did erre ſo much about infant Communion. For as Mr. *Gataker de Bapt. inf. vi.* p. 200. ſaith about *Auguſtins* authority concerning infant Baptiſm, *it will not ſeem equal to preſs the adverſe party concerning the other authority of thoſe whoſe judgement in the other thy ſelf declineſt*: But how *Auguſtine* doted about infant Communion is manifeſt, therefore it is not reaſon to urge his teſtimony about infant Baptiſm as to be reſted on, but we may ſay as *Vorſtius adv. Bellarm. tom.* 3. *contr.* 2. *theſ.* 2. *rat* 3. *The doting of* Auguſtine *and ſome other is ill brought for the conſent of the whole Church*; and we may make that uſe of this inſtance of *Auguſtines*, *Innocentius*, *and others* errour about infant Communion, which *Cameron* doth *c.* 17. of his *Examin. of Rom. prejudices*, to take away the unjuſt fore-judging of the refuſal of infant Baptiſm as unreaſonable, by ſhewing how little the Fathers, particularly *Auguſtine*, are to be truſted, and what juſt reaſon there is to forſake him in the one as they have done in the other.

My

My 4th. Exception was, That *Auguſtine* 1. aſcribes a certainty of regeneration to children baptized, though they were not brought for ſpiritual grace, but temporal health. 2. That he juſtifies this fact, *Epiſt.* 23. *ad Bonif.*

Mr. *M* confeſſeth "He aſcribed too much ſometimes to Baptiſm, yet "ſometimes he ſaith of ſome, that they have the thing of Baptiſm with- "out the ſacrament, and ſo *Ambroſe* of *Valentinian*, yet *Ambroſe* as well "as *Auguſtine* at other times attributed too much to outward Baptiſm. To which I reply. It is true, and ſo did generally the Fathers, as may be ſeen abundantly in Mr. *Gatakers ſtrictures againſt Biſhop* Davenants *Epiſt* p. 52, *&c.* And this cauſed great abuſes, 1. the allowing of infant Baptiſm, yea, and much advancing it; 2. the allowing of the Baptiſm of men that kept their beds by reaſon of ſickneſs on their beds; 3. the Baptiſm by women; 4. the Baptiſm by *Athanaſius* on his play-fellows, which he did in play with them, when but a boy, as ſufficicently done for Baptiſm; 5. the bringing of infants to be baptized for cure of their bodies. But ſaith Dr. *Homes*, "By all the words *Epiſt.* 23. *ad Boniſac.* "I ſhould think *Auguſtine* doth no way juſtifie or excuſe their bad in- "tention.] To which I reply, yet he juſtifies their bad action, ſaying, *by them the neceſſary ſervice or miniſtery is celebrated.*

My 5th. Exception was, That *Auguſtin Ep.* 23. *ad Boniſ.* was ſo tenacious of cuſtomes then in uſe, that he doth defend or excuſe from lying the anſwer of ſureties, as if the child to be baptized did believe. In this Mr. *M.* ſaith, *I ſcorn* Auguſtines *judgement*; And I reply, I do not ſo much as *Chamier*, *pauſtr. cath. tom.* 4. *l.* 5. *c.* 15. §. 22. where he terms it *mimical, as if it were a play on a ſtage, rather then the celebrating a Sacrament in the Church, which* Auguſtine *defended.* But ſaith Dr. *Homes, This is impertinent to the queſtion.* I reply, it is very pertinent, 1. to ſhew how vain *Auguſtines* judgement was in theſe things about Baptiſm and the Lords Supper: 2. To ſhew what was the primitive uſe of propounding the queſtion of his faith to every baptized perſon, which *Vives, com. in* Auguſt. *de Civit. Dei, l.* 1. *c.* 27. *thought a good evidence that of old none were baptized but perſons grown up and able to anſwer the queſtions.*

To this ſaith Dr. *Homes*, 1. "we wonder Mr. *T.* will aſſert confeſſion "of faith in all Ages before all Baptiſm from witneſſes or ſureties, when "as we know that the firſt intimation of touching them was not till a- "bout 195 years after Chriſt. And how novel the invention of their "confeſſions is who can juſtly tell.

I reply, 1. *I* wonder Dr. *Homes* will ſo untruly ſay *I* do ſo aſſert. 2. If ſureties were ſo late an invention, ſurely infant Baptiſm was as new, it being never without ſuch ſureties.

2. Saith he, "*I* propound it to grave conſideration, whether ſure- "ties did not conſeſs in relation to themſelves, that they might be repu- "ted fit to ſtand as a kind of parents to a child of an unbelieving pa- "rent to be baptized; even as *Abrahams* profeſſion of his belief in "God, *Gen.* 15. *Gen.* 17. made him ſtand as a parent to all his "houſhold.

I repiy. Upon my conſideration it was not ſo, becauſe *Tertull. de Bapt.* *c.* 18.

c. 18. mentions them as undertakers for the child, and *Bonifacius* and *Auguſtine* that they profeſſed in the childs ſtead.

My laſt Exception againſt *Auguſtines* judgement was, That they baptized any infants even of unbelievers, whoever brought them, and what ever were their intention, they counted it a work of charity, and the defect of the faith of the baptized they counted ſupplied by the faith of the whole Church.

To this ſaith Mr. *M.* " Neither *I* in that juſtifie him: You may take " notice that here again you confeſs the queſtion that infants were bap- " tized.] *I* reply, this was not the queſtion. But ſaith Dr. *Homes*, " 1. Too much doth not overthrow enough.] *I* reply, it overthrows the imitableneſs of their practiſe. " 2. This argues againſt me that in- " fant Baptiſm hath been anciently more univerſally practiſed then a- " dul Baptiſm.] *I* reply, if ſo, more infidels children ſhould be baptized then Chriſtian converts, which is a monſtrous fiction refuted by all the remaining monuments of antiquity.

Mr. *M.* " They baptized upon Covenant holineſs believers children, " infidels children upon the engagement of undertakers to train them up. *I* reply, the former appears not, the later was of others as well as believers children, as is ſhewed before. This is enough to ſhew the invalidity of *Auguſtine* and the *Latine* Fathers teſtimonies for infant Baptiſm as Proteſtants aſſert it.

To the recollection of the paſſages about the Ancients teſtimonies, Mr. *M.* anſwers. 1. To what *I* ſaid, that that they practiſed infant Baptiſm on erroneous grounds, the neceſſity of it to ſalvation, the certainty of the remiſſion of original ſin by it, denying Gods grace to none, and therefore more likely to be an errour; Mr. *M.* ſaith, *p.* 54. *Do not* Tertullian, Cyprian, *&c. argue from Circumciſion unto Baptiſm as we now do, and others of them from Covenant holineſs?* *I* anſwer, No not one that *I* know of.

2. To what *I* ſaid, that it is not proved to have been practiſed but in caſe of ſuppoſed neceſſity, he ſaith, *It is otherwiſe, and an* Arminian *book termed* Cenſura cenſuræ, *of which I have made great uſe in this controverſy* (which is not true) *ſaith*, Auguſtine *firſt grounded infant Baptiſm upon neceſſity.* But *I* anſwer, this is not true, that which is ſaid before out of *Tertullian*, *Nazianzen*, *Cyprian*, proves it otherwiſe; Yea, long after *Auguſtine*, *Concilium Gerundenſe* in the 6th. *Century*, appointed in the 4th. and 5th. *Canon*, *That ordinarily perſons catechized not infirm ſhould be baptized at Eaſter and Whitſontide, the infirm at other times, and infants if infirm, and deſire not the mothers milk if they be offered, the day of their birth*; which expreſſeth it to be a permiſſion in that caſe, and ſhews it to be an exception from the ordinary courſe: Yea, *Magdeb. cent.* 1^v. c. 6. *of the rites of Baptiſm*, ſhew *infants then to have been baptiſed only out of fear of death.*

3. To what *I* ſaid, that there was a conſtant courſe of baptizing believers children at age, he ſaith *I have been been miſtaken, and this practiſe was diſavowed by their inveighing againſt deferring Baptiſm.* *I* anſwer, 1. That *I* have not been miſtaken, appears by that which goes before.

before. 2. They ſpeak not againſt deferring infants Baptiſm, but for it, though they ſpeak againſt the deferring it by the aged.

4. To what *I* ſaid of their opinion of the neceſſity of, and practiſe of infant Communion, he ſaith, *All did not ſo, though ſome of the* Africans *did*. *I* anſwer, The chiefeſt of them, and ſome of them *Europæens* held it. Dr. *Field*, 3d. *book of the Church*, *ch.* 1. ſaith, *According to the old cuſtome uſed in the primitive Church*, *the* Greeks *miniſter the Sacrament of the Euchariſt to children when they baptiſe them*. And *Ortelius* in his *Theat.* where he deſcribes the *Abiſſins* in *Affrica*, ſaith, *To all the baptiſed the ſame moment they miniſter the holy Euchariſt*.

5. To what I ſaid of their baptizing infidels children, he ſaith, *It was not their conſtant and general practiſe*: But it appears not but that it was practiſed and allowed of as well as the other.

6. To my words, that the ancienteſt teſtimony for practiſe according to any rule determined is *Cyprian*, near 300 years after Chriſt, he ſaith, *he muſt needs take notice of my overlaſhing*; and *I* reply, *I* muſt needs take notice of his overlaſhing in again mentioning *Juſtin Martyr* as a witneſs, though the book be but ſuppoſitious; and *Irenæus*, when he ſaith nothing of it; and *Origen*, who is doubtfull; and *Tertullian* who is againſt it; and excepting againſt my words as overlaſhing, when the firſt determination of it in any Councel was that of *Cyprian* with hi 66. Biſhops, which, as Dr. *Hammond* ſaith, was *anno* 257. near 300. years after Chriſt.

7. To my words, that infant Baptiſm was not from the beginning, *Auſtins ſemper habuit ſemper tenuit* is oppoſed, to which how little credit is to be given, is ſhewed *Apol.* § 16. here, *ſect.* 88. and in this before.

8. To my alledging the propoſal of the queſtions of repentance and faith to infants as a ſign that none but thoſe who anſwered the queſtions were formerly baptized, it is ſaid, "This ſuppoſeth theſe queſtions to "be of as ancient uſe in the Church of God as Baptiſm it ſelf, which "certainly you can never prove from Scripture; *I* have produced teſti-"monies for infant Baptiſm, afore any you can bring to witneſs, that "thoſe forms of queſtions and anſwers had any being in the Church. But *I* think the queſtion of faith plainly proved *Act.* 8. 37. to be antecedent to Baptiſm; and the words of *Beza*, *annot. on* 1 *Pet.* 3 21. are thus. *Yet to me more nearly now conſidering the word* ἐπερώτημα, *it doth ſeem better to agree that we interpret it ſtipulation, and that we ſay the Apoſtle had reſpect to the interrogations of Catechiſts, in which the catechiſed even then did teſtifie their more inward Baptiſm to be confirmed by the outward, as* Act. 8. 37. *to which the whole Apoſtolick Creed looks, and that from the Baptiſm of adult perſons by a great errour, if we look to infants themſelves, tranſlated to the Baptiſm of infants, Doeſt thou believe? I do believe. Doeſt thou renounce? I do renounce. Whence that of* Tertullian, *which is as if it were in ſtead of a Commentary on this place in his Book of the Reſurrection of the fleſh, the ſoul is not confirmed or ſanctified by waſhing, but by anſwering. Tertullian de corona militis, Aquam adituri ibidem, ſed & aliquanto prius in Eccleſia ſub antiſtitis manu conteſtamur nos renunciare Diabolo & pompæ & angelis ejus. Debinc ter inergitamur, amplius aliquid reſpondentes*

ſpondentes, quam Dominus in Evangelio determinavit. *Grot.* in *Mat.* 28. 19. proves the profeſſion of faith out of *Juſtin Martyr*, who ſaith expreſly, *Apol.* 2. *That the baptiſed did promiſe to live according to the Chriſtian Doctrine*; and out of *Ignatius*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, &c. what they anſwered who were baptiſed. In the *Councel of Baſil* in the *Oration of the Cardinal of Ragiſium* it is ſaid, *In principio hujus ſacramenti baptizabantur ſolum illi qui per ſe ſciebant fidem interroganti reſpondere* The teſtimonies of this kind are ſo many that *I* think it ſuperfluous to alledge them. The very form of Common Prayer in propounding thoſe queſtions as they were in *Auguſtines* time to infants, is evidence enough of the antiquity of that cuſtome of propounding queſtions to the baptized.

9. To what *I* ſaid of the examples of *Greg Nazian Chryſoſt. Auguſt. Conſt the Great*, to whom *I* might have added *Hierome*, of whom *Eraſmus* in his life teſtifies of his birth of Chriſtian parents, yet not baptized till of age; Mr. *M.* anſwers by *referring to what is ſaid before*: And *I* intreat the Reader to look back to what *I* ſay before, *ſect* 89, 90. and this.

10. In like manner the evidences againſt infant Baptiſm from *Tertullians* and *Gregory Nazianzens* diſſwaſions, the teſtimony of the *Councel of Neocæſaria*, the ſilence of *Euſebius*, *Epiphanius*, *Athanaſius*, the conſtant terming it an Apoſtolical tradition, are referred to what is before ſaid by Mr. *M.* and by me to my anſwers to him and others, in thoſe Sections, and *ſect.* 88.

For *Grotius*, what reaſon *I* had to alledge him, may be eaſily diſcerned by thoſe that know his abilities. *Cenſura cenſuræ* was unknown to me as yeelding me any advantage, till Mr. *M.* here minded me of that book. What *Vives* ſpeaks he had good evidence for, as in part may be ſeen in what is ſaid before. *Strabo's* teſtimony is ſuch as *Voſſius* his exception doth not weaken, but is ſundry ways confirmed here. That *I* could have brought more teſtimonies, it hath appeared in part by this writing, and in part by my *Præcurſor*, *ſect.* 20. and my anſwer to Dr. *Savage* in Latine, *ſect.* 13.

The more *I* ſearch into the point of antiquity, the more *I* am confirmed in my poſition, that infant Baptiſm is not ſo ancient as is pretended, as now taught is a late innovation. Nor am *I* altered from the opinion *I* had, that none before *Zuinglius* taught infant Baptiſm as a priviledge of believers children from federal holineſs. *Tertullians* and *Athanaſius* his words ſerve not turn to prove it, nor *Epiphanius*, *Cyprian*, *Nazianzen*, *Auguſtine*, or *Chryſoſtome* ſo taught it from Circumciſion as due to them by vertue of the Covenant to a believer and his ſeed, but in other manner, as is before ſhewed. Nor doth the Pelagians acknowledgement ſerve Mr. *Ms.* turn therein. The more teſtimonies Mr. *M.* might have added, had added no more weight to the cauſe then thoſe he alledged have done. *I* did not *charge the Ancients that they held that all who died unbaptiſed were damned*; but that in the caſe of infants born they taught, that if they died unbaptized they ſhould not enter into the Kingdome of Heaven, but periſh, or be damned, though with the mildeſt damnation: And this is manifeſt enough from *Cyprians* Epiſtle to *Fidus*, and very

very many places of *Auguſtine*, *Tertullian l. de Bapt. c.* 12. *Cùm verò præſcribitur nemini ſine Baptiſmo competere ſalutem ex illa maximè pronuntiatione Domini qui ait: niſi natus ex aqua quis erit, non habet vitam, &c.* However *Ambroſe* and *Auguſtine* determine of the ſalvation of grown perſons without Baptiſm, if they believe, deſire to be baptized, be Martyrs, yet both they and many more held *both Baptiſm and the Lords Supper to be neceſſary for infants unto ſalvation by an Apoſtolick tradition*, as M. *Perkins Demonſt. of the probleme* in the point *of Baptiſm* proves, though perhaps *they could not reaſonably grant the one and deny the other*. That *Calvin* was *a man well verſed in Antiquity* for his time it's not denied, nor that he was a man well acquainted in the Scriptures; yet that in neither he was in this point in the right, is ſo fully demonſtrated before, that I may ſafely ſay *Calvin* was not therein *Calvin* as he is in his oppoſition of the Papiſts. And if Mr. *M.* or his friend think it not meet to be tied to *Calvins* judgement in the point of the Sabbath and Lords day and Uſury notwithſtanding his skill in Antiquity and Scripture, the ſame in equity is to be allowed to us about the point of Baptiſm. I like Mr. *Ms. acknowledgement with* Rivet, *that tradition is in moſt points uncertain, and therefore he that will build ſure muſt build on the Scripture, and therefore we muſt neceſſarily come to arguments from the Scriptures, which if they evince not the thing we ſhall in vain call to Tradition.* If Mr. *M.* had not firſt in his *Sermon* foreſtalled his hearers and readers with the pretence o *the Churches poſſeſſion for* 1500 *years and upwards*, and Dr. *Hammond* reſolved all his proof of infant Bapriſm into his expoſition of 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. which he had no way to make good but by *Tertullian* and ſome of the Ancients, I had ſpared this labour of ſhewing their and and the Ancients miſtakes. Tha Doctrine and practiſe of Baptiſm of infants which *Auſtin* ſaith to be *according to the ſentence of the Goſpel*, is rejected by Proteſtants; who if they would in this, as in ether things they have done, reform, according to Scripture and all their own principles, muſt baptize no infants till they be made believers; till then they do but prevaricate, and profane the holy Ordinance of Baptiſm.

SECT. XCIX.

Mr. Crs. *objections about my 9 untruths, his diſcourſe about re baptizing are refelled.*

I Return now to Mr. *Cragg*. Part 1. ſect. 6. he chargeth me *with 9 untruths, outvying the number of the lines*; in which he is a falſe accuſer. In the firſt he miſ recites my words, which were not, that *the Epiſtle affirms, that the baptiſing of believers had its ſpring and riſe from* Nicholas Stork; but thus, As falſe it is that the baptizing of believers (called by theſe Anabaptiſm) had its ſpring and riſe from *Nicholas Stork* and others there named, which were true. For though it was not in thoſe words ſaid by me, that the Epiſtle did ſo affirm, yet it is true, 1. That

Pædobaptists call the baptizing believers which *Nicholas Stork* and others practised Anabaptism; me thinks he should not be so impudent as to deny that those whom they baptized were believers, or that they baptized them, or that that Baptism is called Anabaptism by them. 2. The very words of the Epistle are, *the spring and rise of Anabaptism had its beginning after truth*, and saith *the first Author thereof was* Nicholas Stork, *then* Phipher, *&c. there you have the spring and rise of it*, and therefore in my words there is no untruth, but Mr. *Cr.* doth falsely insinuate as if there were folshood and inconsequence in my speech, and slanderously make me one of the *great disturbers of the late reformation*, and *the first Author of the disturbance or Anabaptism* and *cunningly altering the subject of the Question from Anabaptists to baptizers of believers.*

The 2d. thing he chargeth on me as untruth, was not expressed as Mr. *Cr.* insinuates, that Pædobaptists *call the baptizers of belivers Anabaptists*, but thus [the baptizing of believers called by these Anabaptism] which cannot be denied to be true, unless he deny that the baptizing used was not baptizing, or the baptized no believers, or that they call it not Anabaptism. It is also false that he saith of me, that *my judgement and practise is, that all that will be saved must be baptized again, when they become actual believers, and this I put in execution by making as many Proselytes by rebaptising as I can.*

The 3d. untruth (as he calls it) is, *that baptising of believers without infants, or excluding infants, had not its spring and rise from* Nicholas Stork; and he notes, *that the Epistle affirmed Anabaptism (which is another thing) had its spring thence.* But he neither shews what other thing Anabaptism is, nor doth he prove it to be an untruth, but by rendring my own instances against it invalid. But therein he doth but abuse me, who alledged not the instances he brings to prove that proposition he terms an untruth; nor is there any thing said by him, but what he hath from Mr. *Ms. Defence*, and is answered before here, *sect* 90 98.

The 4th. untruth he chargeth me with, is, that *infants Baptism was not commanded by Christ*, and he thinks to evince the contrary from *Mat.* 28. 19. But he saith nothing but what is so fully refuted before, *Review, part* 2. *sect.* 5, *&c. part* 3. *sect.* 97. and elsewhere, so that I need say no more here to it.

The 5th. untruth he imagines, is, that *infant Baptism was not practised by the Apostles, which being denied by the Antipædobaptists, the proof lies upon them.* But by his leave the proof lies upon the Pædobaptists, to prove they did baptize infants, sith they claim a right to it, which must be proved by precept or example of the doing it. *A negative argument in matter of fact of this nature is of sufficient validity* to shew infant Baptism not to be according to Gods will, sith in meer positive instituted worship, wherein God hath set down what he will have done, he will have it so done, and no otherwise. It is proved before, *Review, part* 2. *sect.* 5. *&c part* 3. *sect.* 52. that the Apostles baptized not infants. Mr. *Crs.* imagined reasons *why they might baptize none but of ripe age, de facto*, are vain, there being no intimation of any such reasons in the History of the Apostles Acts; Yea, the story is against his surmises, for the

the converted and baptized did not travel far to hear the Apostles, but the Apostles travelled far to preach to them in their own Cities, and in them they went from house to house, *Acts* 16.15,34. & 20.20. *Hierusalem and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan* are said to go *out to* John Baptist *to be baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins*, which cannot be meant of infants. Though *infants be a part of a Nation*, yet *Mat.*28.19. *Is.* 2.2. by *nations* no infant is meant, nor *Luk.*19.19. is infant Baptism intimated. The Baptism of infants is not proved from *Act.*16.15. *v.*32,33. shew that by *the house* are meant persons of age: and by so expounding we *diminish not Gods word*, nor *make exception that God hath not made*, nor *imply a contradiction*, nor *incur a curse*, as Mr. *Cr.* after his vein of prating, writes.

All that Mr. *Cr.* saith in opposition to what I said of baptizing believers in the first ages continued without any infant Baptism, proves not my words *an untruth*, nor *a frontless assertion*, and is answered before, *sect.* 88,89,98. in which, and *sect.*90,91. all that he brings to evince my 7th. and 8th. untruth (as he terms my words) is examined.

I justly account infant Baptism a Popish abuse, it being derived from these principles, unwritten tradition, and necessity of it to save an infant dying, which are judged Popish errours. And for answer to what Mr. *Cr.* saith of my 9th. untruth, as he terms it, I refer the Reader to the 9th. Section of my *Praecursor*, not refelled by Mr. *Baxter* in his *Praefestinanti is morator*.

Sect. 7. Mr. *Cr.* excepts against me for saying, 1. That the Epistlers assignation of the causes of Anabaptism are vain. 2. That Anabaptism is true Baptism. 3. That the true cause is the light shining from Scriptures and other Authors. 4. That this light was not discovered formerly as now. What he saith against the first, is but a repeating of the reasons, without any confirmation, but some light Poetical pedantique expressions, which deserve onely neglect. Against the 2d. he gives his reasons against reiteration of Baptism, which are nothing to me, who asserted not that baptizing twice was true Baptism, but baptizing of persons of age professing faith though in infancy imagined to have been baptized is true Baptism. Yet do I see no force in the reasons he gives. For 1. in the institution of Baptism, *Mat.*28.19. the precept is to the baptizer, and I presume he doth not think the baptizer is not to reiterate his act of baptizing, yea doubtless he is to baptize as oft as there are Disciples made by him. And as for the act of the baptized, which is implied it is true, neither is it determined to be once or twice, and may therefore seem to be left to liberty. That he allegeth, *whatsoever is not of faith is sin*, is clean mistaken by him, the meaning being onely, what a man doth with a doubting conscience is sin to him, & so by this reason rebaptization is a sin only to him that doubts of it. And when he saith, *whatsoever is not grounded on the Scripture is will worship*, I presume he means it of that which is used as worship, and determined to be but once. But then the question is only begg'd, not proved, that Christ hath determined Baptism to be but once. In that which he saith of *Act.*19.3. (which is an instance of being twice baptized) I find nothing brought by Mr. *Cr.* to avoid the

force of it. For to *be baptized into* Johns *Baptism* can be no other then to be baptized with water according to the profession of *Johns* Disciples, and this was true Baptism from Heaven, not differing in the nature of it from Christs, as say Protestant Divines; and it is certain, that *to be baptised into the name of the Lord Jesus*, is to be baptized with water into the profession of him, as *Act* 2. 38, 41. & 10. 48. the giving the Holy Ghost is distinctly expressed *v.* 6. to have been by *laying on of hands*, and this was on the same persons *v.* 6. who were said *to hear and to be baptised* *v.* 5. and these were not all *the people* mentioned *v.* 4. but *twelve only* *v.* 7. and therefore it is far more probable, and in mine apprehension certain, as the Ancients did conceive, that those twelve were baptized with water twice, once according to the profession *Johns* Disciples made at Baptism, and the other according to the Christian. Nor am I moved by the observation of *Marnixius*, approved by *Beza* in his *annot. in locum*, and followed by many others, *That the particles* μεν *and* δε *must necessarily answer each other, and therefore the words* v. 4, 5. *be* Pauls. For 1. the particle μὲ is put oft, and the matter requires it should be so conceived here, either as an expletive that is without force, to which in the vulgar translation nothing answers, as it is *Act* 3. 21, 22, *&c.* or an adverb of affirmation, or if it be a conjunction discretive, that which answers to it is not that *v.* 5. there being no good sense, to say, *John verily baptised with the Baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after, that is, on Christ Jesus; but they hearing this*, &c. there being no apt discretion made in such speech, if the particles be discretive, the other part is concealed, and should be to this purpose, But the Baptism we use is into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, or into the name of the Lord Jesus already come. And for this reason the particle δὲ must be expounded as our interpreters, *when*, or as a meer expletive as in the vulgar. 2. The words *Act.* 19. 5. do give an obvious plain sense on the other side as the words of *Luke*, thus, *when the twelve*, mentioned *v.* 7. *heard this of Paul*, that it was *Christ Jesus* to come after *John*, on whom *John* would have his Disciples to believe when he baptized them with the Baptism of repentance, then they were baptized into the name of the Lord *Jesus* with express profession of him. Nor is it true that there is express Scripture, *Ephes.* 4 5. *One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, against the iteration of the same Baptism.* For as *one Faith* notes not one act of believing, but one kind of faith from the unity of the object believed, which may be and is one faith though an hundred times iterated; so *one Baptism* notes not one act of baptizing, but one kind of Baptism distinct from Pharisaical Baptism into the observance of the Law for righteousness, termed one by the profession of the same Doctrine or Lord, though it be an hundred times iterated. The same man baptized an hundred times, and an hundred men once onely baptized, each of them have one Baptism in the Apostles sense, if they be baptized with the same profession; and the same person though but once baptized, yet if with another profession, hath not that one Baptism there meant: One Baptism is not as much as once baptized and no more, but Baptism into one profession and no other.

The

The 2d. argument is of no force, "Baptiſm is the Sacrament of re "generation, or new birth; and as *Auſtin* hath it, we are carnally and "naturally born but once, ſo we are ſpiritually and ſupernaturally new "born but once; Faith though it admit of gradations begins but once, "Baptiſm that matriculates us into Chriſts School is to be performed "but once.

Anſw. The Scripture no where terms Baptiſm the Sacrament of regeneration; nor, if the expreſſion be allowed, will it follow Baptiſm is to be but once. For 1. it doth not follow, natural birth is but once, therefore ſupernatural new birth, which is onely ſo metaphorically, is but once; as it follows not, we die naturally but once, therefore we die to ſin, or through ſin but once. Natural birth hath not degrees, therefore neither regeneration. 2. Baptiſm is not regeneration though it were yeelded to be the ſacrament of regeneration, and therefore though regeneration could be but once, yet Baptiſm might be often. 3. Thoſe that hold intercision of regeneration and faith (which I do not) will ſay that regeneration may be often, and faith begin often. 4. Baptiſm may be termed the ſacrament of regeneration either as the cauſe or ſign of it. If as the cauſe of it ſo it ſhould rather follow it ſhould be often adminiſtred, as the word is often preached to beget us again. If as the ſign, ſo it may often be uſed to ſignifie it, though it be but once done; as the breaking of bread is oft uſed to ſignifie Chriſts death, though he died but once.

The 3d. argument, from once Circumciſion, is of leſs force. For neither is it true, that our Baptiſm ſucceeds Jewiſh Circumciſion, nor is it proved that in no caſe a perſon might be twice circumciſed, nor if both theſe were granted will it follow, that the rule of circumciſing but once muſt be a rule to us of baptizing but once, any more then the Jews Circumciſion was tied to the 8th. day, therefore ſo muſt our Baptiſm. Yet this reaſon of Mr. *Cr.* may be thus urged againſt infant Baptiſm: Circumciſion was tied to the 8th. day, therefore to circumciſe on another day were ſacriledge; Baptiſm is tied to Diſciples, or believers, *Mat* 28.19. *Mar.*16.15,16. therefore to baptize infants who are not Diſciples or believers, cannot be juſtified without ſacriledge, at the rate of Mr. *Crs.* reaſoning. The reſt of that Section and the next Section need no other anſwer then what is already made, there being no argument needfull to be anſwered, nor any thing almoſt but ſcoffing Rhetorick, cavils, miſ-repreſentations of my words and the paſſages at Diſputes, which were rightly repreſented in the 2d. Section of my Plea.

SECT. C.

The arguments of Mr. Cragg *for infant Baptiſm are re-examined.*

MR. *Cr.* in the diſpute at *Abergavenny* began thus, *Some infants may not be baptiſed, therefore ſome infants may be baptiſed*; and this the Relator (who was likely to be himſelf, or one whoſe relation he viewed and approved) terms an *Enthymema*. To which in my *Plea* I anſwered, 1. the conſequence could not be made good according to Logick rules, but by adding this Propoſition, All that may not be baptized may be baptized. 2. That it is like theſe arguings, Some infants may not have the Lords Supper, therefore ſome may; ſome boys are not to be ordained Biſhops, therefore ſome are.

To this he replies, *Part* 2. *ſect.* 1. 1. *That the Relator and I were both miſtaken*: Which if true, it was ill done that he did not rectifie the thing ere it was printed. 2. "That my cenſure of this arguing as fri-"volous, aroſe from ignorance or inadvertency, that betrayed me to a "double miſtake, 1. That there was no way of arguing conſecutive, by "two Propoſitions, but Enthymematically, ſo that they were immediate-"ly reducible, to a ſyllogiſm compleat in mood and figure. 2. If an En-"thymema and reducible, that it muſt neceſſarily be reſolved into his "ſyllogiſm as he calls it, All that may not be baptized, may be bap-"tized; ſome infants may not be baptized, *ergo*, ſome infants may be "be baptized. Truly this is ſo frivolous, and deſerves ſo much con-"tempt, that a freſh man would laugh at it. And then he goes on, I "would gladly know to what mood of the firſt figure (for it hath *ſub* "*præ*) his monſtrous ſyllogiſm belongs, conſiſting in the premiſes of "two negatives, in the concluſion of an affirmative; whereby (as eve-"ry Puny knows) two Maximes are violated, 1. That of pure nega-"tives nothing is concluded. 2. That the concluſion ſhould follow the "unworthier part, whereas he extracts an affirmative concluſion from "negative premiſes.

Anſw. I am content that an ingenious freſh man judge whether there were any ignorance, inadvertency or miſtake in my anſwer to this argument, and whether there be not groſs ignorance and ſophiſtry, in his argument, and in the reply impudent boldneſs to avow ſuch a ſhameful act; and that any wiſe conſcientious Chriſtian judge, whether the argument at firſt, or this reply, could come out of any other then a wrangling ſpirit, bent to baffle a reſpondent, and make ſport for a company of vain auditors and readers, without any care befitting a Chriſtian teacher to clear truth. At firſt when I denied the conſequence he proved it not, but brought a ſyllogiſm concluding another thing then the conſequence; and whereas then his ſyllogiſm appeared to have four terms, he brings another ſyllogiſm, in which he would infer, that becauſe ſubcontraries may be both true, therefore that propoſition, Some infants

may

may be baptized, must be true; as if because both may be true, it follows that proposition must be true: whereas every fresh man knows, that though both may be true, yet it is true also one may be false, and that may be the proposition he infers, notwithstanding the force of that rule. Now in the reply he discovers the same spirit. Though his relator (with whom he must concur, or else they juggle with Readers) term his dispute an *Enthymema*, yet he would not have it so conceived, but tels us *there is a kind of argumentation in* Keckerm. syst. Log. l. 3. tr. 1. c. 1. *defined, one sentence or proposition following another without disposition of the* medium *as in conversions*. But doth he shew there is any such conversion, or any other way of consecution of sentences allowed by *Keckerman* or any Logician in his argumentation? Then when I had reduced it to that syllogism to which the *Enthymeme* was to be reduced according to Logick rules, he hath the impudence o term this my syllogism, and so suggest as if *I were not able to make a syllogism, or reduce that to a syllogism which was reducible*, whereas the syllogism was his own virtually, as all Logicians know that understand the rule about *Enthymemes*, though it were formed by me rightly and the monstrosity of it must lie at his door, not mine, who value little his judgement of my abilities, better known to others of better esteem then to him. And for the way he new forms it, it is quite another argument then what he made at the dispute, and of which the *minor* is to be denied, which is thus, *There are some infants besides them that are excluded Baptism*; but this is contrary to the antecedent in the *Enthymeme*, *Some infants may not be baptised*, which should be the *minor*. He adds, *that the force of the argument lies in the immediateness of the propositions, that what belongs not to one of them must needs belong to the other*, and a topick rule out of *Cracanthorp*, and some other instances about divisions, in all which there is nothing but vanity. For let Propositions be immediate, yet when they are opposite as these are, *some infants are to be baptised, some not*, the one follows not from the other, but the contrary rather, except in those termed *subaltern*, which are rather subordinate then opposite. His instances of *consequences upon a sufficient division*, they are all impertinent here, where there is no division of terms, but the same terms are in both Propositions. In his answer to my instances he would make a difference between the Propositions about infant Baptism and the Lords Supper, and ordination to be Bishops, that *the one is in a capable subject, not the other*; but he shews not that an infant is capable of Baptism any more then of the Lords Supper, or a boy of ordination; nor if they were doth the force of the argument hold more in the one then in the other: and therefore it's his ignorance to say, *the scruple here will be, whether infants are capable of Baptism or no*: but it is whether this illation be good. *Some are not, therefore some are to be baptised*; which if right, it will follow in the other instances of Communion and ordination as well as in it. That which he saith of *my grant of the capacity of Baptism, because I grant they may be elected and believe, and would if I knew it of infants baptize them*, follows not; for though *my ignorance hinders not their capacity in themselves*, yet it hinders their capacity from mee, I being not warranted

ranted to baptize any believer till his faith be manifested to me.

Sect. 2. Mr. *Cr* goes on to scribble after his usual manner. He had thus disputed, *To whom belongs the essence of Baptism they may be baptised, But to some infant belongs the essence of Baptism, Ergo.* To this I said, This Proposition, *the essence of Baptism belongs to infants*, may have two senses. He replies, as if *I distinguished of a two fold essence of Baptism*, which he terms a *Chymæra, the essence of a thing being but one and indivisible*; which shews hee hath some smattering in Metaphisicks, but is impertinent to the thing in hand. For be it all granted, yet a Proposition which speaks of the essence may have a two fold sense; and the senses I conceived of his words were rightly set down, and more favourably to Mr. *Cr.* then his words did deserve. For this Proposition, *To some infants belongs the essence of Baptism*, must have one of those senses, or a worse, to wit, either that infants are in the definition of Baptism, so as that there is no Baptism but of infants; or that Baptism is of the essence of infants, so as that they are no infants without Baptism, which are absurd. And to speak truly, the whole argument is ridiculous, take it what way he will, except he give the same sense which I did, and then the *minor* and the conclusion are all one, and the *major* meerly tautological, To whom the right administration of Baptism belongs they may be lawfully baptized, But to infants, *&c. Ergo.* In the other sense it is more vain. For if the essence numerical of Baptism belong to infants then not a moral right is asserted, but either a present or a future event, and so the *minor* Proposition should be, Some infants are baptized, which is a thing discerned by sense; or shall be baptized, which were a prediction, but nothing to the point about moral or legal right. To understand it of the specifical essence, makes no sense but what is worse. His proof from the definition is also as vain; For it is a proof of the same by the same: But he tels me, *It is not all one as to argue, infant Baptism is Baptism, therefore it is right baptism, but it concludes infant Baptism is baptism, therefore infants may be baptized, which is the question by this inference put out of question.* To which I reply, this talk seems to me like the words of a crazed man, there being no question between us about the baptism of infants, whether they may be baptized, that is whether this may be done to them so as that they be passive subjects of it, I never denied that infants may be thus baptized, but the question is whether it may be lawfully done by him that doth it, and then to say they may be baptized is all one as to say infant Baptism is right baptism, and so his argument from the definition is that which he denies not to be vain, infant Baptism is baptism, therefore it is right Baptism.

But he thinks to prove from the definition, that infant Baptism is right Baptism, and he sets down his conceits of Baptism, that it is *a relation whose fundament is the Divine institution infolding infants in all nations in several families*, which if he once prove, he needs prove no more, but here he doth not attempt it, but *excepts against me for denying Baptism to be a relation, but an action or passion with a relation superadded, and he brings against me sayings of Divines who call it a signe*, which I deny not in respect of the use, but that shews not the nature of it, no more then

Circumci-

Circumcision is in its nature a relation, because it is a signe of the Covenant in its use, the carrying a scepter is in its nature a relation, because in its use it is a sign of royalty. What he saith, that *I tell not whether it be action or passion, and not to be placed in one category is to be placed in none*, is answered by his own confession, that *in Baptism is included baptization which is both action and passion*, which is enough to shew that Baptism is in its nature either an action or a passion, and may be put in either predicament, and that in different respects a word may be put in divers predicaments, and his talk false, that *nothing formally can be placed in two categories*, and the rest of his talk about the *genus* of Baptism being a signe, and other passages to be but mistakes.

But he attempts to gain his purpose by this argument, *Every Sacrament is a relation, But Baptism is a Sacrament, Ergo.* To which I answered, both premises might be denied, and as a reason of the denial alleged, 1. That the term [*Sacrament*] being but a term invented by Latin Fathers, may be laid aside. He replies, *that the* 12. *Tables and* Tully *mention it, therefore it was long before the Latin Christian Fathers*; True, but not in the sense in which Baptism is termed a Sacrament. But, *if the word Sacrament be laid aside because a Heathen word, then should also the terms Bishop, Presbyter, Deacon, be laid aside also. Answ.* No, for they are Scripture terms, not so the term Sacrament in the Ecclesiastical sense: Yet again, *then Trinity, unity, Humanity, Antipædobaptist must be laid aside. Answ.* It followes not, yet what I said of *Sacrament* I say of them, they may be laid aside, when an argument is drawn from them, as here from the word Sacrament. He adds, *Besides is there not no mystery in the original? Answ.* It is, but never in the use in which the term *Sacrament* is used as now it is defined.

2. I alleged that there is no common nature of Sacraments (not as Mr. *Cr. of a Sacrament*) express'd in Scripture, This he sayes *is untrue in the sequel. For what consequence? There is no common nature of a Sacrament expressed in Scripture, therefore Baptism is not a Sacrament, more then in this? There is no common nature of infused grace expressed in Scripture, therefore faith is not an infused grace.*

Answ. It was not my sequel; but this, therefore the term Sacrament may be laid aside, and no good argument is from the definition of a Sacrament to prove Baptism to be a relation.

The term *grace* or *grace of God*, I do much question whether any where in Scripture it be applied to inherent qualities in us, or good acts proceeding from us, and I conceive that the use of it in that manner hath occasioned or strengthened the errour of justification by inherent righteousness, because *we are said to be justified by grace*, and do wish that when approvers of Preachers are directed to examine persons of the grace of God in them, the thing had been otherwise expressed, and that such an expression as *the gift by grace*, or the like were used; yet I deny not there is in Scripture a common nature of those gifts by grace in us which accompany salvation, and that faith is a gift by grace infused, inspired, or wrought by the spirit of God.

Mr. *Cr.* saith further, *untrue in it self, for though not in one place*

there may be in many places of Scripture compared together a common nature of Sacraments compared together. And is there not the common nature of a Sacrament expreſſed in one Scripture Rom. 4. 11. *a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith? This is the judgement of the Ancients, and the moſt of the Divines of the reformed Churches.*

Anſw. That neither the text *Rom.* 4. 11. nor the Ancients do ſo define a Sacrament, is ſhewed before; and however the Divines of the Reformed Churches do define thence a Sacrament as the ſeal of the Covenant, yet not (as there it is expreſſed) *a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith*; But of this I have ſaid enough before ſect. 31.

What I ſaid of *Auſtins* definition of a Sacrament, that *it is a viſible ſigne of inviſible grace*, as imperfect (which I proved by inſtances) was without a *miſcellany of abſurdities*; If *the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt as a Dove were a ſigne or ſeal of Chriſts office of Mediatorſhip and not of his righteouſneſs of faith*, yet it was a viſible ſigne of his hol qualifications, *Luk.* 4. 18. *Joh.* 3. 44. and ſo of inviſible grace, and conſequently a Sacrament by *Auſtins* definition; Chriſts waſhing his Diſciples feet, ſhewed his love and humility, *ergo*, by *Auſtins* definition muſt be alſo a Sacrament; and holding up the hands in prayer ſhews faith in God; kiſſing the Bible in ſwearing ſhews appealing to God as Judge or hope in his word, which are inviſible graces according to *Auſtin*, and according to his definition Sacraments. And though it be added in the Common Prayer book Catechiſm, *ordained by Chriſt*, yet it is not ſo in *Auſtins* definition uſed by Mr. *Cr.* in the diſpute, and if it had, holding up the hands in prayer had been a Sacrament, being appointed 1 *Tim.* 2. 8. And for the addition in the Catechiſm [*as a means to receive the ſame, and a pledge to aſſure us thereof*] I know no Scripture that ever made Circumciſion, the Paſſeover, the Lords Supper, or Baptiſm, meanes to receive inviſible grace, and how far and in what manner it aſſures I have before ſect. 31. and elſewhere ſhewed. Enough of Mr. *Crs.* vain prattle in this ſection.

Sect. 3. Mr. *Cr.* quarrels with my reconciliation of my own words, denying all inviſible Churchmembers were to be baptized, but affirming it of viſible. He tels me, 1. *This diſtinction is not fitly applied, for the propoſition was meant of viſible Churchmembership.* But 1. however it were meant the expreſſion was, *God appointed infants Churchmembers under the Goſpel*, and this might be underſtood of inviſible as well as viſible Churchmembership; and therefore it was fitly applied to take away the ambiguity of the expreſſion. 2. It was fitly applied alſo to cleer my meaning, and to free my words from contradiction. 2. He tels me *my propoſition is not true, for all viſible Churchmembers are not to be baptized, then all baptized before (they being viſible members) were to be baptized again.* But what is this but wrangling, ſith the propoſition was his own, and I granted it with that limitation in his own ſenſe, of them that were not yet baptized? He tels me of the ſtate of the queſtion between us, which is impertinent to the preſent buſineſs of cleering my words.

He adds, "Inviſible and viſible members differs as *Genus* and *ſpecies*, "all inviſible members are viſible, but not all viſible members inviſible,

"the

"the invisible being extracted out of the visible; now if all invisible "members be also visible, it will inevitably follow they may be bapti- "zed, whether visible by profession, or by prerogative and promise of "parents or sureties of infants.

But what a dotage is this? Doth visible Churchmember *prædicari de pluribus specie differentibus in quid?* If it be asked what is an invisible Churchmember, will any that is in his wits say hee is a visible Churchmember? Is not this a contradiction, to say all invisible members are visible? How is it proved that any are visible members of the Christian Church, but by profession of faith? The like dotage is in what he saith after, *that there is an intrinsecal connexion of these termes [actually to receive into Covenant under the Gospel, and to appoint Churchmembers under the Gospel] that they are as essentially coincident as to bee a man and a reasonable creature, which makes this proposition to be æternæ veritatis, those whom God did actually receive into Covenant under the Gospel, those God did appoint Churchmembers under the Gospel.* For is the one to be defined by the other? Do not these terms express existences restrained to *hic* and *nunc* (for sure actual receiving and appointing are singular acts in time) not essences? If these speeches of Mr. *Cr.* be *according to Metaphysical and Logical principles*, I am yet to seek in them, as having not heard or read of such principles before. And if *God did promise before the Law, foretell under the Law, actually receive into Covenant under the Gospel, or appoint Churchmembers under the Gospel without faith or profession of faith*, then infidels are actually in Covenant under the Gospel, and so justified; then is Mr. *Baxters* dispute against Antinomians, about the condition of the Covenant and justification false, *and if they be Churchmembers without faith or profession of faith and to be baptized*, and *the truth of* Mr. Crs. *proposition, those whom God did promise before the Law, foretell under the Law, actually receive into Covenant under the Gospel, those God did appoint Churchmembers under the Gospel, have no dependence upon faith or profession of faith*; then Mr. *Baxters* 20 arguments in his 2d. *dispute of right to Sacraments* against Mr. *Blake* are false; so that I need no more but to leave Mr. *Cr.* to be chastized by his magnified Doctor Mr. *Baxter* about this point; and so enough of this section.

Sect. 4. He terms this *an untruth*, that a person may bee in Covenant, who is not yet born or conceived as my instance of *Isaac* implies, and saith; "It may bee confuted *insito argumento*, by an argu- "ment inbred in the terms, for he implies and that right, that a per- "son must be the subject of being in Covenant, but none who is un- "born, and unconceived as *Isaac Gen.* 17. 22. is a person.] But this is false, he may be a person though not in present but future existence. Those *Ephesians who were elected before the Foundation of the world*, Eph. 1. 4. were persons when elected, for they were singular men, though not then in actual being but future. Mr. *Crs.* reasoning in this, is like the reasoning of *Adam Medlicot* my neighbour, in his book stiled *Comfortable doctrine for Adams off-spring*, p. 99. "Who will not have any "particularly elected before the foundation of the world, *because* then "they

" they were not any where men, *and p. 96. that* none is absolutely elect-
" ed till he believe, because not in Christ, and if not in Christ not in
" election, and one is elected before another because in Christ before
" another. *And in his* Honey found in the Lions Carkass, *p.* 102. Al-
" though the purpose of election and reprobation was fully in God be-
" fore time, yet there could be no absolute or real election or reproba-
" tion of men and women, until they had a real and absolute beeing.
Surely infants are in Covenant no otherwise then by Gods promise or mans vow, or some such act in their behalf, and this may be afore they are in being, and consequently they may be in Covenant afore they are in actual being. If I do not mistake, Mr. *Cr.* both here *Sect.* 5. and in the 3d. *Part Sect.* 9. makes those with whom the Covenant was made *Deut.* 29. 10. to have been in Covenant, but doubtless the Covenant there was made with the posterity yet unbegotten *v.* 14, 15. for no other can bee meant by *him that was not with them that day*, all that were born or begotten then of the Congregation of *Israel*, whether by nature or Proselytism being present, as the words *v.* 10, 11. shew, and the end of the Covenant being to prevent the Apostasie of their posterity *v.* 18. therefore the unbegotten were in Covenant. Nor is it a good argument, A man is in Covenant, *ergo* he is, any more then a man is elected therefore he is, these termes being *termini diminuentes*, as Logicians speak; and the verb (*est is*) in these speeches not noting the present existence of the subject of these propositions, but of the act of the person who elects or covenants. A child unbegotten may be said to be in a copy or a deed, and so in covenant in respect of the assuring an estate to him when hee shall be existent.

But Mr. *Cr.* tels me, " 2ly. It is a false suggestion that to have a
" Covenant made to one is to be in Covenant, if by having the covenant
" made to (for the phrase is somewhat strange) be meant (as he can mean
" nothing else) a promise from God to be and be in covenant, for a
" promise may be made to or of one, long before he hath any being, nor
" executed or performed till long after his being; Then to be elected
" and to be in covenant would be both one, then *Mary Magdalen* and
" *Paul* while a persecutor were in covenant, nay from eternity to be in
" covenant would precede outward and inward calling, conversion, pro-
" fession and prerogative of birth, then which nothing can be more ri-
" diculous.

Answ. It is so far from being ridiculous, that to me it is very plain to be in covenant precedes calling, and to be in covenant is to have a covenant made to one, and that a person is said to be in covenant with God by Gods promise to be his God though the man be not existent. This is in my apprehension that which Pædobaptists mean by being in covenant, for they usually say infants are in covenant, which sure they mean of Gods promise to them, for they prove it from *Gen.* 17. 7. *Acts* 2. 39. Nor can they mean it of any other being in covenant, sith there is no act of any infant or any other for him, that can denominate him in covenant with God in the time of the Gospel, but Gods promise, which is long before the being of those to or for whom it is made, *Tit.* 1. 2. *Gal.* 3. 16.

3. 16, 17. And thus two Kingdomes are said to be in league and covenant, and they that are born many yeers after may be said to be in covenant by vertue thereof. This being in covenant may be, though the things covenanted be not executed or performed till long after the being in covenant, as persons first enter into covenant and then perform. And yet to be in covenant and to be elected would not be both one, though attributed to the same persons, sith there is a different formal conceit of them, election being an immanent act, covenant a transient, that from eternity, this in time, as to be justified and sanctified are not both one, though to the same persons. Nor is it any absurdity to say *Paul* was in covenant while a persecutor, nor that to be in covenant precedes conversion, sith it is by vertue of being in covenant that one is converted, *Heb.* 8. 10. *Rom.* 11. 26, 27. As for being in covenant with God by prerogative of birth, I know not of any such in the time of the Gospel.

"Thirdly (*saith Mr.* Cr.) It is of the same leven of untruth, that "*Isaac* was in Covenant when he was not yet born, which his own quo- "tation, *Gen.* 17. 21. proves against him. For he saith he will establish "a Covenant with *Isaac* in the future, not that he does establish a Co- "venant in the present.

Answ. Surely *Isaac* was *a child of the promise*, *Rom.* 9. 8, 9. and *Jacob*, *v.* 11. *afore they were born*, and consequently in the Covenant; and when God said *he would establish his Covenant with Isaac*, he meant no other then the Covenant made with *Abraham*, and therefore it was made to him then, and he in Covenant, though confirmed and performed after.

Mr. *Cr.* saith of my speech, that a person is not actually received into Covenant till he is born, and by some acts of his own engageth himself to be Gods, *That it is founded upon the basis of this mistake, that every Covenant must be expresly and actually mutual between both parties*; and talks after his foolish fashion, *as if it were an argument sophistically (though sillily) drawn a negatione unius speciei ad totum genus*: But this is his meer cavil. For my reason added, receiving importeth an offering, which is to be done by profession, shews I inferred it otherwise. Against which his exception is in these words, *as if more were to be required for admission of visible members into Covenant, then was for admission, or actual receiving of Christ as God-man and Mediator to be visible head of the Church.* To which I reply, When and how Christ was visible head of the Church, is a point that requires much discussion. To be head of the Church imports direction, government, *&c.* To be visible head, is to do these things discernably by reason from something sensible. That he was visible head of the Church till he was manifest to Israel, and how he was visibly head of it but by his preaching, calling Disciples, or how he was actually received as such but by believing on his name, *Joh.* 1. 11. or how he was admitted visible head but by *Johns* Declaration, his Baptism of him, the Spirits descent on him, and his Fathers Proclamation of him, or how any according to the Evangelical order are admitted visible members into Covenant but by their own profession of faith, and thereupon being baptized, I understand not. But

as

as for my ſpeech, I ſee not how it imports that which Mr. *Cr.* would have it to do, but onely, That *being actually received into Covenant* doth import an offer or tender on his part who is to be received, which however it might be under the Law, yet ſure in the Goſpel is no other way but by the perſons own profeſſion; and this neither *ſmels rank of Hereſie nor Blaſphemy*, but Mr. *Crs.* conceit as *if under the Goſpel ſome might be received into Covenant, and admitted as viſible members repreſentatively by others, who are their Proxies, and engage for them, they being but meer paſſives without any voluntary act of their own*, is but an innovation from what Chriſt or his Apoſtles appointed or practiſed; and his acknwledgement that *it is not neceſſary that a Covenant be mutual, that the Covenant* Ezek. 36.26. Gen. 15.8. & 17.9. *are ſuch as wherein one party maketh the Covenant without mentioning the other but as patient*, ſerves me to prove what I aſſert before, *ſect.* 45. againſt Mr. *Bl.* that a Covenant is not always a mutual agreement, and that a perſon is ſaid to be in Covenant in that a Covenant is made to him, and this may be to perſons not actually exiſtent, againſt Mr. *Cr.* in this Section.

Mr. *Cr.* to prove that *God did promiſe to* Abraham *that infants ſhould be in Covenant under the Goſpel*, alledgeth *Gen.* 17.7. and thus argues. "He that makes an everlaſting Covenant to *Abraham* and his ſeed after him in their generations, promiſed that infants ſhould be in Covenant under the Goſpel; God made an everlaſting Covenant with "*Abraham* and his ſeed after him, *Ergo.*

To this I ſaid I had many exceptions; for beſides thoſe to which Mr. *Cr.* here replies, I might and do deny his *major* for another reaſon then I did before. For now by his words *p.* 254. I perceive by *being in Covenant under the Goſpel*, he means *an outward and viſible Covenant*, like to which he hath *p.* 155. and *p.* 261. he calls this *an impregnable rock which the Anabaptiſts will never overthrow, that to be circumciſed or baptized is all one as to be in viſible Covenant*; and *p.* 158. he ſaith, *I clearly affirm with all the Reformed Churches, that all in viſible Covenant are ſubjects of Baptiſm, and all ſubjects of Baptiſm are in viſible Covenant.* I muſt confeſs, I magined that Pædobaptiſts if they would ſpeak plainly could mean no other by *the being of infants in Covenant under the Goſpel* but their being baptized; and ſo their argument, *infants are in Covenant*, ergo *to be baptized*, is but a meer tautology, or worſe, they are baptized therefore they are to be baptized. But I think I have *ſect.* 25. before ſhewed, that the diſtinction of outward and inward Covenant as the Pædobaptiſts uſe it, is either *non ens* or non-ſenſe, and I now deny this Propoſition, *He that makes an everlaſting covenant to* Abraham *and his ſeed after him in their generations promiſed that infants ſhould be in covenant under the Goſpel*, not onely for the reaſon given in the Diſpute, but alſo becauſe I now perceive he means (unleſs he ſtill juggle, as I fear he will in the uſe of the phraſes *being in covenant, the covenant is made*, &c.) that God promiſed that infants ſhould be baptized under the Goſpel, which is too ridiculous a ſenſe to be put upon the promiſe of *being a God to* Abraham *and his ſeed*, *Gen.* 17.7. much unlike Chriſts expoſition of the phraſe, *Luke* 20.38,39. and ſeems to be the attempt

of

of men that have for their baby-ſprinkling reſolved to avow the groſſeſt abſurdities. But to keep to the Diſpute as it hath been printed. *I* ſaid *the covenant* Gen. 17.7. *to* Abraham *and his ſeed after him in their generations*, if it be underſtood of the natural ſeed of *Abraham*, the everlaſtingneſs of it was but for a time, and that time afore the Goſpel as in the next verſe; the poſſeſſion of *Canaan* is promiſed to be everlaſting, and yet the Jews now diſpoſſeſſed of it. Which Mr. *Cr.* grants, and therefore muſt needs grant, that the promiſe *v.7.* though it be termed *everlaſting*, yet it is to be underſtood onely of a limited time, as in other paſſages, *Exod.* 21.6. *&* 12.24. *&c.* if meant of the natural ſeed of *Abraham*.

To this he replies, "How doth that follow? If it had been with a "particle of excluſion, onely to the natural ſeed, there might have been "ſome colour of Diſpute; and yet without all controverſie, the ever-"laſtingneſs of it is extended even to the natural ſeed of *Abraham*; for "there hath been, is, and will be a ſucceſſion of Jewiſh believers to "the end of the world; which proves that in his ſenſe it's falſe, that "the everlaſtingneſs of it was but for a time, and that time afore the "Goſpel.

Anſw. My meaning was plain enough, that the Covenant as it was Evangelical, that is, as it contains a promiſe of the Spirit, juſtification, *&c.* (which is the onely Goſpel Covenant *I* know) if meant of the natural ſeed of *Abraham*, that is, the generality, or body of them was but for a time afore the Goſpel, which *I* learned from our Lord Chriſt, who foretold *Mat.* 21.43. *that the Kingdome of God ſhould be taken from them*, and the Apoſtle ſaith was accompliſhed, *Rom* 11.20. *that the branches*, meaning the Jewiſh-people, *were broken off by unbelief*: and this is true, though it be true alſo that there have been a ſucceſſion of Jewiſh believers ſtill, they being *a remnant onely according to the election of grace*, *Rom* 11.5. and thus they were not merely *Abrahams* natural ſeed, but alſo his ſpiritual, to wit, elect and true believers, to whom *I* never denied the Covenant to be ſimply everlaſting.

Mr. *Cr.* adds. "But the truth is, it is not onely meant of the natural "ſeed, but of the ſpiritual ſeed of *Abraham*, both whereof ſucceſſively "and in part, if not altogether concomitantly (for there were always "Proſelytes) it is everlaſting, or to the end of the world.

Anſw If Mr. *Cr.* mean, that to the natural ſeed, who are alſo the ſpiritual ſeed, the Covenant *Gen.* 17.7. is ſimply everlaſting, *I* grant it, but this doth no way advantage Mr. *Cr.* For then it will onely follow, that to ſuch infants as are not onely the natural ſeed of *Abraham* or a believer, but alſo are themſelves believers, God hath promiſed they ſhall be in Covenant under the Goſpel; which would not be true of all the infants of believers, or any but the elect: If he mean it as it is there meant (as appears by the next words, *v.8.*) being underſtood of the natural ſeed of *Abraham* of the nation or people of *Iſrael*, and not of a remnant of them, it can be true onely of a limited everlaſtingneſs, and not at all of the Gentile believers infants, and ſo is not at all for Mr. *Crs.* purpoſe.

But he tels me, "It follows not, unleſs the ſame word in adjoyning "verſes muſt neceſſarily ſignifie the ſame thing; which if ſo, an argu- "ment might be drawn againſt the Infiniteneſs and Eternity of the De- "ity from theſe words, *God of Gods and Lord of Lords*, Gods and Lords "in the latter ſignifies creatures, therefore in the former; but how in- "conſequently in both, a child may judge.

Anſw. My arguing needs not proceed thus, but is good againſt Mr. *Cr.* thus, The term [*everlaſting*] ſignifies a limited everlaſtingneſs afore the Goſpel, *v.* 8. therefore it may be ſo meant *v.* 7. and if meant of the body of the Iſraelitiſh people who were the natural ſeed of *Abraham*, it muſt be ſo meant, otherwiſe it were not true. And for his inſtance, I think the argument not good as he makes it; yet it follows, the term [*God*] doth not neceſſarily of it ſelf infer infiniteneſs and eternity, but when it is applied to the moſt High God the Creatour, who is *the God of Gods*, becauſe it is ſometimes ſpoken of Creatures.

But Mr. *Cr.* tels me, "That *v.* 8. can be true onely in one of theſe "ſenſes, that they had title to all the Land of *Canaan*, though not actual "poſſeſſion of it, or that it was a type of the everlaſting ſpiritual *Ca-* "*naan*, in which ſenſes from *Abraham* they poſſeſſed it; or that the ple- "nary, and full poſſeſſion of the whole begins at the converſion of the "Jews, and ſhall laſt from thence to the end of the world without in- "terruption, becauſe neither *Abraham* nor his ſeed had actual poſſeſſion "of all the Land of *Canaan*; none of theſe will ſupport Mr. *T.* his decli- "ning cauſe.

Anſw. That *the land of Canaan*, *Gen.* 17. 8. muſt be meant of that part of the earth ſo called is manifeſt from the expreſſion, *wherein thou art a ſtranger*, or *the land of thy ſojournings*, and might be, if need were, proved by multitudes of other Scriptures. And that *the ſeed of Abraham* is that which is natural and afore their later converſion, is apparent from *v.* 9, 10. where *the ſeed to whom the land of Canaan is promiſed* are enjoyned *to be circumciſed*, and the term *poſſeſſion v.* 8. cannot be meant of a mere title, for that's implied in the words *will give*, but the *poſſeſſion* is diſtinct from it and conſequent upon it, therefore I chooſe rather to untie Mr. *Cr's.* knot by expounding it thus, *I will give to thee and to thy ſeed after thee all the land of Canaan for an everlaſting poſſeſſion*, but not altogether, thou ſhalt poſſeſs a part in thy time as a pledge of the whole, as his burying place was, and thy ſeed in *Joſhua's* and *Davids* time ſhall poſſeſs the whole, and this ſhall be not onely a place to ſojourn in, but *a poſſeſſion* for them to dwell in, and that *everlaſting*, that is, for many ages, as *Phinehas his Prieſthood* is termed *everlaſting*, *Numb.* 25. 13. ſo long as they ſhall keep my Covenant and obſerve my ſtatutes. Now this will ſerve thus far to ſupport my cauſe, which is ſtill ſtanding and not declining, to ſhew that the Covenant *Gen.* 17. 7. as it is made to the natural ſeed of *Abraham* is termed *everlaſting*, that is, for a limited time afore the Goſpel; which ſenſe alſo the terms *for ever* and *everlaſting* have, *Exod.* 12. 14. & 21. 6. *Numb.* 25. 13. *&c* and ſo the *major* Propoſition of Mr. *Cr.* juſtly denied, *He that makes an everlaſting covenant*

to

to Abraham *and his seed after him in their generations, promised that infants should be in Covenant under the Gospel.*

Sect. 5. Mr. *Cr.* endeavours to draw *Gal.* 3. 8. to his purpose, to prove *a continuance of the Gospel Covenant to the end of the world, to* Abraham *and his seed*, by paraphrasing it thus; *That the Scripture foretold that God would justifie the Heathen through faith, that is, the partition wall should be pulled down, and the Heathen nations should profess faith as visible members, whereof some should be actually justified as members invisible.* But besides his inept expression of [heathen nations] which is all one with nations nations, he abuseth the text by paraphrasing [*through faith*] thus, that *the nations should profess faith as visible members*, when it should be, *shall be true believers as* Abraham *was*, and *would justifie the nations*, by *whereof some should be actually justified*, whereas the text mentions no other then should be justified, and *v.* 9. terms them, *they that are of the faith, who are blessed with Faithfull Abraham*, and only meant by *the nations*, *v.* 8.

Mr. *Cr.* tels me, 1. That "I injuriously misreport his allegation, as "that he urged this argument drawn from *Gal.* 3. 8. to prove that *A*"*brahams* natural seed were promised to be in Covenant under the Go"spel, whereas he urged it to prove the Covenant *Gen.* 17. 7. to have "been a Gospel Covenant made with *Abraham* and his seed, that is pro"professors and believers, whether carnally descended from him or no. But sure he that reads his first argument in his *Sermon* p. 88, 89. and his *Defence* p. 256. where his words are, *the minor I prove from* Gen. 17. 7. *where the infants of believing parents are implied, it being a Covenant not only established with* Abraham, *but with his seed after him in their generations for an everlasting Covenant, by vertue of which* Isaac *and all succeeding male infants were circumcised*; now sure these were *Abrahams* natural seed, and here the Covenant is everlasting, and therefore according to Mr. *Crs.* reasoning to extend to the end of the world, and *the infants of believing parents*, who are their natural seed, *are*, he saith, *implied*; which can be no otherwise then as *Abraham* is imagined to be taken for each believer, and the believers natural seed proportionably correspondent to *Abrahams* natural seed, *by prerogative of birth*, as he there speaks, and then adds. *In Gal.* 3. 8. *there is implied* Abrahams *seed, in that it was a Gospel Covenant, and that in him all nations shall be blessed, and is directly for me, for it asserts the Covenant, and in that justification to the believing Gentiles, not onely from* Abraham *promise, but also a promise to them and their seed*; which plainly shews that he imagines *Gal.* 3. 8. the Gospel Covenant, to be a promise to believers and their seed who are their natural seed, as in *Abraham his seed is implied*, which conformably must be his natural. And if Mr. *Cr.* did not in the dispute mean *Abrahams* natural seed he went from the point to be proved, and by me denied, that the Covenant *Gen.* 17. 7. was not simply everlasting to the natural seed of *Abraham*, sith they were dispossessed of *Canaan*. His suggestions therefore of my *using officious untruths and pious frauds*, are but the venome of his spirit which throughout his book he discovers, and most pestilently in that Section, for which the Lord rebuke him.

What he next saith, that when I say the thing promised *Gal.* 3. 8. was justification, and that of the heathen and that through faith, therefore this text proves not *Abrahams* natural seed in Covenant under the Gospel, is, *As if all this might not be, and yet some of the natural seed of* Abraham *be in covenant under the Gospel, who professed, were justified and had faith as well as the heathen*; which I grant; but then they were not onely *Abrahams* natural seed but also his spiritual, to which I grant the Covenant is made *Gen.* 17. 7. and is everlasting, and if he can prove infants of believers to be such, there's no question but they are in Covenant under the Gospel and to be baptized, till then he can never prove either from *Gen.* 17. 7. or *Gal.* 3. 8. that *Abrahams* natural seed, much less infants of believing parents to be in the Gospel covenant, which whether hee had reason to bee ashamed of attempting the Reader may judge. That the entring into Covenant, *Deut.* 29. 10, 11. was a transeunt fact and not a thing perpetually binding, I had thought none would deny; nor argue as Mr. *Crag* doth, *it was by command*, Deut. 29. 1. *they were* v. 29. *to do the words of the Law, and that was a command, and the revealed things belong to them and their children for ever, therefore the entring into Covenant* v. 10, 11. *was a command perpetually binding under the Gospel*, which is too frivolous to spend time in answering, and his argument, *that if wives and servants were in Covenant under the Gospel much more infants*, is alike frivolous, sith he himself makes no *other then believing wives and servants in Covenant under the Gospel*, which when he proves of infants their being in Covenant will not be denied. This is enough in answer to that Section and most of the 8th. and 9th. Sections of the third part.

I said his allegation is vain of *Heb.* 8. 6. to prove that *if infants were in covenant under the Law they are in covenant under the Gospel*, whereas the meliority of the Covenant is not placed in the extent to the sort of persons; He asks me, *what then? will it follow, if a Covenant was made to no more then before, therefore not to all that were before? Answ.* No, yet it will follow that the text is vainly alledged to prove the co extension to persons, tha speaks not at all of that thing, nor i it at all to the purpose, that *it is extended to more, to wit to Gentiles.* For 1. however that text speaks not of it. 2. It is extended to more nations of the world besides the Jews, but to none but believers of those nations, and consequently not to infants of believing parents as such. That the new Covenant contains promises of better things then the old Covenant, and differs more then in administrations, is shewed before Sect. 43. and yet there is no *such thing implied as if there were salvation in any other then Jesus Christ*, unless he could prove salvation were by the promises of the Law. My *third Paradox* (as he calls it) *that the promises of the Gospel are not to any other then the elect and true believers*, is proved before Sect. 33. That *there are in the Gospel Covenant promises of external ordinances made to all visible members*, is more then Mr. *Cr.* proves or any other, and therefore I count it a figment, I know none but spiritual promises in it, which Mr. *Cr.* grants *are made absolutely and terminated or performed onely to the elect and invisible members*, which is the same with my

Para-

Paradox, but hath more asserrors then his most gross speech, *that the meliority of the Covenant consists principally in outward ordinances, manner of administration and dispensation, extent and amplitude of the proposal, not of grace and glory.* He adds, *of which there was always the same reason*; Enoch, Abraham, Eliah, Moses, *were as well justified by faith*, which is true, but not according to the Covenant of the Law, but by the Covenant of the Gospel, which it seems *Mr. Cr.* understands not, though he assume the title of *a Preacher of the Gospel*.

Mr. *Cr.* saith of me, *His last assertion* is, *that because the promises of the Gospel are not to any other then the elect, and true believers, therefore they are not to infants as the natural seed of believers: The antecedent is proved to be false, for though the spiritual part of Gospel promises is absolutely performed and terminated to the elect, yet they are conditionally proposed to all Professors; and the external part, which consists in administration of ordinances, is equally belonging to all visible members.* But are the promises to all professors because they are conditionally proposed to them? If so, we may say the promises are to the most obstinate infidels, to every man in the world, for to them they are conditionally proposed. Sure this is not according to the doctrine of the Scripture which makes the promises to bee the believers inheritance, *2 Cor.* 1. 20. *2 Pet.* 1. 4. *Gal.* 3. 16. & 4. 28. *Heb* 6. 12, 17. according to the doctrine of Protestants, the Saints Legacy, yea Pædobaptists make them their priviledge, *Rom.* 9. 4. though the promises there were other promises. As for *an external part of Gospel promises, which consists in administration of ordinances equally belonging to all visible members*, it is a mere figment no where in Scripture; And the sayings of Mr. *Cr. Part.* 3. *Sect.* 11. *p.* 261. [" Christ is said *Heb* 8. 6. to be a Mediator of a " better Covenant, which could not be, if infants, that were in covenant, " under the Law, were out of covenant under the Gospel, and is grounded upon this impregnable rock, which the Anabaptists will never o- " verthrow, that to be circumcised or baptized is all one as to be in vi- " sible covenant: that the reason of baptizing or circumcising a person " is their birth right, tuition, self-profession, whereby they are visibly " admitted into covenant, that what he hath said *Examen part.* 3. *sect.* 1. " *Antipæd. part.* 1. *sect.* 5. touches not the true state of the Controver- " sie, but is a confused Maze intricated with his *fallacia decumani*, or " master fallacy of Gods making, whereas he should say, completing his " Covenant onely with the elect, *Heb.* 8. 6. the new Covenant is a bet- " ter Covenant not onely positively, because it is established upon bet- " ter promises in circumstantials, but also because it is extended to move " all nations; negatively would not be better, if any sexe, age, degree " were excluded] contain such a heap of mistakes and untruths as is not elsewhere usually found in the most heedless scribler. For 1. if the first speech were true, then unless we grant infants to be baptized, which is in his language, to be in Covenant, either the new Covenant shall not be better then the old, or Christ not mediatour of it, which is as much as to say, if infants who were circumcised under the Law be not baptized under the Gospel then the promises of the Spirit, justification, Gods

writing his laws in the heart, teaching, forgiving sins cannot be better then the promises of the Law, which assure righteousness and life to the keepers of the Law, or Christ cannot be Mediatour of the new Covanant, which if it be not a more monstrous conceit and to be more abhorred by Christians then ever any Popish conceit of the necessity of baptism to infants to prevent exclusion out of heaven, for which *Austin* is by Mr. *Cr.* himself reckoned *the hard Father of infants*, I know nothing. Sure all that doubt of infant Baptism, must by this reason either doubt whether it were not as good to be under the Law as under the Gospel, or whether Christ be a better Mediatour then *Moses*. 2. It is a monstrous boldness in him to tell us of a visible Covenant of so great necessity, and never tell us distinctly what it contains, nor where it is to be found, especially when not onely my self, but his Oracle Mr. *Baxter*, hath written so much against it, as hee hath done in his *Apology against Mr. Blake*. 3. It is alike confidence in his own conceits, to tell us, that *it is an impregnable rock which the Anabaptists will never overthrow, that to be circumcised or baptised is all one as to be in visible Covenant*, and yet shew us none that useth such language but himself. How doth hee think I or any other should answer his arguments, which are vented in such gibberish as no Dictionary or Author, or use makes intelligible? Is not his own first agument in his *Sermon* here *pag.* 254. *Those* (*meaning under the Gospel*) *that are in Covenant with God* (*meaning outward and visible*, which according to him is all one as to be baptized) *ought to have the seal of the Covenant which is baptism, But infants of Believing parents are in the Covenant with God* (that is in his language in the outward Covenant which is all one as to bee baptized) *therefore they ought to have the seal of the Covenant, which is baptism.* In which he plainly makes 1. baptism the Covenant, and yet the seal of it. 2. He argues in this manner, infants are baptized therefore they are baptized, which is either merely an inept tautology, such as boyes in Schools would hiss at in a Freshman, or else it infers from baptism already done baptism to bee done, which Pædobaptists call Anabaptism, and so Mr. *Cr.* is turned an Anabaptist. 4. Hee tels us, *this is an impregnable rock which the Anabaptists will never bee able to overthrow* (though it be a Castle in the Air built by his imagination and will of it self vanish) *that the reason of baptizing a person is his birth right, tuition*, which proceeds onely on that conceit as if there were the same reason of Baptizing as of Circumcising, which is oft before shewed to bee false. 5. If his words [*whereby they are visibly admitted into Covenant*] bee referred to the *outward Covenant* and *baptizing*, then the sense is Anabaptistical, by baptizing they are admitted to baptism, if to [*birthright, tuition*] and *admission* bee meant as Mr. *Baxter* in his *Book of Baptism* page 24. then the sense is, by birth right persons are baptized, and so they baptize themselves and need no other baptism besides Birth right. 6. Hee corrects me for saying *God makes, when I should say completes*, as if the Translators of *Heb.* 8. 8. were mistaken, or Gods making his Covenant were not his completing it, or he did not complete the

Covenant

Covenant hee made. But this exception of Mr. *Crag* ſhews either his oſſitancy or unskilfulneſs; ſith it is the ſame word in *Jerem.* 31. 31, 32, 33. כרת *to ſtrike*, rendered in the Greek LXX by the Verb *διατιθημι*, and ſo *Heb.* 8. 10. & 10. 16. which is as much as to diſpoſe or put, and *Heb.* 8. 9. by ἐποίησα *I made* although it be v. 8. rendred by συντελέσω I will complete, ſo that this exception is but *nodus in ſcirpo*, out of a cavelling vein. 7. He ſaith, *I do not touch the true ſtate of the controverſie Exam. par.* 3. *ſect.* 1. *Antipæd. part.* 1. *ſect.* 5. though it be the very hinge of it, unleſs they mean no otherwiſe by *being in Covenant* then baptiſm, and then I muſt confeſs there is no controverſie about the conſequence of Mr. *Ms.* argument *Infants are in Covenant*, that is to be baptized, *therefore they are to be baptized*, but the argument to be derided as nugatory, as indeed it is. 8. He terms my diſpute there *a confuſed Maze intricated*, which either his ignorance or impudence prompted him to do, ſure he ſhews no confuſedneſs in it. 9. He calls my propoſition *of Gods making his covenant onely with the elect or ſpiritual ſeed, my Maſter ſakacy*, and yet it is proved from Scripture before, and acknowledged by Proteſtants, yea Mr. *Cr.* himſelf to be true. 10. He takes on him to foretell no ſatisfaction to be expected from the third part of my *Review* before hee ſees it. 11. He ſaith *Heb.* 8. 6. *the new Covenant is a better Covenant, becauſe it is eſtabliſhed on better promiſes in circumſtantials and extended to move all nations*, which are not in the text. 12. He ſaith, *it would not bee better if any ſexe age or degree were excluded*, which being meant of the outward Covenant, it were as if he ſaid, the new Covenant were not better then the old if an infant of a day old were excluded baptiſm.

Hee tels mee pag. 140. *His conſequent is alſo unſound, for the internal and ſpiritual part may be made intentionally to infants as the ſpiritual ſeed of believers, and yet the external part and that of Ordinances to infants as the natural ſeed of Believers, as well under the Goſpel as under the Law*; In which paſſage the phraſe *ſpiritual ſeed of believers* is a new notion, intimating that believing fathers beget them ſpiritual, contrary to *John* 3. 6. and that *there is in the Goſpel promiſes a part which is of ordinances*, which is a figment, and that *belongs to the natural ſeed of believers* which is falſe, and *that my conſequent is unſound for that reaſon*, which if it were good the conſequent is ſound nevertheleſs.

What hee adds, "if the external part under the Goſpel belong "not to infants, the Goſpel and that made with *Abraham* are two "diſtinct Covenants and eſſentially different, and that made with *A*-"*braham* and his ſeed carnal, as the carnal *Anabaptiſts* affirm, their "portion no better, then Turks they made (as *Calvin* obſerves) as beaſts, "whereas the Covenant *Gen.* 17. 7. is everlaſting] is true thus far, that the Covenant *Gen.* 7. 17. ſo farre as it did aſſure righteouſneſs to *Abrahams* ſpiritual ſeed by faith was the Goſpel Covenant the ſame with ours, made in Chriſt and everlaſting, but this is nothing to prove that there was ſuch an external part of outward ordinances belonging to infants in that Covenant. But that Covenant is mixt, Mr. *Cr.* himſelf ſaith,

faith, *there was a promise of Canaan and temporal blessings in it though in the main the Covenant were spiritual*, and that part belonged to the Israelites by nature onely, not to our children at all. So that Mr. *Cragg* terms of *carnal* and *gross* put upon us, and *Calvins* observation are but reproaches and calumnies by Mr. *Cr.* and other Pædobaptists, devised and used by them wickedly to make us odious: but in time their wickedness will return on their own head.

Sect. 7. Mr. *Cr.* speeches of *infants sad condition without baptism*, are like the Popish talk of the necessity of baptizing infants that they may enter into Gods kingdome. By denying their baptism we deprive them not of Gods Covenant. The priviledges *Rom.* 3. 2. *&* 9. 4. were peculiar to the Jews; Did he write with heed, he would not say they belong to infants of Gentiles under the Gospel. When *I* say Baptism is not an ordinary meanes of salvation without faith, I mean that no ones baptism but the baptism of true believers is an ordinary meanes of salvation, which is true, though there may be true baptism without true saving faith if it be professed. His talk of *preaching to infants by presenting objectively the benefit of that which is preached without manifesting to the understanding*, is another of his wild conceits. It's *no contradiction* to say infants are not saved by ordinary meanes, to wit, preaching the word, *&c.* and yet to say they are saved by election, redemption, the work of Gods Spirit, sith by ordinary means *I* understand and so do others, the Word and Sacraments and Christian discipline.

It is false he saith of me *p.* 146. that *I confess if I knew infants were elected I would baptize them*, or that *here I acknowledge of the species or sort of believers infants, that they are not onely elected of God but redeemed of Christ and have the work of his Spirit.* Sect. 8. the *major* of his Syllogism [*That which was proposed and entertained with success amongst the Jews, which were the natural seed of* Abraham, *was not onely made with the spiritual seed of* Abraham] *p.* 147. is denied, he is grossely mistaken in conceiving believing Jews were not *Abrahams* spiritual seed: and his arguing *that many of the natural seed of* Abraham *were believers under the Gospel*, *Rom.* 4. 11, 12. to prove it confirms the contrary. For all that are true believers (not every professour of faith) or elect are *Abrahams* spiritual seed, and this I often expressed plainly, and Mr. *Cr.* knew well enough; but says *I speak ambiguously*, that he may have some colour for his random roving talk *of persons in visible Covenant being children of the promise and* Abrahams *seed*, which is much of it non-sense, unproved dictates, and quite beside the meaning of the texts *Rom.* 4. 11, 12, 16. *&* 9. 8. which make none *Abrahams* seed, and children of the promise *Gen.* 17. 7 as it was Evangelical, but true believers or elect persons, as is amply before proved Sect. 28, 29. The rest of his scribling in that Section runs on these two mistakes; 1. *That there is now under the Gospel a national Church as the Jews was, and that the expression* Ephes. 3. 6. *may be applied to this whole Nation.* 2. That *there is such an outward visible Covenant which God hath made with such a whole visible National Church*, which is not proved from *Deut.* 29. 10, 12. *Joh.* 1. 11. *Psal.* 50. 5. *Joh.* 15. 2. two of which speak not at all of the Gospel Covenant,

nant, nor of Gods making a Covenant with them, but of theirs with God, the 2d. is expreſly meant onely of true believers, the 4th. of being a *branch in Chriſt* (which it's true may be meant of a viſible profeſſour) but not of being in the Goſpel Covenant of grace, in which none any where are ſaid to be, nor is God ſaid any where to make it to any but true believers or elect perſons, as is proved Sect. 33. There is not any thing Sect. 9. that I need reply to, ſaving that he grants *that the Goſpel Covenant of grace* Heb. 8. 10, 11, 12. *is made onely to the elect, if by the Covenant I mean the end, event and ſucceſs thereof*, which I confeſs I do, and acknowledge that I abhor any conceit to the contrary, as if God ſhould make a Covenant to any, which ſhould not have the end event and ſucceſs anſwerable to his promiſe, and therefore this Covenant promiſing things, which none in the event have but the elect, can bee ſaid to be made by God to none but them, unleſs we will charge God with falſhood, mutability or impotency.

Sect. 10. That *Iſa.* 49. 22, 23. is a propheſie of the reducing the Jews from Babyloniſh captivity is evinced from *v.* 19, 20, 21. in that the deſcription of *the places waſt and deſolate, the land of their deſtruction, the place which was too ſtrait* are meant of the *land of Canaan*, and Mr. *Cr.* himſelf thus *v.* 20. *the place is too ſtrait for me, that is the Land of Canaan is too narrow to contain the whole Church*, and he himſelf expounds after, *thou haſt loſt the other*, v. 20. *of the natural ſeed of* Abraham, and *the being deſolate, a captive, and removing too and fro off* Jeruſalem: But he will have it meant *of the time after the deſtruction by* Titus, *and the diſperſion after it, for we never find it verified literally that the Land of* Canaan *was too ſtrait during the time of captivity (as the words point) to contain the Jews.* But whereto the words point that the Land of Canaan was too ſtrait during the time of captivity to contain the Jewes. The words point at the multitude of Jews after the return from the Babyloniſh captivity, at which time according to *Zechariah* his propheſie, *ch.* 8. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. the Jews mightily encreaſed and proſpered, and *the place deſolate* confeſſedly being meant of *Canaan* and *Jeruſalem*, and *the Jewes the Captives*, the ſenſe of *v.* 22, 23. is meant undoubtedly (in the firſt ſenſe of the words) of the Jews reduction from captivity, which was not true of them after the deſtruction by *Titus*, therefore of their return from *Babylon* by *Cyrus*, and other Perſian and Grecian Kings and Queens favour. The like may be inferred from *v.* 24, 25. for therein is foretold that they which were taken captive (who were the Jews) ſhould be delivered. But Mr. *Cr.* ſaith, "That one *Democritus* would "not be enough to laugh at, nor three *Anticyra's* ſuffice to purge that "head, that would attempt from hence to draw an argument to prove "the fore-going concluſion: the words are theſe, even the captives of "the mighty ſhall be taken away; from whom? From *Cyrus*, *Artax-*"*erxes*, *Darius*, *Abaſuerus?* That would imply a contradiction, for he "confeſſes that theſe were nurſing fathers that did bring back the Jews "from captivity; the prey of the terrible ſhall be delivered, children "are not preys to their nurſes, nor are their nurſes terrible to their "children." But we need not make the *mighty* and *terrible* the ſame

with

with the deliverers or nurses. The Chaldean Princes were the mighty and terrible to whom the Jews were captives and a prey, and *Cyrus* and others after deliverers and nurses. Yet did we make them the same persons there were nothing ridiculous in it, sith the Jews were at first their captives, and prey, and they terrible to them, and yet not long after deliverers and nurses. So that we may retort Mr. *Crs.* words thus; One *Democritus* (except such a scoffer as Mr. *Cr.*) would not bee enough to laugh at, nor three *Anticyra's* suffice to purge that Craig that makes such a silly refutation. What he adds to disparage Mr. *Gattakers* notes may be dispelled by reading the notes, nor is he alone in the sense hee gives, *Grotius* in his *annot.* agrees in that thing with Mr. *Gattaker.* And for the contents of the Chapter though there is not sufficient reason to ascribe them to the Church of *England*, they being made by one Translator though allowed by others without any Canon, or Act of Parliament establishing them, yet I see not that they make against my sense, but the making the content of *v.* 24. to be *the powerful deliverance out of captivity*, did in the Dispute and doth still seem to make for my sense of delivery or returning of the Jews out of the Babylonish captivity, which being derided by Mr. *Crs.* party shewed the levity of their spirits, to whom this book shews him to be too like. Which is seen in his alleging my words (not *p.* 14. as he cites them but *p.* 16.) against my reason; which he makes my interpretation, though if hee had added my words [and if so] it would have appeared that I spake not those words as my interpretation. And for his allegation of Gods saying *to Moses thy children which thou hast brought out of Egypt*, I remember not where it is used, but [*thy people Exod.* 32. 7.] And for Mr. *Crs.* reconciliation, I do not conceive it may be congruously to speech so paraphrased, *the Gentiles shall bring thy sons, that is the Churches by spiritual succession, the Gentiles by natural generation, Gods that is mine by adoption.* It may be accommodated mystically to the conversion of the Gentiles as shadowed out by the reducing of the Jews from captivity, and yet make nothing for infants Churchmembership or Baptism. For though I yeeld in the litteral sense infants to be comprehended, yet in the mystical sense humble persons, or mean contemptible persons, or new born babes, that is believers desiring the word, may be meant. If the words be mystically meant, yet the words are not *a propheſie of a propheſie*, but as many speeches are which have a double meaning, as *Gen.* 15. 5. & 17. 4, 5. *Exod.* 12. 46. one more open, the other covert. And Mr. *Cragg purpose from Isai.* 49. 22. *were not to prove it foretold that infants under the Gospel should be brought to baptism, but to prove the proposition in question, that God foretold that infants should be Churchmembers under the Gospel, whence infant Baptism will follow*; it seems Mr. *Cr.* understands not the bringing of children in arms and upon shoulders of bringing infants to baptism, and how else in a litteral sense they by bringing in armes and on shoulders become Churchmembers I yet understand not, and am out of hope ever to do.

Sect. 11. Mr. *Cr.* speaks thus. *He says* (meaning me) *if by standard be meant baptism, which the Scripture never cals Gods standard, and the bringing*

bringing should be to Baptism, then the sense should be, that supream Magistrates, as Kings and Queens, should bring infants in their armes, and carry them on shoulders to Baptism, which no story mentions to have been done, and is too frivolous to be made the matter of that prophesie, in which words there is neither verity, nor consequence if sense. First hee says, if by standard hee meant Baptism, who makes a Thesis of his Hypothesis? or affirms that by standard is meant Baptism? To which I reply, Mr. *Cr.* of whom the relatour of the Dispute *p.*35. saith, *That to give me satisfaction (which he needed not) he told me, that by standard he understood some visible Gospel Ordinance, as Baptism,* without an *&c. to wit, Preaching, Praying, with many more*; nor had I any reason to conceive he understood any other sith he named no other, nor did he say *Gospel Ordinances*, as if he included the *genus* (as now he would evade) but *some Gospel ordinance* in the singular number. Now I said Baptism is no where called Gods standard, and he hath nothing to reply hereto, but that *it is so in this place, the Genus being predicated on the species.* But this is but a begging of what he should prove, that by *standard* here is meant *Baptism* in particular or Gospel ordinances in general. Sure the phrase of *setting up the standard* is very unsutable to the use of baptizing, which was not by setting up, but putting down into the water. And if Mr. *Crs.* words or the text do not necessarily speak of Kings and Queens bringing in their arms and on their shoulders to baptism, my reasons are the same, and of a like force, if meant of the people. For no story doth mention carrying infants on shoulders to Baptism by the people, and such a thing is too frivolous to be made the matter of this prophesie, which expresseth some great and wonderfull thing to be done by Gods extraordinary incitement and power, of which kinde that is not. Though Mr. *Cr. grant the phrase of nursing fathers and mothers* Isa. 49. 23. *to be metaphorical*, yet he applies the words before (which are alike metaphorical) [*they shall bring thy sons in their armes or bosome, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders*, v. 22.] according to the proper sense of the words, when he saith, *the people should bring sons in their arms and daughters upon their shoulders to Baptism*, now if the words *v.* 23. be metaphorical, so are those *v.* 22. which is also acknowledged by Mr. *Cr.* 1 In that he grants that in story it is not found that infants have been brought to Baptism on shoulders. 2. In that they are said to be brought to the standard, which is according to Mr. *Cr.* Baptism, but that is not a standard properly but metaphorically, and therefore it follows upon Mr. *Crs* grant, that the application of that one phrase *of bringing their sons in their arms and daughters on shoulders*, according to the proper sense of the words is not right. Nor is his endeavour to fit the metaphor to infant Baptism any better, though *in the Low Countries it were true that the eldest son of a Commission Captain being born there whilest his father is in the service of the State, is by the courtesie of the Camp enrolled in the souldiers List on his birth day, and by the allowance of the State receives pay from the time of his nativity*, as he scribbles out of *Fullers* frivolous Treatise termed *Infants Advocate p.* 99. For 1. if infants be listed, yet no *standard is set up*, or *hand lifted up to the people to bring them, nor are they brought in their*

Pr- arms

arms or bosoms in the Low Countries. 2. Nor was any such usage among the Jews or Gentiles in *Isaiahs* time, to which he might bee conceived to allude, and it is too ridiculous to go about (as Mr. *Cr.* doth) to explain a metaphor alluding to an use in *Isaiahs* time by an use no where shewed to be but in the Low Countries in our time. That Mr. *Gataker in the cause of infant Baptism interprets innumerable places against me*, is an untruth. Though *Esther were a Jew*, yet a Queen of the Gentiles, and these things foretold *Isa* 49. 22, 23. were fulfilled in *Cyrus* time, and in *Ahasuerus*, *Artaxerxes* and *Darius* time also, yea and after them in *Alexander* the Great, and some of his successors, and their Queens as *Grotius* conceives, in his *Annotations*, who also and Mr. *Gataker* shew how the prediction of *bowing down and licking the dust of the Jews feet* was fulfilled, though not in *Esthers* time (as I said the prophesie of Queens being *a nursing mother* to the Jews was) yet in the times after afore Christs incarnation. And for Mr. *Crs.* argument from *v.* 1, 6, 7, 8, 20, 21. let him form it as strong as he can, yet he will never prove that *Isa.* 49. 22. is a prophesie of infants visible Churchmembership in the times of the Gospel or their bringing to Baptism, nor was I by any argument *of Mr.* Cr. *forced to surrender up this hold*, that *Isa.* 49. 22, 23. is a prophesie of the return of the Jewes from the Babylonish captivity, and their prosperity in *Judea* after their return afore Christs incarnation, and yet were it understood of the times of the Gospel, I shewed how it might be understood of grown men perswaded by the preaching of the Gospel, as *Junius* in his *Annotations*, which Mr. *Cr.* abusively puts into an argument as if it were alledged thus, *Junius says so therefore it is so*, and denies the antecedent and consequent. But neither was the consequent mine, nor the antecedent as Mr. *Cr.* sets it down. But this *Junius* saith, that *the standard* Isa. 49. 22. *is the Gospel, which is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth*, Rom. 1. 16. and therefore it is meant of perswading grown men by the preaching of the Gospel, and that *all those things are allegorically spoken of the amplitude of Christs spiritual Kingdome*, and therefore not of bringing infants to baptism And for *Cornelius a Lapide*, *Hierome*, *Cyril*, *Haymo*, *if they held it fulfilled in Gospel times, and extended the words to grown men*, though they *were for infants visible Churchmembership and Baptism*, yet they overthrow Mr. *Crs.* argument from thence, which is of no force unless the words be understood onely of Gospel times, and of infants being brought to some visible Ordinance as Baptism, the contrary whereof his own Authors shew, and himself grants, and therefore I take all Mr. *Crs.* reasoning in the Dispute and this Reply from *Isa.* 49. 22. to be meer cavilling, and still think it meet to refer the Reader for the discerning of my interpretation whether right or no, and my yeelding that the words may be accommodated to the calling of the Gentiles without any oppositeness to my interpretation, or appositeness to Mr. *Crs.* inference whether true or not to Mr. *Gatakers Annotations*, which for no other reason but because (however otherwise he differ from me) I take to be the exactest, and the most incomparable learned on that part of Scripture of any I know.

To

To Mr. *Crs.* defence Sect. 12. of his alleging thus *Isa.* 65. 20. *There shall be no more an infant of dayes, that is infants shall not be uncapable of the seal*, against my answer impliedly denying the consequence, and saying it hath no proof but his dictate, which is thus. *To which it were sufficient reply to say it hath no disproof, but his dictate, which is without all shew of probability, there being not a word of any such thing as outward peace, increase, possession, and long life to the* Jews, *unless in the type and that scarce probable, but of the glorious estate of the times of the Gospel held out in outward ordinances as shall appear.* I oppose 1. that I needed bring no other disproof, but denial being a respondent, but it is necessary hee should make good his sense if hee will inferre his conclusion thence. 2. My disproof was right: for *v.* 18; 19. speaks of the outward peace of Jerusalem and her people, their long life, increase, building, planting, possession, opposite to their former troubles *v.* 16. are expressed *v.* 20. 21, 22, 23. nor a word of outward ordinances.

Against this saith Mr. *Cr.* "And in *Isa.* 65. 20. there is need of "such an interpretation, for as *v.* 17. the new heavens and new earth, "and 18, 19. creation, and Jerusalem were analogical, and not proper, "so the 20. *v.* is wholly tropical and mystical. There shall be no more "thence an infant of days; How can this be understood litterally? did "not infants after as well, as under the captivity make up their weeks "of dayes, months of weeks? *&c.* It must needs relate to some thing un- "der the Jewish Pædagogy, and nothing so probably as that of theirs, "that nothing was clean till a Sabbath had gone over it, and therefore "according to Divine institution Circumcision was not till the 8th. day; "Mr. *T.* might have done well to have imparted us either his own or "Mr. *Gataker*s descant on these words, but because they could devise "nothing that like the ears under the Lions skin would not discover the "whole imposture, *ne γρυ quidem.*

Answ. That *Jerusalem is analogical* is not proved, nor doth it follow *v.* 17. *is tropical, therefore also v.* 20. any more then *Isa.* 11. 6, 7, 8. is allegorical, therefore also *v.* 2, 3, 4, 5, 9. Mr. *Gataker*s sense is plainly set down without any imposture in his *Annotations*, which is this, "There shall be no more thence brought to burial by reason of untime- "ly ends, as formerly a child that hath not fulfilled his dayes, but shall "live and attain to his just growth and full stint of years." This sense is not infringed by any thing Mr. *Cr.* saith, yea his question, *did not infants &c.* confirms it. That it must needs relate to something under the Jewish Pædagogy, is not proved, nor that the conceit *nothing was clean till a Sabbath was gone over it*, was of the Jewish Pædagogy, nor that it was the reason of circumcising the 8th. day, nor do I see what this, if it were granted, makes for his sense, *There shall be no more an infant of dayes, that is infants shall not be uncapable of the seal while their age is measured by dayes, as the* Jews *infants that might not be circumcised till a week had passed over them.* For there is neither mention of seal nor incapacity of it, nor of circumcision, nor its limiting to the 8th. day, and Mr. *Cr.* leaves out [*thence*] that is from *Jerusalem*, which shews it's meant of infants there being, and so not of Gentiles infants, and the predi-

Prediction is of an event of great moment, not of a capacity of a thing which might never be in the event, and if it were is of ſmall or no importance, nor is [*an infant of dayes*] well paraphraſed by [*while their age is meaſured by dayes*] For *an infant of dayes*, is all one in regard of dayes an infant, or child as the oppoſite term *an old man* ſhews, and his expreſſion is either non-ſenſe, or elſe it is vain to ſuppoſe that a perſon is *an infant while his age is meaſured by dayes*, for a perſon of many years hath his age meaſured by dayes, and if the meaning be, *an infant that hath his age meaſured by dayes*, not by one day or ſome hours *is capable of the ſeal*, then it ſhould imply that an infant of one day old is not. I am blamable for ſpending time in refuting ſuch fooleries, but the intolerable inſolent brags of Mr. *Crags* diſpute and ſcribling neceſſitates me.

Mr. *Cr.* from *Iſa* 65. 20. argued thus, "The childe ſhall die an "hundred years old, or as well a Churchmember as if hee were an hundred years old, therefore children may bee baptized under the Go- "ſpel, *and here p.* 174. *of me he ſaith*, He denied the conſequent which "I made good firſt *ab impoſſibili*, becauſe to take it literally would im- "ply a contradiction. For it is impoſſible being a childe to die a hun- "dred years old, childe is the ſubject of the queſtion, which is to be "taken properly without enallage; ſhall die an hundred years old, the "predicate that cannot otherwiſe be affirmed of it but analogically re- "ſembling in ſome capacity and qualification them that dies an hun- "dred yeares old.

Anſw. This arguing is indeed childiſh like, as if it were argued *Luk.* 1. 76. *Thou childe ſhalt bee called the Prophet of the Higheſt, for thou ſhalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his wayes, to give knowledge of ſalvation*; *Ergo*, this muſt bee underſtood analogically, *childe is the ſubject of the queſtion, which is to be taken properly without enallage*; and ſo this muſt be true of *John Baptiſt* while hee was a childe. The like might bee ſaid of *Luk.* 2. 34. 1 *King.* 13. 2. He is but a childe that knowes not that in ſuch paſſages as theſe there's no need of imagining an analogical predication, but that they are to be underſtood *ſenſu diviſo*, as when our Lord *Chriſt* ſaith *Luke* 7. 22. *the blinde ſee, the lame walk, the Lepers are cleanſed, the deaf hear, the dead are raiſed*; that is, ſuch as were blinde, lame, lepers, deaf, dead, not *in ſenſu compoſito*, ſuch as are when they *ſee, walk, are cleanſed, hear are raiſed*, ſo in the other place, not he that is a childe while he is a childe, but he that is now, or ſhall be once a child ſhall afore he dies be an hundred years old, which agrees with the reſt of the verſe, and *v.* 22. *as the dayes of a tree are the dayes of my people, and mine elect ſhall long enjoy the work of their hands*, they being expreſſions of long life. And M. *Gataker* ſaid rightly, *the ſyntax is familiar, and as clear as the day light or Sunſhine*: *the childe or youth (that now is) ſhall die the ſon of* 100 *years*; *that is ſhall be* 100 *years old when he dieth.* So *Gen.* 11. 10. *Gen.* 21. 25. *&c.* To which Mr. *Cr.* inſolently replies, *I had thought ſyntax had been Gramatical conſtruction according to rule, not literal interpretation, or univocal not analogical prædication.* I ſay for Maſter *Gataker* that hee may think ſtill that *ſyntax is Grammatical conſtruction according to rule, not literal*

literal interpretation, Mr. *Gataker* saith nothing to the contrary; yet literal interpretation is to be according to the rule of Grammatical construction; he may think *Syntax is neither univocal nor annalogical prædication*, there may be Syntax in imperfect speeches that are no enunciations, nor in them any predication of one thing on another, Mr. *Cr.* hath been a Pædagogue long enough to know, that which his Schoolboyes might tell him, there's Syntax between a Noun Adjective and Substantive, a Noun and a Preposition, or Interjection, where there is no predication. He adds of Mr. *Gataker*, *And this Syntax he says, is as clear as the day light, or sun shine, perhaps to an Owle or Bat.* Answ. Yea, and too to as seeing men as Mr. *Cr.* though his Eagle-eye be in this as dark as an Owle or Bat at noon.

He goes on, "And what is this Syntax that is so clear? The child "or youth that now is, shall die the son of an hundred years, that is, "shall be an hundred years old when he dieth; the child or youth, there "is one addition, for the Text mentions not youth, which is a distinct "age from childhood. *Answ.* It may be an addition to the English translation, but not to the Text, sith as Mr. *Gataker* shews the word נער is applied to *Joseph* at 17 years old, *Gen.*37.2. to *Benjamin*, *Gen.* 43.8. *when he is deemed to have been above thirty* but that's the ill luck of it, that then it will not serve Mr. *Crs.* turn for his infant Churchmembership visible in the time of the Gospel Mr. *Cr.* adds, *That now is, there is another, the child was not yet, it was a prediction.* Answ. So it might be, and yet the child one that then was when *Isaiah* spake it; nor is it any more addition to the Text then if he had said, the child that shall be; nor any untruth in the speech as exponnded by Mr. *Gataker*.

Mr. *Cr.* goes on. "There is a third [son of] by addition put in, old "by substraction taken away; excellent Arithmetick! besides here is a "new creation of a new generation [son of years] who ever heard such "a Syntax? did the son beget the years, or the years the son? or whe-"ther is elder? That is, shall be an hundred years when he dieth, here "is an exposition of an exposition, and a fourth addition [he and when] "being superadded.

Answ. It grieves me not so much that Mr. *Cr.* hath so much vilified my self, as that though he pretend to be a Preacher of the Gospel, yet like a *terræ filius*, or Grammer reader, he should shew such contempt of a man then alive when he wrote it (as I conceive by the date of his Epistle) however whether alive or dead, a man very reverend, and (however he conceived of me) one of the most learned and accurate writers (specially in such things as this) of his age, and while he slights him discover so much folly and ignorance in *Hebrew* and *Greek*, as an ordinary Grammarian or student in the Bible would hardly have shewed; certainly it's unsuitable to his undertaking of a Schoolmaster. The phrase בן־מאה שנה is word by word *the son of an hundred years*, for without [*of*] it would be non-sense, it being the sign of the Genitive case, nor is [*old*] substracted, but included in that expression, it being the *Hebrew* expression of old or aged, as M. *Gataker* shews from *Gen.*11.10. & 21.5. & 5.32. & 7.6. & 12.4. & 16.16. & 17.1. & 25.20, 26. & 37.2. & 41.46. & 45.26. and elsewhere.

and the same he might have learned from *Ainsworth Annot. on Gen.* 5. 32, &c. *Hebr. son of* 500. *years*, that is, *going in his* 500. *year. An usual speech in the Hebrew Scripture of mens age or of beasts*; *Gen.* 17. 1. *Exod.* 12. 5. And for [*he and when*] how can they be said to be superadded, when the very term [*shall die*] is all one with [when he shall die,] which shews it is not for Mr. *Cr.* purpose, for then it should have been, *shall be born as an hundred years old, as well a churchmember as if he were*; but is agreeable to the Prophets meaning, to express long life: And therefore his jeer of *excellent Arithmetick* shews his folly in deriding that which was right. And for his prattle, it shews his excellent ignorance of the *Hebrew* and *Greek* of the *Bible*, *Buxtorf. Thes. Gram. Hebr. l.* 2. *c.* 3. *p.* 360. in that piece which is termed by *Amama*, &c. *admirandum opus syntacticum*, *nomen* בן *filius periphrases & Hebraismos facit insignes*: *ut* בן קשת *filius arcus Iob* 41. 19. *id est sagitta & similes innumeri. Sic Joban.* 17. 12. ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, &c. *Apud Latinos Horat. l. carm. od.* 14. *Terræ filius*, should one scribble as Mr. *Cr.* doth here, Here's a new creation of a new generation [son of the bow, of perdition, of the earth] who ever heard such a syntax? did the son beget the bow, perdition, the earth, or the bow, perdition, the earth the son? or whether is elder? Would not a Scholler say he played the fool? For this I leave him to Mr. *Vaughans* correction.

But he seems to be more considerate in what follows. "According to "which interpretation, the words must carry this sense, There shall no "more infants die when they are young, nor an old man till he hath "filled his days, for he that now is a child shall not die till he be an "hundred years old, I wonder in what age this was performed, that no "man died till he had compleated his century, no mortal disease, nor "disease, nor use of Physitians, but every man might certainly know "the day of his death.

Answ. The words contain not such an absolute universal longævity, as Mr. *Cr.* would make to be the consequent of our interpretation, but a length of days opposite to *former troubles*, *v.* 16. in which so many died by war, famine, and pestilence, which therefore comparatively is reckoned as universal, as in like manner *Jeremiah* ch. 50. 20. speaking of the same times saith *the iniquity of* Israel *shall be sought for & there shall be none*, that is, as formerly to provoke God to cut them off by grievous deaths, as before the captivity. And according to this is that of *Zech.* 8. 4. and I said without any vaunting *Nebuchadnezzar* like *language*, as Mr. *Cr.* abusively chargeth me with *Isa.* 65. 20. was rightly made by me answerable to *Zech* 8. 4. which doth not intimate, that *the Text was made by me, and not by the Holy Ghost*, but made answerable, or correspondent, which arrogates no more to me then if I had said, made clear, made manifest, &c. Nor is any *experience or History contrary* to this, that the *Jews* after their return from *Babylon* had peace, prosperity, increase and long life in *Canaan* a great while together, and were honoured by divers *Persian* Kings, *Alexander* the Great, and some of the *Grecian* Kings, and the Nations near them subject to them. The *Contents of the Chapter are* [illegible] *by any Synod or Parliament interpretatively entitled to the Church of*

England, nor are to be accounted any more valid, then Mr. *Gataker's* notes, who though a single man, yet had his notes approved by other Annotators, and in some sort by the *Assembly* at *Westminster*. Yet the Contents of the Chapter being *v.*17. *The blessed estate of the new Jerusalem*, and in the Margin at *v.*19. *Revel.* 21.4. being put, shew, that Mr. *Crs.* conceit is no more favoured by them then mine. And the speech being to be understood comparatively to the former times, was true of the Jews after their return from the captivity at *Babel*. *V.*25. expressing the Jews peace notwithstanding the *Samaritan* neighbours, was true at the same time, although both were accommodated to the Gospel times, and the calling of the Jews yet to come. Nor is it any strange thing in that Prophet to make the restitution of the Jews from Captivity as answering to making new Heavens and Earth, as *Isa.*51.16. & 41.24, 25,26. & 45.12,13. Yet I deny not that 2 *Pet.* 3.13. *Revel.*21.1. the words are rightly applied to some other great work of God resembled by this and to be yet accomplished. That *the Israelites* 1 Cor. 10. 2. *were actually baptized or washed under the cloud it raining upon them, and in the Red Sea, the water touching their feet at least, after the dividing of the waves in such a sudden passage, and blowing upon them with the sprinkling thereof*, is no where set down *Exod* 13. and 14. Nor will such wetting be ever found in any Greek Author to be termed Baptism formally, and therefore it can be no other then similitudinary Baptism which is there meant, as the eating Manna and drinking Water was a similitudinary partaking of the Lords Supper, and *Grotius* did rightly expound [1 *Cor.*10.2. *were baptised*] by [*were as if they were baptised*] and yet *Isa.*65.20. is not rightly so expounded *shall die as an hundred years old*, there being no need of such an interpretation, nor any thing leading to it in the Text, but the expression is of long life; nor if it were meant so, is it proved that infants must be Churchmembers, and capable of some seal under the Gospel, unless there were no other way then that in respect of which he might be as one an hundred years old. Had Mr. *Cr.* sought the clearing of truth, he had been willing to read out the whole that his dealing might not be taken for deceitfull. By my refutation of Dr. *Savage* in *Latin*, some years since Printed, it may appear whether Text, Dr. *Savage* or the *Dr. of the Chair* did avoid my argument. The rest of M. *Crs.* arguments are the same with what others have urged, and have been answered in this and the former parts of this *Review*; nor do I find that Mr. *Cr.* hath added any thing of moment to them, to which I need make further reply. As for his taunts, quips, misrecitals or mistakes of my words, mis-reports of my actions, together with his own mistakes in Logick, Grammer, Divinity, they are otherwise discernable then by a particular answer in Print to each part of his Book. I presume the Christian and equal Reader will think it unnecessary to make any more reply to what is written of infant Baptism, till some thing be found written which better defends it then those have done who are here answered. If any other think it fit I should answer him also in particular, he may conceive that if I did perceive any thing that might not have an answer in that which is already written, or had in it any difficulty, I should

have

have done it: But being conscious to my self that I have not declined the answering of any out of contempt of the person, or sense of the difficulty of doing it, but because it is thought that I have been too large already, and that to answer every meer quirk of wit is unnecessary, as knowing that however light wits that love to shew their skill in disputing be taken with them, yet solid conscientious men will be led onely with good proofs out of Scripture which may shew the institution of Christ, I do here supersede from this work and commend it to his blessing, of *whom and through whom and for whom are all things, to whom be glory for ever.*

AMEN.

I AU59

FINIS.

I AU59